



class size matters

124 Waverly Place, NY, NY 10011

phone: 212-674-7320

www.classsizematters.org

email: classsizematters@gmail.com

**COMMENTS BY CLASS SIZE MATTERS ON A-190
PROPOSED REGULATIONS IN REGARDS SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN SCHOOL
UTILIZATION AND PROCEDURES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF SCHOOL
BUILDINGS HOUSING MORE THAN ONE SCHOOL**

October 4, 2010

SUMMARY:

Unfortunately, the proposed Educational Impact Statements, building plan template and Instructional footprint are inadequate to meet the needs of students for a sound basic education, as defined by research, experience, and the state's highest court.

- The EIS should include an analysis that projects the impact of the proposal on class size, and no co-locations or changes in utilization should be proposed that would prevent schools from reaching their class size goals in their Contract for Excellence plan.
- The EIS should include an analysis to determine if the proposed class sizes violate the building code, especially as the minimum size of rooms in the proposed instructional footprint has shrunk by as much as 50%.
- The EIS should provide enrollment projections for at least the next five years; including students disaggregated by grade, program, and student status (English language learners, Gifted and Talented, students with disabilities etc.)
- These projections should specify what data sources they are based upon, and should include (but not be limited to) current enrollment trends, building starts, census data, birth rate data geocoded by residence, and surveys of neighborhood day care centers and preKindergartens.
- The EIS should include an analysis to determine if the proposed change in utilization would affect the ability of students to be provided with sufficient dedicated space for art, music, science, remediation and special education services, as well as shared spaces.
- Instead of the minimal standards provided, the EIS and the utilization proposal should ensure that there is adequate space for SETTS, resource rooms for remediation, and special services, based upon the actual number of students who require such services at each school.
- The footprint is especially inadequate for high schools; and appears to call for only two specialty classrooms, no matter how large the school, and only one science lab, even for high schools of 4,000 students (a reduction from two in 2009).
- As for shared spaces, the EIS should describe during which period and times of day the cafeteria will be utilized for lunch each day, and how many periods a week the students

in each school with have access to the gym for physical education;

- The EIS, as well as instructions on how to provide public comment and when and where hearings will take place, when it is issued, should be made available to all parents in the affected schools in a document that is sent home through backpack mail.
- The DOE should publish at least 24 hours in advance of the PEP meeting on its website an assessment and summary of all public comments concerning the proposal.
- For school closings: A summary of the significant steps taken by DOE to improve school performance before decision to seek phase-out was reached should be required, not optional as currently proposed, as a required part of the EIS.
- Enrollment options must be made available to all current students enrolled in the school, so that they are provided with an opportunity to graduate from high school by accumulating course credits in the usual way, that is by attending regular classes, without engaging in substandard “credit recovery” . (Right now the only opportunity afforded students who are behind in credits at closing schools is either to be discharged to GED programs or receive their diploma through sub-standard and rushed credit recovery programs.)
- For each school in the building, the allocation of instructional space should include a listing of all rooms that will change in terms of school ownership or boundaries, their size, and current use.
- The analysis of the impact on the community should include how many students currently attend overutilized schools in the community; and how the school closing may affect these figures; as projected five years into the future, by grade and program.

Our more detailed comments are provided below.

| | |
|--------------|---|
| A-190 | SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN SCHOOL UTILIZATION AND PROCEDURES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF SCHOOL BUILDINGS HOUSING MORE THAN ONE SCHOOL |
|--------------|---|

I. DEFINITIONS

We believe that the public process for providing input from the community as well as an Educational Impact Statement should be required for both opening a new Gifted and Talented program in a school, as well as placing new schools or programs in newly constructed buildings, as these decisions can have significant impacts on students’ educational opportunities, overcrowding and class size.

Right now the DOE inserts charter schools in newly constructed buildings even though the original plan for that building was a neighborhood school. The DOE had gotten approval from the City Council in the capital plan based on original assurances that it will house district public school students in these spaces. They have also received 50% reimbursement from the State, with such reimbursement not allowed in the case of charter schools. The decision as to which schools to place in a newly constructed building can also have significant effects on overcrowding elsewhere; these decisions should have input from the community as well as a

public process to elicit that input.

“Capital improvement or facility upgrade” as defined should include whiteboards and other technological improvements, including computers; these are commonly provided in charter schools but not in district public schools, and are even more key to educational opportunities than air conditioners.

Finally, though the proposed regulation states that “The Chancellor retains final authority to determine whether a given proposed project qualifies as a facility upgrade”, **no one individual should have final authority**; the Chancellor’s determination should be available to appeal to the Commissioner or to the court.

II. PROCEDURES FOR PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT ON THE CHANCELLOR’S PROPOSALS FOR SCHOOL CLOSINGS AND CHANGES IN SCHOOL UTILIZATION

A. Educational Impact Statement

1a. As part of the Educational Impact Statement, the current and projected student enrollment of all the affected schools should be provided.

The enrollment projections should provided for at least the following five years; should be specified by grade, program, and student status (English language learners, Gifted and Talented, students with disabilities etc.) The projections should specify what data sources they are based upon, and these should include (but not be limited to) current enrollment trends, building starts, census data, birth rate data geocoded by residence, and surveys of neighborhood day care centers and preKindergartens.

We have seen that enrollment is now growing fast citywide, and overcrowding is worsening throughout the city, particularly in the early grades, with double digit percent increases in nearly every district for Kindergarten students.

Enrollment projections need to be done for at least five years out, to ensure that the co-locations do not have severely damaging effects on class size, Kindergarten waitlists, and the lost of critical cluster and specialty rooms.

The SCA currently hires two consulting companies to do enrollment projections – though neither consultant has been reliable in their projections, claiming that no citywide increases will occur until 2014, when this occurred already last year. The SCA claims to do separate enrollment projections, though they have never released them to the public.

1f. The EIS should include an analysis that projects the impact of the proposal on class size, and no co-locations or changes in utilization should be done that would prevent schools from reaching their class size goals in their Contract for Excellence plan.

Class size is a critical determinant of educational adequacy as determined by the state’s highest court. The projected class sizes should be included as part of the EIS, as well as whether they are consistent with the city’s Contract for Excellence (C4E) goals, (20 students per class in grades K-3, 23 in 4-8, and 25 in high school).

The EIS should include an analysis to determine if the proposed class sizes violate the building code, especially as the minimum size of rooms in the proposed instructional footprint has shrunk by as much as 50%.

The EIS should be required to analyze whether the likely class sizes in the rooms provided each school will be aligned with the building code, which sets out required minimum square footage per student of no less than 25 sq. ft. per Kindergarten student, and 20 sq. ft. per students in grades 1-12.

Indeed, some of the co-locations planned last year would have violated these requirements, and the new instructional footprint that defines regular classrooms as little as 500 sq. ft. would appear to legally limit the number of students in these rooms to no more than 25, which is smaller class size than the vast majority of NYC students in grade 4-12 were provided last year (2009-2010). In Kindergarten, these minimum room sizes would require class sizes no more than 20; currently 72% of Kindergarten students are in classes larger than this.

The EIS should include an analysis to determine if the proposed change in utilization would affect the ability of students to be provided with sufficient dedicated space for art, music, science, remediation and special education services, as well as shared spaces.

The EIS should analyze the impact of any change in school utilization on availability of dedicated rooms for art, music, science, special education services, including SETTs and guidance counseling, and critical shared spaces, such as libraries, gyms, playgrounds and other outdoor spaces, and auditoriums.

h. The effect of the school closing on personnel should include an analysis of how many teachers will be likely put on Absent Teacher Reserve (ATR) and the likely cost of this based on previous experience.

j. The ability of other schools in the affected community district to accommodate students following the school closure or change in utilization should also include enrollment projections for the community district as a whole.

EIS's concerning the Location and/or Co-Location of a Charter School in an Existing Public School Building should be extended to all co-locations; even though the new charter law may have referred specifically to charters, there is a need for all EISs to include the information cited in this section, and should be required for any proposal to locate or co-locate a charter school or new school not only in an existing public school building, but also in an annex or a trailer.

ii. a) A building usage plan should include a list of any rooms that will change ownership between schools, and what their current usage is. And while an equitable distribution of space between co-located schools is mentioned, adequacy should also be required.

While equity is cited in the proposed regulations throughout this section, adequacy must also be required. to ensure that students be able to receive a sound basic education, as defined in the decision of the state's highest court in the Campaign for Fiscal Equity case. Two co-located schools that are overcrowded may have equitable conditions, but that will not benefit the students in either. No students should be relegated to classrooms that are in substandard spaces (eg those without windows.)

Similarly, the shared spaces must provide that all students have an adequate access to gyms, libraries, cafeterias, etc. so that their lunch times are at reasonable times, and they are provided with physical education in these gyms at least at the state-mandated periods. such facilities in a similar manner and at reasonable times to non-charter school students as provided to charter school students;

The building plan should include a list of rooms that will be shifted or subtracted from the school

or schools already located in the building, and their current usage or dedicated purpose (ie classroom, art room, science lab, library, SETTS or intervention room, etc.), as well as where, if any, the existing school will be able to provide adequate space for this type of instruction or services within the new arrangement.

3. The EIS, as well as instructions on how to provide public comment and when and where hearings will take place, when it is issued, should be made available to all parents in the affected schools in a document that is sent home through backpack mail.

Not all parents have access to computers, and not all parents are in touch with their CECs. Thus, in order to ensure that parents are aware of these proposals and have sufficient information on how to provide input, this information must be distributed at the school level. This information should also be made available with the local elected officials, including the borough president, state legislators and city councilmember who represent the area in which the school is located.

4. The date and location of the hearing should be made available at least two weeks ahead of any hearing, again through backpack mail.

5. There needs to be far more clarity as to what constitutes a significant revision to the proposed change in utilization; which will automatically trigger a new EIS and a new hearing. Right now, this is left ambiguous in the proposed regulations.

C. Approval by the PEP

4. After the period for public comment has ended the DOE should publish AT LEAST 24 HOURS on the DOE's official internet website an assessment of all public comments concerning the proposal.

The intent of the law was clearly that this ***summary of public comments should be posted at least 24 hours before the day of the PEP meeting***, so that they might inform the decisions of the PEP members. This means that the cut-off period for comments must be before that time, perhaps two or three days before the vote.

Up to now, this law has been **misinterpreted** by DOE to mean that a summary can be posted any time immediately before the PEP vote, even up to an hour before the vote; which is contrary to the intent of the law and means that all the PEP votes on school closings and co-locations up to this time have been legally suspect.

PROCEDURES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOL BUILDINGS HOUSING MORE THAN ONE SCHOOL OR PROGRAM

Building Councils should be required to have open meetings, and their minutes and records should be available to the public upon request. The Campus Audit that each building council fills out annually should also be available to the public upon request.

There should be shared space committees for all co-located schools, not just charters, in order to ensure cooperation instead of conflict at these schools.

These shared space committees should be open to the public, and announced to parents at least two weeks before the meeting. Minutes should be taken and made available to any member of the public upon request.

If the building usage plan is not being followed or does not appear to allow for equitable and adequate classroom conditions and access to shared spaces, any member of the shared space committee should be able to bring a complaint to the Chancellor and appeal his decision to the Commissioner.

2. b. **Approval Process**

1. In addition to the shared space committee, all proposed capital improvements and facility upgrades should be submitted to the district community education council, the local city councilmember, state legislators and borough president, for their comment and input before the decision of the chancellor as to whether to approve the proposal.

3. The Chancellor or his designee shall notify not only the charter school's operator and the co-located non-charter schools of his decision, but also the shared space committee, the CEC, the city councilmember and state legislators and borough president who represents the area.

PROCEDURES FOR EMERGENCY SCHOOL CLOSINGS AND SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN SCHOOL UTILIZATION.

The decision of the Chancellor to make a decision based upon an "emergency" without going through the legally mandated process should be more carefully defined, to prevent decisions such as occurred last year with Girls Prep Charter, universally criticized as outside the intended scope of the law.

**Comments on the Building Utilization Plan/ Instructional Footprint
Attachment No. 2**

The Footprint sets forth the baseline number of rooms that should be allocated to a school based on the grade levels served by the school and number of classes per grade.

Unfortunately, the proposed plan and Footprint are inadequate to meet the needs of students for a sound basic education, as defined by research, experience, and the state's highest court.

No class size standards

There are no class size standards attached to the new proposed Footprint. The original footprint assumed class sizes of 20 in grades K-3, and 25 in grades 4-5; this was changed in 2009 to class sizes of 28 in grades 4-5. The other grade levels left class sizes undefined.

Now there are no class sizes mentioned anywhere in the proposed Footprint; meaning the DOE could propose pushing more and more new schools into these spaces, each one eating up classroom space, until class sizes increase in our existing schools to maximum levels.

This will likely lead to even more overcrowding, and likely prevent our schools from ever being able to reduce class size to more optimal levels as set out in the Contracts for Excellence plan..

Room sizes shrunk to untenable levels

In the proposed new version of the Footprint, the minimum room sizes have consistently shrunk in size, and classrooms and rooms for student support services would be only a minimum of 500 square feet, compared to a minimum of 750 sq. feet in the prior instructional footprint. This represents a reduction in size of 33%.

Cluster rooms have shrunk to 500 sq. ft. minimum, from 1000 sq. feet in 2009, a reduction of 50%; resource rooms have shrunk to 240 sq. ft. from 300 sq. feet. The total square feet of programmed areas have been reduced from a minimum of 2875 sq. feet to only 1500 sq. feet, a reduction in size of almost 50%.

Since the building code requires that classrooms contain at least 20 sq. ft. per student in grades 1-12 and 25 sq. ft. per student in Kindergarten, according to the SCA's "Blue Book", or this means that class sizes in these rooms will have to be limited to 25 students or less in grades 1-12, and 20 in Kindergarten, or else violate the building code.

Currently the vast majority of classes are larger than this. As of last year, 72% of Kindergarten students were in classes larger than 20 students ; 21-28% of 1st -3rd graders; 50-53% of 4th and 5th graders; 69% of 6th graders, 74% of 7th graders; and 81% of 8th graders were in classes that exceeded 25 students per class.. In our high schools, 74% of students were in science and social studies classes larger than 25, and 68-69% of students in larger math and English classes. Nearly a quarter of high school students were in classes of 34 or more.

Yet there is no evidence that the DOE plans to reduce class size in the future, and in fact, class sizes have been sharply rising throughout the city in recent years and are expected to rise even higher this year.

Rather than ensure adequate classroom space, the following statement is made:" Certain course offerings may require rooms with an area greater than 500 square feet. The Office of Space Planning will accommodate these course offerings to the extent larger rooms exist in the building." If this proposed instructional footprint is used for space planning, this statement is an inadequate assurance that these rooms will be large enough for the students they will hold.

Inadequate space for student support services, resource rooms, and administrative services

The proposed footprint will allow schools only a baseline of the two rooms (min. 500 sq. feet each) for both student support services and resource rooms, and only one and a half size classroom for administrative services.

This is insufficient, especially given that SETTS is now included in the category of students support services.

The EIS and the utilization proposal should require that there is adequate space for SETTS, resource rooms for remediation, and special services, ***dependent on the actual number of students who require such services at each school.***

Cluster rooms and specialty spaces too few and too small

Cluster rooms have also been reduced in minimum size by 50%, from 1000 sq. feet minimum to now 500 sq. feet. This is inadequate classroom space than is needed for most activities like art and science.

There also should be a more generous allocation of cluster and specialty space, to allow for dedicated space for art, music, and science in all schools; now the formula allows for only 3-4

cluster rooms, no matter how large the school. Recommendations of arts groups propose that schools should provide at least one dedicated arts space for every 400-500 students.

High school footprint formula especially absurd

The footprint is especially absurd for high schools; and appears to call for only two specialty classrooms, no matter how large the school, and only one science lab, even for high schools of 4,000 students (a reduction from two in 2009).

Presumably, if a school like Brooklyn Tech or Stuyvesant had more than one science lab, it would register as having excess capacity. This is despite the fact that NY State Education guidelines require laboratory experience for all high school students.

Again, the minimum size for resource rooms and student support rooms have shrunk in size, and now SETSS is now included in this category, along with guidance, records, college, conference rooms; etc. It now appears that the formula allows high schools to only have two such rooms, as little as 500 sq. feet each, even for a school of 4,000 or more students.

Suggested additions to language in CAPITALS and comments in bold below

Comments on the Phase-Out and Eventual Closure of School Name (DBN) Attachment no. 1A

Summary of Proposal

Rationale for the proposed action: ***A summary of the significant steps taken by DOE to improve school performance before decision to seek phase-out was reached should be required, not optional, as a required part of the EIS.***

Impact of the Proposal on the Impacted Students, Schools and Community

Students: The impact on the students currently enrolled in the phase out school:
Describe any impact to Special Education (SE) and English Language Learner (ELL) students and the plan to support them going forward (if applicable)

Explain enrollment options available to ALL current students enrolled in the school, including WHICH SCHOOLS THAT STUDENTS WILL HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO TRANSFER TO, AND HOW ALL STUDENTS CURRENTLY ENROLLED WILL HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO GRADUATE FROM HIGH SCHOOL BY ACCUMULATING COURSE CREDITS IN THE USUAL ACCEPTED WAY, THAT IS BY ATTENDING REGULAR CLASSES, WITHOUT ENGAGING IN substandard "CREDIT RECOVERY" .

Right now the only opportunity afforded students who are behind in credits at closing schools (which usually represent the majority of students) is to be discharged into GED programs or receive their diploma through sub-standard and rushed credit recovery programs.

In addition, each student currently enrolled in the school should be provided with an individual graduation plan, to ensure this occurs. If there are students enrolled in

specialized programs (designed for pregnant students or those w/small children; or vocational, bilingual, etc.), the EIS should explain how and where they will be provided access to these programs elsewhere.

The impact on the students that would have enrolled in the phase-out school should include Enrollment data, CURRENTLY, AND AS PROJECTED FIVE YEARS INTO THE FUTURE, BY GRADE AND PROGRAM, WITH AND WITHOUT THE PROPOSED CLOSING, BASED ON CURRENT TRENDS, CENSUS DATA, SURVEY DATA, BUILDING STARTS, BIRTH RATE DATA, GEOCODED BY LOCATION, AND PRESCHOOL AND DAYCARE SURVEYS IN THE AFFECTED COMMUNITY.

For each school in the building, describe how the allocation of instructional space will change as a result of the proposal, INCLUDING A LISTING OF ALL ROOMS THAT WILL CHANGE IN TERMS OF SCHOOL OWNERSHIP OR BOUNDARIES, THEIR SIZE, AND CURRENT USE.

Community

Impact on the community should include how many students CURRENTLY ATTEND OVERUTILIZED SCHOOLS IN THE COMMUNITY; AND HOW THE SCHOOL CLOSING MAY AFFECT THESE FIGURES; BOTH IN THE FOLLOWING AND AS PROJECTED FIVE YEARS INTO THE FUTURE, BY GRADE AND PROGRAM, GIVEN PROJECTED ENROLLMENT TRENDS, AT LEAST FIVE YEARS INTO THE FUTURE.

These enrollment projections should be explicit and based at minimum on the following data: current trends, building starts, census data, birth rate data geocoded by neighborhood, and pre-k and day care center surveys (if applicable).

The analysis of the Capacity need should include how many students currently attend overutilized schools, as well as estimated number of seats being eliminated in community as a result of phase-outs and truncations, as well as lost leases and other causes..

The list of proposed new schools (at relevant grade levels) in the community (whichever is applicable) and provide information as to whether the type of students currently in the school (special ed, bilingual etc.) will be eligible to enroll.

WILL BE ELIGIBLE TO ENROLL, BOTH THE INDIVIDUALS THEMSELVES AND THE TYPE OF STUDENT (SPECIAL ED, ELL ETC.):

Administration: If decreases in staffing are expected, explain what will happen to staff, INCLUDING how many will be placed on ATR, and at what projected cost, based upon past experience.

Comments on the Co-location of New School with Existing School Attachment no. 1B

Summary of Proposal

Educational Impact Statements as well as the mandated public process should be REQUIRED IF AN EXISTING CO-LOCATED SCHOOL, WHETHER CHARTER OR NOT, EXPANDS

BEYOND ITS PREVIOUSLY AGREED UPON BOUNDARIES, AS IN THE GIRLS PREP AND PAVE CHARTER SCHOOL EXAMPLES.

The impact on the students currently enrolled in the building:

Describe any impact to Special Education (SE) and English Language Learner (ELL) students and the plan to support them going forward (if applicable). HOW MANY THERE ARE OF EACH CATEGORY OF STUDENTS SHOULD BE SPECIFIED; EITHER RECEIVING SERVICES BY TYPE OF SERVICE; AND/OR IN SELF-CONTAINED CLASSES;

WHETHER PROPOSED CO-LOCATION WILL MEAN THE LOSS OF DEDICATED SPACE FOR ANY OF THE CLASSES, SERVICES, AND/OR PROGRAMS OF THE STUDENTS LISTED ABOVE SHOULD BE SPECIFIED, WHETHER FOR THE FOLLOWING YEAR AND/OR AT SCALE OF EXPANDING CO-LOCATED SCHOOL;

DESCRIBE THE NUMBER, SIZE AND TYPE OF ROOMS LOST TO THE EXISTING SCHOOL IN THEIR BUILDING AND THEIR CURRENT USAGE;

DESCRIBE WHAT THE EXPECTED IMPACT ON CLASS SIZE WILL BE, FOR THE FOLLOWING YEAR AND FIVE YEARS INTO THE FUTURE, GIVEN EXISTING ENROLLMENT TRENDS;

DESCRIBE WHETHER GIVEN THESE EXPECTED CLASS SIZES, THE CO-LOCATION WILL REQUIRE THAT STUDENTS BE TAUGHT IN CLASSROOMS THAT VIOLATE THE BUILDING CODE (IE LESS THAN 20 SQ. FEET PER STUDENT IN GRADES 1-12; AND/OR 25 SQ. FEET PER STUDENT IN KINDERGARTEN)

LIST ALL THE ROOMS THAT WILL CHANGE ACCORDING TO SCHOOL BOUNDARIES AND THEIR CURRENT USAGE,

;

DESCRIBE DURING WHAT PERIODS WILL THE CAFETERIA BE UTILIZED FOR LUNCH EACH DAY, AND HOW MANY PERIODS A WEEK THE STUDENTS IN EACH SCHOOL WITH HAVE ACCESS TO THE GYM FOR THEIR PHYSICAL EDUCATION CLASSES;

In the aggregate, describe the impact of the proposal on the community, including available seats and surrounding schools:

Enrollment trend AND PROJECTIONS, EACH YEAR FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS, BASED ON CURRENT TRENDS, BUILDING STARTS, CENSUS DATA, BIRTH RATE DATA, AND PRESCHOOL AND/OR DAYCARE SURVEYS, IF APPLICABLE TO THE TYPE OF SCHOOL INVOLVED;

Capacity need, INCLUDING THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS AT THE RELEVANT GRADE LEVEL CURRENTLY IN OVERUTILIZED SCHOOLS;

Number of projected new seats being created in the community as a result of new schools, grade expansions, and ongoing phasing in of schools, AS WELL AS THE NUMBER OF SEATS LOST ELSEWHERE THROUGH OTHER CO-LOCATIONS, LAPSED LEASES OR OTHER SCHOOL CLOSURES

Enrollment, Admissions and School Performance Information

For each impacted school, provide the following: Enrollment data, Current enrollment and

grades served

Projected enrollment of new schools (if applicable), AND PROJECTIONS, EACH YEAR FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS, BASED ON CURRENT TRENDS, BUILDING STARTS, CENSUS DATA, BIRTH RATE DATA, AND PRESCHOOL AND/OR DAYCARE SURVEYS, IF APPLICABLE TO THE TYPE OF SCHOOL INVOLVED.

Comments on the Re-Siting of Schools
Attachment no. 1C

Impact of the Proposal on the Impacted Students, Schools and Community

The impact on the students currently enrolled in the existing and re-locating school:
Describe any impact to Special Education (SE) and English Language Learner (ELL) students and the plan to support them going forward (if applicable)

DESCRIBE HOW MANY THERE ARE OF EACH CATEGORY; EITHER RECEIVING SERVICES BY TYPE OF SERVICE; AND/OR IN SELF-CONTAINED CLASSES;
DESCRIBE WHETHER PROPOSED CO-LOCATION WILL MEAN LOSS OF DEDICATED SPACE FOR ANY OF THE CLASSES, SERVICES, AND/OR PROGRAMS OF THE STUDENTS LISTED ABOVE, THE FOLLOWING YEAR AND AT SCALE;

The impact of the proposal on the schools in the building:

For each school in the building, describe how the allocation of instructional space will change as a result of the proposal. Also, describe if there will be a direct increase or decrease in enrollment of other schools in the building as a result of the proposal;

DESCRIBE THE NUMBER, SIZE AND TYPE OF ROOMS LOST TO THE EXISTING SCHOOL IN THEIR BUILDING AND THEIR CURRENT USAGE;

DESCRIBE WHAT THE EXPECTED IMPACT ON CLASS SIZE WILL BE, FOR THE FOLLOWING YEAR AND FIVE YEARS INTO THE FUTURE, GIVEN EXISTING ENROLLMENT TRENDS;

DESCRIBE WHETHER GIVEN THESE EXPECTED CLASS SIZES, THE CO-LOCATION WILL REQUIRE THAT STUDENTS BE TAUGHT IN CLASSROOMS THAT VIOLATE THE BUILDING CODES (IE LESS THAN 20 SQ. FEET PER STUDENT IN GRADES 1-12; AND/OR 25 SQ. FEET PER STUDENT IN KINDERGARTEN)

LIST ALL THE ROOMS THAT WILL CHANGE ACCORDING TO SCHOOL BOUNDARIES AND THEIR CURRENT USAGE,

Describe the impact on shared spaces such as the gymnasium, cafeteria, library, and playground, where applicable. Include an example of how such space might be shared between or among the proposed co-located schools

DESCRIBE DURING WHAT TIMES OF DAY WILL THE CAFETERIA BE UTILIZED FOR LUNCH EACH DAY, AND HOW MANY PERIODS A WEEK THE STUDENTS IN EACH SCHOOL WITH HAVE ACCESS TO THE GYM FOR THEIR PHYS ED CLASSES;
Community

In the aggregate, describe the impact of the proposal on the community:
Impact on available seats and surrounding schools:

Enrollment trend AND PROJECTIONS, EACH YEAR FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS, BASED ON CURRENT TRENDS, BUILDING STARTS, CENSUS DATA, BIRTH RATE DATA, AND PRESCHOOL AND/OR DAYCARE SURVEYS, IF APPLICABLE TO THE TYPE OF SCHOOL INVOLVED;

Capacity need; INCLUDING THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS AT THE RELEVANT GRADE LEVELS CURRENTLY IN OVERUTILIZED SCHOOLS

Number of projected new seats being created in the community as a result of new schools, grade expansions, and ongoing phasing in of schools; AS WELL AS THE NUMBER OF SEATS LOST ELSEWHERE THROUGH OTHER CO-LOCATIONS, LAPSED LEASES OR OTHER SCHOOL

Enrollment, Admissions and School Performance Information

For each impacted school, provide the following:
Enrollment data

Current enrollment and grades served ; AND ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS, EACH YEAR FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS, BASED ON CURRENT TRENDS, BUILDING STARTS, CENSUS DATA, BIRTH RATE DATA, AND PRESCHOOL AND/OR DAYCARE SURVEYS, IF APPLICABLE TO THE TYPE OF SCHOOL INVOLVED;

Comments on the Grade Reconfiguration of Schools Attachment no.1D

Impact of the Proposal on the Impacted Students, Schools and Community

The impact on the students currently enrolled in the building.

Describe any impact to Special Education (SE) and English Language Learner (ELL) students and the plan to support them going forward (if applicable)

HOW MANY THERE ARE OF EACH CATEGORY; EITHER RECEIVING SERVICES BY TYPE OF SERVICE; AND/OR IN SELF-CONTAINED CLASSES;

DESCRIBE WHETHER PROPOSED CO-LOCATION WILL MEAN LOSS OF DEDICATED SPACE FOR ANY OF THE CLASSES, SERVICES, AND/OR PROGRAMS OF THE STUDENTS LISTED ABOVE, THE FOLLOWING YEAR AND AT SCALE;

DESCRIBE THE NUMBER, SIZE AND TYPE OF ROOMS LOST TO THE EXISTING SCHOOL AND THEIR CURRENT USAGE;

DESCRIBE THE EXPECTED IMPACT ON CLASS SIZE;

EXPLAIN IF THE RECONFIGURATION WILL REQUIRE THAT STUDENTS BE TAUGHT IN CLASSROOMS THAT VIOLATE THE BUILDING CODE, IE LESS THAN 20 SQ. FT PER

STUDENTS IN GRADES 1-12 AND 25 SQ. FT. PER STUDENT IN KINDERGARTEN;

Schools

The impact of the proposal on the schools in the building

For each school in the building, describe how the allocation of instructional AND SPECIALTY, CLUSTER AND INTERVENTION AND/OR SUPPORT space will change as a result of the proposal. Also, describe if there will be a direct increase or decrease in enrollment of other schools in the building as a result of the proposal

DESCRIBE WHAT HOW MANY PERIODS THE CAFETERIA WILL BE IN USE FOR LUNCH, AND HOW MANY PERIODS PER WEEK STUDENTS WILL HAVE ACCESS TO THE GUY; If space will become available as a result of the proposal, describe potential uses

Community

In the aggregate, DESCRIBE THE IMPACT ON OVERCROWDING, INCLUDING THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN OVERCROWDED SCHOOLS IN THE COMMUNITY AT THE AFFECTED GRADE LEVEL; DESCRIBE THE EXPECTED IMPACT ON CLASS SIZE, AND IF CLASS SIZES ARE LIKELY TO INCREASE AS A RESULT;

IF SEATS LOST IN CERTAIN GRADES DUE TO RECONFIGURATION; DESCRIBE THE NO. OF NEW SEATS BEING BUILT IN NEW SCHOOLS IN THE COMMUNITY, AND/OR LOST THROUGH LAPSED LEASES, SCHOOL CLOSURES OR OTHER CHANGES;

Enrollment, Admissions and School Performance Information

For each impacted school, or school affected by the proposed reconfiguration, provide the following: Enrollment data

Current enrollment and grades served, AND ENROLLMENT TRENDS AND ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS, BASED UPON CURRENT TRENDS, BUILDING STARTS, CENSUS DATA, BIRTH RATE DATA, AND DAYCARE/PRESCHOOL SURVEY DATA, (THE LAST IF RELEVANT TO THE GRADE LEVEL INVOLVED)
