

**Community District Education Council District 26**  
**Address:** 61-15 Oceania St, Bayside, New York 11364  
**Tel:** 718.631.6927 **FAX:** 718.631.6996 **Email:** central/cec26@nycboe.net

**MINUTES FROM BUSINESS /CALENDER/ PUBLIC MEETINGS**

**Date:** Thursday, September 26, 2013

**Time:** Calendar/Public Meeting - 7:00 P.M. - Business Meeting – TO FOLLOW

**Location:** MS 67 – 51-60 Marathon Pkwy, Little Neck, NY – Room B44A

The meeting of the Community District Education Council of District 26 (CDEC26) was called to order by Ricky Chan, 1<sup>st</sup> Vice President at 7:05 p.m.

Roll Call - Jeannette Segal, Susan Shiroma (Borough Appointee), Lucy Vieco, Jaime Alvarez-Isasi, Leslie Rubenstein, Alan Ong (Borough Appointee), Ricky Chan & Anastasio Politidis

Excused – Jaya Patil

Also present: Lori Stein-Butera, District Family Advocate & Anita Saunders, Community Superintendent

**CALENDAR/PUBLIC MEETING**

Ricky Chan, 1<sup>ST</sup> VP introduced Anita Saunders, Community Superintendent to present

Ms. Saunders started out by stating that she would be observing principals next week and doing 50 Principal Performance Observations (PPOs). Ratings will come through at the end of the year. Ms. Saunders stated that MS74 was on the TODAY Show for Wellness.

Ms. Saunders informed the attendees that she has been working with the principal at PS 94 to accommodate her school with a handicap ramp and a lift. An Interim Acting AP (Ms. Diana Simon) has been appointed for a year. Ms. Saunders has written a letter stating why a handicap ramp and lift is needed for the principal to the DOE and why it is worthwhile.

- Contract for Excellence (C4E) Presentation (see attachment)

**Contracts for Excellence Overview**

The New York City Department of Education receives a portion of its overall budget in the form of Foundation Aid from New York State. Part of this funding is subject to the provisions of the State's "Contracts for Excellence." New York City schools received Contracts for Excellence, or C4E, funds for the first time in the 2007-08 school years. These are funds that, under State law, must be distributed to certain schools and must be spent by those schools in specific program areas.

**Funds must go to students with the greatest educational need:**

- *English Language Learners*
- *Students in Poverty*
- *Students with Disabilities*
- *Students with Low Academic Achievement or At Risk of Not Graduating*

**Funds must support specific program initiatives:**

- *Class Size Reduction*

- *Time on Task – programs focusing on students who may require additional or increased individualized attention in order to raise achievement*
  - *Teacher & Principal Quality Initiatives – programs supporting development & retainment of high quality teachers and principals for raising achievement in struggling schools*
  - *Middle & High School Restructuring – instructional and structural changes in middle and high schools to support class size reduction and raise achievement in struggling schools*
  - *Full-Day Pre-Kindergarten Programs*
  - *Model Programs for English Language Learners – programs aimed at supporting schools in adopting “best practices” for raising achievement among English Language Learners*
- The Governor's 2013-14 Budget states that “school districts that submitted a contract for excellence for the two thousand twelve-two thousand thirteen school year, unless all schools in the district are identified as in good standing, shall submit a contract for excellence for the two thousand thirteen-two thousand fourteen school year”.
  - Funds are to be used to support C4E allowable programs, as approved by the Commissioner.
  - For the current year, FY14, there are **no new Contract for Excellence funds** to apply towards new or expanded programs.
    - NYCDOE is in “maintenance of effort” status, meaning that C4E funds will be used to maintain programs that were approved in prior years.

The total C4E amount for FY14 is \$530 million, out of which \$182 million is embedded in Fair Student Funding. Details for Fair Student Funding can be found [here](#). This leaves \$348 million for school allocations and district-wide programs. This presentation represents the \$348 million.

### Discretionary Allocations to Schools

Amount	\$201.1 million in restricted Contracts for Excellence funds were released to 1,400+ schools in June 2013. <i>57.8% of total Contract amount</i>
Description	Schools should use Contracts for Excellence funds to establish continuity of service for existing C4E programs. However, if a school cannot maintain effort due to significant changes in its student population or its overall instructional strategy, it could choose to reallocate funds to a different allowable program area.

### Targeted Allocations to Schools

Amount	About <b>\$99.4 million</b> of C4E funds were targeted for specific programs. Schools receiving allocations were chosen based on a) overall student need and b) capacity to carry out the specific programs. <i>28.6% of total Contract amount</i>
Description	Funds allocated by the DOE directly to schools for specific uses that are eligible within the C4E programs areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$82.2 million – <i>Integrated Co- Teaching Classrooms (ICT)</i> (Formerly Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT))           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ \$9.1 million – <i>Full-Day Pre-K</i></li> <li>▪ \$6.3 million – <i>Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD)</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Classrooms</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ \$1.8 million – ELL Summer School</li> </ul> <p>Schools that received “targeted” C4E allocations in 2009-10 received those allocations again in 2013-14 as long as they retained the population necessary to maintain effort.</p>
--	---

## District-Wide Initiatives

Amount	<p><b>\$16 million</b> is our estimate in this category. While these funds will not appear on schools’ budgets, the Department is required to attribute dollars to programs that support the neediest students as part of the DOE’s citywide C4E plan.</p> <p><b>4.6% of total Contract amount</b></p>
Description	<p>Funds allocated to Central programs that directly benefit high-need schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ \$6.3 million – Multiple Pathways to Graduation Initiatives (for over-age and under-credit students)</li> <li>▪ \$8 million – Principal Training Initiatives</li> <li>▪ \$1.7 million – College and AP Prep for High Need 9-12 Students</li> <li>▪ \$75,000 – ELL Youth Institute</li> </ul>
<b>Maintenance of Effort</b>	
Amount	<p><b>\$30 million</b></p> <p><b>8.6% of total Contract amount</b></p>
Description	<p>The Department proposes to spend these funds to maintain summer programs impacting the students with the lowest academic achievement in the city.</p>

## Proposed Discretionary Spending – CEC 26\*

Schools in this district were allocated discretionary Contracts for Excellence funds. Schools have proposed to spend those funds as follows:

C4E Program Area	Amount Budgeted	% Total
Class Size Reduction	\$ 1,189,253	47%
Full Day Pre-K	-	-
Middle School & High School Restructuring	\$ 89,134	3%
Model Programs for ELLs	\$ 17,033	1%
Teacher & Principal Quality Initiatives	\$ 204,756	8%
Time on Task	\$ 1,057,161	41%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,557,337</b>	<b>100%</b>

## 13-14 C4E Plan: All Funds By Program Strategy – CEC 26\*

		Citywide Total	CEC 26 Total	CEC 26	% Total
<b>Class Size Reduction</b>	Maintain Class Size	\$10.4M	\$	146,323	3%

	Maintain PTR	\$2.9M	-	-
	Minimize Class Size Growth	\$1.7M	\$ 40,083	1%
	Reduced Class Size	\$39.4M	\$ 1,002,847	20%
	Reduced PTR	\$6.9M	-	-
	Team Teaching Strategies	**\$87.4M	\$ 1,423,887	29%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$148.7M</b>	<b>\$ 2,613,140</b>	<b>53%</b>

Time on Task	Before & After School	\$3.2M	-	-
	Dedicated Instruction	\$77.3M	\$ 1,057,161	22%
	Individualized Tutoring	\$1.4M	-	-
	Summer School	\$30M	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$111.9M</b>	<b>\$ 1,057,161</b>	<b>22%</b>

Teacher and Principal Quality Initiatives	Leadership Coaches	\$9.4M	-	-
	Mentoring for New Staff	\$2.0M	\$ 3,768	<1%
	Recruit & Retain HQT	\$2.3M	-	-
	Teacher Coaches	\$17.6M	\$ 200,988	4%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$31.3M</b>	<b>\$ 204,756</b>	<b>4%</b>

**\*\* Targeted allocations (CTT and ASD Classrooms) + school-level discretionary allocations**

**\*All proposed allocations described in this plan are preliminary and contingent on further analysis of school-based conditions.**

		Citywide Total	CEC 26 Total	CEC 26 % Total
Middle & High School Restructuring	MSHS Instructional Changes	\$10.3M	\$ 89,134	2%
	MSHS Structural Changes	\$1.6M	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$11.9M</b>	<b>\$ 89,134</b>	<b>2%</b>

Full-Day Pre-K	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$9.1M</b>	<b>\$ 917,076</b>	<b>19%</b>
----------------	--------------	---------------	-------------------	------------

Model Programs for ELLs	ELL Innovative Programs	\$33.3M	\$ 17,033	<1%
	ELL Parent Involvement	\$174K	-	-
	ELL Teacher Recruitment	\$177K	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$33.7M</b>	<b>\$ 17,033</b>	<b>&lt;1%</b>

**(\$1.4 million in discretionary funds still to be determined by schools)**

## Class Size Reduction Planning

In light of the current federal and state financial constraints, it was necessary to re-evaluate the original 5 year Class Size Reduction Plan that was first introduced in 2007. That plan was predicated on an increase in Contract for Excellence funds year over year which has not been realized. After consulting with NYSED, a proposed amended Class Size Reduction Plan was presented for approval to NYSED.

On or about July 2, 2013, SED approved NYCDOE's amended Class Size Reduction Plan which focuses on a cross section of schools that have predominantly large class sizes and low student performance.

NYCDOE identified a list of 75 schools with:

1. High average class size in the previous school year (average of 26 students per class or higher),
2. Low student performance (NYCDOE Progress Report grade of C, D, or F as well as struggling schools),
3. and a building utilization rate of less than 100%.

For FY14, NYCDOE anticipates that an analysis of the change in average class size between FY13 and FY14 in these 75 schools will show an overall decrease in class size or an increase of less than 0.5 students per class from the 2012-13 school year.

## Class Size Reduction Planning

For 2013-14, NYSED has required NYCDOE to:

- Provide an update on class size numbers for the Targeted 75 schools identified in 2012-13 relative to the changes in the citywide averages,
- Certify to NYSED that average class size or pupil teacher ratio in each of the 75 targeted schools with low academic performance identified in the 2013 -14 school year plan will not increase by more than half of the citywide increase over the 2012-13 class size.

A list of the FY13 Target 75 schools can be found [here](#).

## Public Comment

We will take public feedback into account in the coming months as we continue to develop a citywide Contracts for Excellence plan.

The deadline for submitting public comments will be **Friday, October 18<sup>th</sup>** which is more than 30 days from the date the comprehensive 2013-14 proposed plan was posted on the DOE's website.

The public may comment on any aspect of the plan, including:

- How schools are planning to spend their discretionary funds within the six allowable program areas
- How the DOE is allocating targeted Contract funds to schools
- How the DOE is allocating funds for District-Wide Initiatives
- NYC's Class Size Reduction plan
- The public comment process

Educators, parents, and all other members of the New York City community with feedback should e-mail us at [\*\*ContractsForExcellence@schools.nyc.gov\*\*](mailto:ContractsForExcellence@schools.nyc.gov)

- NYSED – Reward Schools (Most Progress) - (Handout)
- Capping Elementary Schools
  - PS 173 – PS 205
  - PS 213 – PS 205
  - PS 41 – PS 98
  - PS 133 – PS 115
- Martin Van Buren HS – Proposed 9-4 Career Technical Education (CTE) School with QCC
- Principal Practice Observations – PPO's –

Superintendent – 2 visits per school based on Quality Review Rubric  
Unannounced & Announced

(Quality Review counts as one visit)

Rating – Ineffective, Developing, Effective, Highly Effective

- Parent Workshops – Lori Butera - (Handouts)
- MS 74 – “Today Show” – School Wellness Council – Alliance for a Healthier Generation (Clinton Foundation)
- PS 173 – NYSABE Bi-Illiteracy Award
- New IAAP
  - MS 158 – Calia Kelly
  - MS 216 – Jessica Bader & Ajith Satyanrayana
  - PS 191 – Meredith Broxmeyer
  - PS 94 – ATR AP – Diana Simon
- PS 188, 203 – Among Top 25 Schools in NYS  
Chancellor Dennis Walcott – PS 203  
Deputy Chancellor Joshua Thomases – PS 188

**Quote**

“Intelligence is the ability to adapt to change.”

Stephen Hawkins, British Theoretical Physicist and Cosmologist

Jeannette introduced the next speakers: Jillian Roland, Dariana Castro & Ms. Emily Ades from the **Department of Portfolio to discuss Martin Van Buren’s issue.**

Emily Ades (Office of Portfolio) presented their PowerPoint presentation pertaining to Martin Van Buren (See Attachment).

Emily stated that the new co-location school has an affiliation with Queensboro Community College and SAP. To achieve our goal to improve access to quality schools and utilize seat capacity in the most efficient manner to create high-quality seats, we are proposing the following for District 26:

Co-location of New Limited Unscreened Early College High School (26Q315) with Martin Van Buren High School in Building Q435

- Chancellor’s Regulation A-190 governs the public review process for proposals for significant changes in school utilization.
- For every proposal for a significant change the NYCDOE is required to:
  - Publish an Educational Impact Statement (EIS)
  - Schedule and convene a Joint Public Hearing to discuss the proposal;
  - Produce and publish an Analysis of Public Comment at the Joint Public Hearing;
  - Arrange for the Panel for Educational Policy (PEP) to vote on it.
- We communicate additional information to families in affected schools and solicit public comment throughout the proposal process.
- Divisions across the NYCDOE support compliance with A-190.

Timeline	Action
August 29 -September 13	Educational Impact Statement (EIS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written by Portfolio, incorporates input from stakeholders</li> <li>• Describes changes to be made and impact on students, school, and community</li> </ul>

August 29/September 13– October 14/October 29	Public Comment Period <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further input from stakeholders at hearing held at the school</li> <li>• Further input from stakeholders via online and emailed comments</li> </ul>
October 14 and October 29	Analysis of Public Comment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written response posted to officially address comments</li> </ul>
<b>October 15 and October 30</b>	<b>Panel for Educational Policy (PEP) votes on EIS</b>

The mission of the Office of Postsecondary Readiness (OPSR) is to ensure that every student will be equipped with the knowledge, skills, and competencies to graduate high school and successfully pursue a rigorous postsecondary pathway that meets their interests and needs. OPSR supports the goal of increasing the numbers of New York City students who graduate college and career ready - with a focus on over-age and under-credited students, students enrolled in Career and Technical Education programs, and Black and Latino students.

OPSR administers and promotes strategies and policies that reinforce academic rigor, innovation, clear pathways to 21st century labor options and increases student access to opportunities that prepare them to succeed through high school to a college and a career.

## Office Of Postsecondary Readiness

Identifying College and Career Readiness Benchmarks, which define the qualities and achievements that students need to complete in order to be ready to enroll, persist, and succeed in college, postsecondary training opportunities, and gain entry into meaningful careers.

Providing career readiness for the emerging 21st century workforce through Career and Technical Education, including work-based learning. Career and Technical Education schools and programs are supported by industry and community-based partnerships and provide opportunities for students to master academic, technical, and deep learning skills to complement a range of growing sectors.

Closing the achievement gap through the Expanded Success Initiative (ESI) whose goal is to dramatically increase the number of Black and Latino students who complete high school fully prepared to succeed in college and careers. ESI is a component of the Office of the Mayor's Young Men's Initiative and supported by Open Society Foundations.

Expanding digital literacy and technology programs in the context of college and career readiness. Building off the success of Connected Foundations, Digital Ready is a technology-driven program that leverages digital technology in the classroom and connects students with the technology community in New York City. Digital Ready implementation will begin in Fall 2013.

Bringing students who have disengaged or are off-track, through high school graduation to college and careers. These Multiple Pathways include Transfer Schools and Young Adult Borough Centers , many of which include Learning To Work.

## The ECC School Model

- A new model that combines the goals of early college and career & technical education schools
- Program enables students to earn a high school diploma, an associate degree in a specific career field, and extensive workplace experience prior to graduation
- Developed and sustained by collaboration between high school and college faculty, and industry professionals
- Serve students who have an interest in the specified career path
- Offer not just strong academic programs, but also the confidence, study skills and practical preparation to enable students to succeed

**ECC DESIGN**

HIGH SCHOOL	COLLEGE	CAREER
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students take regular high school courses required to earn a high school diploma.</li> <li>• Students receive individual support and guidance as they plan their high school years and begin taking college classes.</li> <li>• Students receive mentoring and internship opportunities to prepare them for college and career.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students have the opportunity to earn an associate degree from the partner college at no cost.</li> <li>• Students take college courses with college faculty during normal school hours.</li> <li>• Students may continue their studies at the partner college or apply to other four-year colleges upon graduation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students participate in real work experiences in which they learn skills they'll need for professional and personal success.</li> <li>• Students explore various careers through internship, coaching and mentoring opportunities provided by the employer partner and other New York-based companies.</li> </ul>

**ECC School Examples**

- Pathways to Technology (P-Tech)
  - CUNY – City Tech
  - Industry Partner – IBM
- Health, Education, and Research Occupations High School (HERO)
  - CUNY – Hostos Community College
  - Industry – Montefiore Hospital
- Energy Tech
  - CUNY – La Guardia Community College
  - Industry Partner – National Grid & Con Edison

**Contact Information**

<b>OPM</b>
<b>Savita Iyengar, Director</b> <a href="mailto:Slyengar@schools.nyc.gov">Slyengar@schools.nyc.gov</a>
Emily Ades, Associate Planner <a href="mailto:EAdes@schools.nyc.gov">EAdes@schools.nyc.gov</a>
Jillian Roland, Associate Planner <a href="mailto:JRoland3@schools.nyc.gov">JRoland3@schools.nyc.gov</a>



Dariana Castro, Associate Director  
[DCastro6@schools.nyc.gov](mailto:DCastro6@schools.nyc.gov)

Division of Portfolio speaker stated that on October 30th a vote will take place on this proposal at Panel for Educational Policy.

Students are having a hard time making it though college per the Div. of Portfolio. At QCC it graduated only 13% of student. In 10th grade students can take college level credits and they are graduating with industry certifications.

Statement & Question- MVB was deemed a struggling "priority" school in 2012. What steps were being taken to help? A. Once a school is deemed “struggling” the state gives them money.

The chapter leader was involved in 2012-13 in the submission of the school leadership grant application. This year they are starting to get the money.

Question asked about the process and how MVB has been helped?

Question asked about the proposal?

Response – Portfolio stated that this is not a performance response. It is a new proposal and a new opportunity. MVB would reduce by a number of students per year every year.

Statement – Community has been screaming for a new high school because of space. Will HS seats be reduced for local D26 students to go there?

A. Zoned students will have zoned priority.

Susan said the EIS statement will not have resources to continue the program it started. Susan concerned if students will complete the 6 year program and who (parents-community-community board) was consulted about this before it was introduced to the school. Who was asked about the Q315?

A. Portfolio explained the process. These are limited unscreened seats. It has priority to all of Queens.

Question - why was MVB was chosen?

A. Portfolio rep. stated that they look at enrollment, performance & need for choice.

Audience member Bernard stated that his children attended D26 schools including MVB & the other schools are crowded because students don't want to attend MVB. MVB used to be a banner HS before the previous principal destroyed it. He feels the new principal has good programs that should be given a try. He believes in the new principal (Mr. Sochet).

Portfolio stated that a new school is a benefit and can collaborate. We don't have smaller HS with focused mission and curriculum. This would be another option. It's not intended to undermine what the principal is doing.

Frank Tona member of MVB community and civic association questioned the presentation to be given in October and will the community have input.

Portfolio - Joint Public Hearing discussion has been set up for October 23<sup>rd</sup> at MVB for everyone to come out and have input. The Panel has the ultimate decision. They provide all the feedback to the Panel.

The school model and co-location will benefit the existing school and students. Students interested in technology, about 108 students per grade, will be getting SAP training similar to the Ptech school in Brooklyn. Students get a free associates degree with transferable credits. It is a great benefit for students and companies.

The principals will work together. The model is the national model as mentioned by President Obama.

Why can't it be done under the MVB banner? Why can't Campus Magnet assist?

Response: This model is one of 16 new schools. The money designated as a school and not a program.

Question - If the governor targeted money for a 6 year school wouldn't it be better elsewhere?

Response: There is another model in LIC co-located with middle schools.

Question - Is there a proposed principal?

Response: not yet

Anastasio: Commented that we need more seats than what is available today.

Portfolio stated that every school has choice to entire city. They are not reducing the seats available at MVB. There has been a natural reduction. There is no reduction in the zoned priority. Few % of D26 children attending.

Question - Will the new school follow under same processes & procedures? Will Juan Mendez be selecting the principal?

Portfolio stated that the office of new schools will be part of the process to select the Interim Acting Principal.

Question - How has DOE helped MVB become a more attractive school since 2012 to help the students?

Chapter leader: They have seen the learning environment survey decline and the DOE left that principal there. Nothing was done to change it. The scholars institute was destroyed.

Portfolio stated that a new principal has been put in place and they will look into the supports given to the network and the principal including facilities and academic supports.

Mary Vaccaro, UFT Re. is adamantly opposed to co-location and they believe if supported, MVB can be a top notch school.

Question - How many times has PEP voted No to colocation?

Portfolio stated it has not happened. But proposals have been pulled before a vote. It's important to go to the site: [D26proposals@schools.nyc.gov](mailto:D26proposals@schools.nyc.gov) or 212-374-7621 and leave a message which is retrieved daily and responded to but no phone calls returned.

[schools.nyc.gov](http://schools.nyc.gov) you can get the impact statement there and on file at MVB.

Question: How much weight does community input have in PEP vote?

Emily: in her experience, the proposals were pulled were mostly based on community feedback.

Question asked if this falls under a new school.

Emily: It's the only school in Queens.

UFT Rep stated that the elected officials are opposed.

Mr. Weprin's office has supported Principal Sochet. The correlation was questioned between the QCC and students who wouldn't attend QCC. Their projections are not showing the D26 rise.

Emily: zoned students will get priority and the zone guarantee will remain. MVB offers other programs for other students around the city.

Statement – community wants a school that has many AP classes, sports and other things like that.

Portfolio stated that the school will have 1600 students that will support AP classes and sports. It will not undermine programming.

Question – Is their data with other CT schools?

A. Early colleges have been around for a while and have shown to be successful.

Q: Can it be done in another building?

A. Audience: 2300 max student capacity on Ed impact statement questioned. Why is the capacity at MVB being reduced?

Chapter leader stated they had over 3000 students with AP classes but they were removed.

Statement – members feel that this is a very special district and with our homes being connected to the school, we are concerned with the community being broken up. The community is passionate about this issue and is upset that MVB has not been given an opportunity. The community must do their job and get out there on Oct 23rd.

Portfolio thanked the CDEC and audience for their comments.

## **BUSINESS MEETING**

Business meeting called to order 8:44 pm

Roll Call - Jeannette Segal, Susan Shiroma (Borough Appointee), Lucy Vieco, Jaime Alvarez-Isasi, Leslie Rubenstein, Alan Ong (Borough Appointee), Ricky Chan & Anastasio Politidis

Excused – Jaya Patil

Also present: Lori Stein-Butera, District Family Advocate & Anita Saunders, Community Superintendent

1. Minutes – Jeannette asked the council had they had the opportunity to read/review September 26<sup>th</sup> minutes. Motion to approve minutes made by Alan Ong and seconded by Ricky Chan. Council voted unanimously to approve Sept. 26<sup>th</sup> minutes.

2. President's Report (Jeannette Segal)

Attended a meeting on Sept 30th at 250 Broadway, NY regarding the InBloom Resolution #1768.

MS67 no longer has a uniform policy because of the vote taken at the SLT meeting. She said 30 % of school opted out and that hoodies are not allowed. Parents were informed at the PTA meeting.

3. School Visits

Jaime stated that he had contacted the PTA at PS133 but have not received any feedback as of yet.

Anita Saunders, Community Superintendent asks that the council be patient with the schools.

4. School Liaison Listing completed showing the following:

Jaime Alvarez-Isasi ~ PS 133 – PS 191 – MS 172 – PS/IS 266

Ricky Chan ~ MS 74 - MS 158 - PS 203 – PS 205

Alan Ong ~ PS 173 – MS 74 – MS 216

Jaya Patil ~ PS 26 – PS 173 – MS 216

Anastasio Politidis ~ PS 46 – PS 159 – PS 213

Leslie Rubenstein ~ PS 31 – PS 41 – PS 203 – MS 158

Jeannette Segal ~ PS 94 – PS 98 – PS 186 – PS 221 – MS 67

Susan Shiroma ~ PS 115 – PS 162 – PS/IS 178

Lucy Vieco ~ PS 18 – PS 188 – MS 67

5. New business

Jeannette informed the council that there is a resolution for a salary increase for Marian which comes out of our budget. Last year we gave back \$5000. Marian has been out AA since our inception. Anita says she works well with her office also. She ask that the council think about increasing her salary (\$2000-4000) and it will be voted on at the October meeting.

Informed the council of the Oct 23<sup>rd</sup> Joint Public Hearing at Martin Van Buren at 6pm and to SAVE THE DATE and save Martin Van Buren.

Mary Vaccaro, UFT stated that she had spoken to a father of a PTA to give flyers to students outside of school.

Ricky Chan informed the council that he attended a meeting at Tweed pertaining to the NYS Common Core Test Results presented by the Chancellor. Ricky will give info to Marian to make copies of the pamphlet for the CDEC. He spoke of the necessity of the Common Core Standards in which the grades have been compared and the comparison of break among ethnic backgrounds.

The Chancellor stated that the DOE is looking to closing the gap. He was concerned that students would be upset with the drop in scores. Ricky stated the students that were promoted in June even if they scored a Level 1. Also, these scores will have no impact on teacher evaluation.

Anita stated that she has a comparison with D26 versus the rest of the city. Teachers have to teach to the CCSS and they will do well on the test.

Motion to adjourn the business meeting made by Leslie and seconded by Ricky. Council voted unanimously to adjourn.

Meeting ended 9:15 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Lucy Vieco, Recording secretary