



# A BLUEPRINT

## School Facilities Master Plan for Orleans Parish

### Compilation Report of Public Comments

October 21, 2008



SCHOOL FACILITIES  
MASTER PLAN FOR ORLEANS PARISH  
[www.nolapublicschools.net](http://www.nolapublicschools.net)



## School Facilities Master Plan for Orleans Parish Comment Summary of over 600 comments

### Schools/Facilities Comments

#### OPSB District 1

Abramson – stay in same location  
Lawless - where will Lawless be replaced?

#### OPSB District 2

Carver HS-replace Phase I  
Carver ES – make all schools equitable across the board  
Coghill – landbank Parkview build Coghill phase I  
Douglass - do not close  
Frantz – Ruby Bridges Foundation support  
Livingston - use funds from 4 special HS that were not asked for to fund  
Livingston in Phase I – why are new boutiques added when real HS are needed?  
Parkview – thank you and please keep us engaged in the design and implementation phase

#### OPSB District 3

Bienville – who will operate, how is operator chosen?  
Dibert – delay landbanking to increase capacity  
Easton HS – thank you for phase 1 for a 95 year old building  
Franklin HS – renovate sooner  
Hynes – what does a new flexible facility mean? Engage community on design  
Jeff – proposals: Open a Morris Jeff as an incubator school in the next year or two at an alternate site; Expedite permanent construction or renovation of Morris Jeff on location to be determined with input of community.  
Kennedy –replace Phase I  
Phillips – replace existing facility in Phase I  
Waters- replace existing facility Phase I

#### OPSB District 4

Ben Franklin Elementary – relocate to a building with amenities to support its education  
Habans – what will fund later phases?  
Harte – will the school have to downsize to fit the new facility?  
Karr — new school phase I

Rabouin – land history?  
Species Center HS- do not build  
Walker – new school phase I

#### OPSB District 5

Cohen – what will happen when land banked? Where will the uptown high school students go?  
Crocker-thank you for Phase I  
Fortier – thank you for stabilization in Phase I  
Green – do not close; \$1million charter investment to date  
Laurel - do not close  
McMain - does not want to move to BTW; renovate Phase 1; do not move to Mc35; move to Kennedy; remain open through 2013  
Washington High School – reopen; renovate for Priestly HS in Phase 2  
Woodson-replace in Phase I

#### OPSB District 6

Audubon - thank you for Phase I & where will the extension move to?  
Demo custodial cottage and replace modulars with permanent facility.  
Banneker – why is it land banked?  
Chester – does not need to come back  
Dunbar - replace in Phase I; Demolish  
Hoffman - replace in Phase I  
Johnson - Phase I – renovate or replace new  
Priestly - renovate Priestly and add Johnson for second HS campus; move to Washington High School; renovate Priestly for an elementary school  
Terrell – community center

#### OPSB District 7

Bradley - replace Phase I  
Capdau – replace Phase 3 and land bank site in phase 2?  
McDonogh 42 - please complete repairs  
McDonogh 35 - requested 30 acres at Phillips/Waters with a stadium, pool, auditorium, cultural considerations, etc  
Modular Campuses - make it a priority for those children to replace the modular campuses with permanent facilities  
NOCHC Math and Science High wants new building in Phase 1  
Tureaud, McDonogh 28 – delay landbanking to increase capacity  
Wheatley - build new requested by Lafitte residents, Providence, St. Peter Claver; do not demolish DOCOMOMO; New Corp would like to incubate small businesses, community organizations, training, counseling and community needs, store large construction equipment and building materials;

house an architecture and construction school; engage students from area schools

Wicker -- renovate in an earlier phase

### Group comments

- ≈ BGR - plan not fully funded
- ≈ Rethink – have designed green bathrooms and cafeterias
- ≈ PRC-reuse schools as schools, demo of historic structures inappropriate, sustainable facilities in plan? Requests additional opportunities for public input on how schools fit into neighborhoods
- ≈ DOCOMOMO – save mid-century architecture; offer of assistance
- ≈ Charters - where/when will a facility be assigned? Lease/agreement issues
- ≈ Early Childhood and Family Learning Foundation-0-3, 4 year old, SHBC, plan with community health centers
- ≈ City Park - supports landbank of Kennedy and incorporation into park
- ≈ Cowen – cost per seat too high in phase 1-provide details & school placement
- ≈ National Trust- Listen to the neighborhoods and families, coordinate with CPC, follow CEFPI guidelines for renovation of old buildings, landbanking make them nervous, mothball historic buildings, salvage when demolishing, green and sustainable technology-the “greenest building is the one already built”, adaptive reuse.

### Individual Comments

- ≈ I Support for the plan – don’t let the community input bog down- move forward as soon as possible.
- ≈ Equity - facilities placement, resources, advocacy, stabilization, maintenance; no specific mention of equity in plan or process to ensure or evaluate in annual update, community engagement, or monitored through out implementation; support facilities board – clarification needed for state/parish run or privatized; concern that in practice facilities will end up with mixed ethnicity middle/upper income high school and a low income African American high school serving uptown due to comments made about not sending kids to BTW – no mechanism to ensure BTW does not suffer neglect when compared with other high school facilities; the challenge is to ensure we stay on a path committed to excellent facilities for all students when the process becomes less visible and future staff, funding and settlement patterns are unknown.
- ≈ Leadership - Future placement/governance; process for a well thought out plan for leadership? Concern for future governance for OPSB/RSD and district run vs. charter schools.
- ≈ Funding

- ≈ Hire DBEs and parents of children
- ≈ Disinvestment - Reuse facilities
- ≈ Trust
- ≈ Why did the plan not explain rationale for each decision?
- ≈ Advocates – time extension for comments
- ≈ Program v. facility perception that closing one closes both
- ≈ Community Schools-all uses under one roof; plan for intentional leadership needed in district governance structure and community support, stable partnership with social services, enabling of citizens at neighborhood level?
- ≈ Need Neighborhood schools - Take into account the people who will be served by the neighborhood schools and the people who will serve the neighborhood schools – this plan punishes neighborhood schools (especially high schools) for being located in old buildings and left behind socially and institutionally and punishes the neighborhoods that need the most help in rebuilding and revitalizing.
- ≈ Landbanking vague - explain to public
- ≈ Extend the comment period v. More action less delay
- ≈ Demographics- do not include private & parochial students; conflicting studies/estimates (perhaps from Jeff group?)
- ≈ No open access high school uptown
- ≈ NOPS TV- instructor unable to do the Math problem
- ≈ Sustainability of facilities and governance
- ≈ Bienville - provider selected without community input
- ≈ Community engagement-more to offer solutions after the plan presentation; dissatisfaction with efforts to engage the entire community in process.
- ≈ Revisions to plan - process
- ≈ Blight - immediately sell property
- ≈ Student Teacher ratio- charter v. direct
- ≈ Safe bike and walk routes – LEED points
- ≈ Renovate not demolish- misconception of wholesale demo of all landbank
- ≈ No Super sites HS over neighborhood schools revise plan or scrap
- ≈ Double speak – TP article listing operators and locations not part of plan
- ≈ Clarify individual charter investments such as Lusher
- ≈ Plan perpetuates need for planning consultants
- ≈ Reject the plan – do not shrink the footprint
- ≈ No open access Uptown HS
- ≈ Land bank VAGUE – EXPLAIN criteria
- ≈ Demolition misunderstood
- ≈ Engage community in process of building assignment/private partnerships

- ≈ Community engagement = vent time, less structure, scheduled after release of plan to gain collaboration and support from community; why has full MP not been made available at community meetings?
- ≈ Require neighborhood quotas for all schools
- ≈ Provide annual review of plan in Spanish and Vietnamese; communicate process widely and clearly well in advance
- ≈ Insufficient High School seats provided in Gentilly
- ≈ Ideological decision to use resources in the repopulated neighborhoods resulting in de facto shrinking of city footprint; arbitrary suburban style acreage benchmark has not correlation with academic performance when national trend shows re-migration to cities and long term benefits of re-densification of urban core; cheaper to renovate than acquire and swap land to build new so use the finite resources prudently to fix up the existing schools, buy text books for the kids without and supply absent special services.
- ≈ Dissatisfaction with prioritization of school buildings and programs
- ≈ Overage kids with young children – need different approach - thought to retool middle school?
- ≈ Not enough HS Uptown or in NOEast

