Valerie S. Mason
Chair

Ian McKnight
District Manager

505 Park Avenue, Suite 620
New York, N.Y. 10022-1106
(212) 758-4340
(212) 758-4616 (Fax)
www.cb8m.com – Website
info@cb8m.com – E-Mail

The City of New York
Community Board 8 Manhattan
Youth, Education, and Libraries Committee
June 25, 2026 - 6:30 PM
Conducted Remotely via Zoom

Please note: The resolution contained in the committee minutes is a recommendation submitted by the committee co-chairs to the Community Board. At the monthly full board meeting, the resolution is discussed and voted upon by all members of Community Board 8 Manhattan.

Resolution for Approval:
Item 1: (T227/R115) Calling on DYCD to reevaluate their decision on after-school programs

Minutes

Board Members Present: Danielle Avissar, Taína Borrero, Lindsey Cormack, Miles Fink, Edward Hartzog, Judy Schneider

Board Members Excused: N/A

Approximate Number of Public Attendees: 5

1. **Discussion on NYC's decision to cut Manhattan Youth's after-school program – with updates from Harry Gale, Chief of Staff - District Office of Speaker Julie Menin**
    a. Chief of Staff to Speaker Menin's District Office, Harry Gale described the issue as one of the largest school issues that the Speaker's office has ever dealt with. There have been hundreds of calls from families in the district and from throughout the city. Principals and parents have entrusted these providers with handling programs like SHSAT prep, theater, mock trial, debate, sports, and other activities. This represents a massive cut to afterschool programming for children across the district and the city. The New York City Department of Youth and Community Development (DYCD) has said that they would work to try to restore everything that was lost but did not provide a firm commitment to doing so.
    b. In Community District 8, these relationships have been cultivated over the past ten years. The schools affected are Ella Baker, Wagner, and Yorkville Middle Schools. The provider primarily impacted is Manhattan Youth, but there are others, too. There is no rhyme or reason to the changes based on the Request for Proposal (RFP), nor was there any warning about the changes to these providers those schools had formed decade-plus relationships with. The principals and schools were not involved in the selection of new providers

c. The explanation from DYDC was twofold: (1) they took principal feedback of the providers into consideration and (2) they had a scoring system. A combination of both of these factors found that the current providers were not the best suited.
d. There are some issues and inconsistencies here, outlined in a letter that Speaker Menin wrote to DYDC. Some of these considered "not best suited" retained some of their contracts for some schools and not others. DYDC suggested that maybe there wasn't a better provider applying for the schools where Manhattan Youth was retained. There is no evidence whether this is factual. Additionally, many principals reported rating Manhattan Youth as "excellent"—making the finding that Manhattan Youth was not the best suited a confusing finding.
e. In response to Speaker Menin's first letter, her office had a closed meeting with DYCD, where the department said that they couldn't explain the scoring rubric and scoring system because there was a "protest period" about the changes. However, after the protest period, the Speaker's office couldn't get a hold of the rubric and scoring system—nor the principal feedback. This was the basis for the Speaker's office's second email, which has not received a response as of the meeting.
f. A week before the meeting, the Speaker's office had a press rally with the organization Manhattan Youth and other providers demanding these programs not be cut.
g. Today, the Speaker is looking at alternative pathways to engaging these providers, including council funding to keep some of these provider's presence in the schools (assuming this is allowed) and keeping the pressure to restore the programs.
h. Following the discussion and questions, the committee passed a resolution to address this issue. The resolution is included below:

RESOLUTION FOR APPROVAL:

WHEREAS the New York City Department of Youth and Community Development (DYCD) decision to cut Manhattan Youth's after-school programs has caused confusion and cut critical afterschool programming—like SHSAT prep, theater, mock trial, debate, sports, among other activities—with long-standing, trusted providers; and

WHEREAS there has been a lack of transparency around both (1) the principal feedback of the providers and (2) they had a scoring/rubric system that DYDC used in making this decision; and

WHEREAS principals in the district have ranked the providers that were cut favorably and do not wish to have new providers; and

WHEREAS parents will now have to reevaluate what after-school programs to place their children into; and

WHEREAS this issue is particularly salient for students grades 6-8, where there are fewer after-school programming options; and

WHEREAS parents have come to Manhattan Community Board 8 (CB8M) asking that the old providers be restored;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that CB8M requests that DYDC explore restoring the previous providers to schools in CB8M. If that is not possible, CB8M asks that DYDC have their

new providers fulfill all the previous activities and programming provided by the previous provider so that students this fall can participate in the same activities as last school year; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that DYDC be fully transparent about the principal feedback and rubric that went into making this decision; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that moving forward, CB8M asks that DYDC provide more advanced notice of these changes in the future.

Yes (6): Borrero, Cormack, Schneider, Fink, Avissar, Hartzog

No (0): none

Abstain (0): none

2. **Old Business – There were no Old Business items**
3. **New Business – There were no New Business items**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:05pm.

Taína Borrero and Addeson Lehv, Co-Chairs