

To: Mr. Arthur Reigel From: Ms. Natalie M. Williams December 31, 2009

Statement in Support of the Closing Arguments made by Mr. Edward Wolf, Esq. in New York City Department of Education vs. Ms. Natalie Williams and Objections to the Hearing Officer Findings and Recommendations.

Mr. Reigel,

As you are now 'juris functus officio', I take the opportunity to inform you directly of my opinion of your performance as a hearing officer 'In the matter of Natalie Williams'.

I have no doubt that a true "fair and impartial" arbitrator would find you remiss in your duties as a 'neutral'. My letter to Mr. Rotunno in 2005, and this one, to you now Mr. Reigel, at the close of 2009 shows the history of my dealings with men, unduly asserting their powers. **Your 'findings and recommendations' for the termination of my employment as a science teacher at John F. Kennedy High School are best described in the vernacular as follows: 'Same crap, different asshole'.**

My belief that you have been collaborating with Mr. Rotunno from the beginning of 'NYCDOE vs. Natalie Williams' were confirmed upon receipt of a letter from him dated December 17, 2009, (and, in actuality, received by me much later), In it, he gleefully informs me that I have been terminated from my employment at the school. The timing of said letter, exactly ten days after your findings dated December 7, 2009 (and, in actuality, received by me much later), is suspect. Mr. Rotunno has thus provided me with one more piece of evidence for my call to have you removed as a hearing officer.

I had informed Mr. Rotunno in 2005: 'You want to go legal? So let's go Legal'. In 2009, you said to me in the presence of the DOE attorney: 'Let's End This. Apparently, both you and Mr. Rotunno have gone legal in attempting to end this; utilizing every illegal trick in your respective arsenals. But, **why exactly is it that you two have marshaled such nefarious manipulations of the proper procedures of law to oppose me?**

Could it be 'my voice'? I will continue to challenge the unfair decisions of both you and Mr. Rotunno. May I remind you that the expression of my voice in speaking 'truth to power' is protected by the First Amendment of the U. S. Constitution.

Below, I am write a statement of support of Mr. Wolf's main points made during his closing statements on July 22, 2009. I also write to challenge your

December 7, 2009 decision in the case.

I. VENDETTA

In short, I believe that my New York City Department of Education alleged Teacher Misconduct prosecution and continued persecution (in the form of an assault by the principal, two false arrests on charges of criminal trespass, demands for a psychological exam, removal from my teaching position and four year relegation to a teachers re-assignment center **at the behest of John F. Kennedy High School Principal Anthony Rotunno**) **are the spiteful acts of an insecure man set on a 'vendetta'.**

I believe that my verbal challenges to him, my filings of grievances, **my advocating for the teacher's union and my support of the concerns of my students is the true reason that I faced charges of insubordination and misconduct.**

My lengthy and expensive trial and my having been barred from teaching has served no one - except perhaps, Mr. Rotunno, who, for his own petty and malevolent reasons, has persisted in trying to blame me for the failings of his principalship.

The fact that **John F. Kennedy High school was subject to a New York State investigation in 2005 for "alleged" administrative cheating on the English Regent's Exam was a result of his actions; not mine.** That he reacted to a press leak by removing our UFT Chapter Leader; (Ms. Maria Colon), and subjected her to a three year stint in the Rubber Room was also by his hand. As was the excessing of over 35 members of the school's staff. That student's protested is not surprising. Mr. Rotunno called in school aides to 'crack heads' at the student 'riot' resulting in police intervention and subsequent investigations. These and the other outrages which ensued, also falls squarely on his shoulders. {By the way; Ms. M. Colon's experience prompted her to speak out in favor of whistle-blower legislation - specifically for schools. Ultimately, she won complete exoneration of all charges preferred by Mr. Rotunno}.

II. DOE CHARGES AND WITNESSES

I have learned a lot from my lawyers. **The case basically breaks down into two main categories:**

A. My Legitimate basis for videotaping my teaching performance so as to earn Certification in Chemistry
and

B. The Trespass and Conduct Issue Allegations

Had I the opportunity to enter my evidence on record; my closing statement would have been presented as follows:

CLOSING STATEMENT

Teacher Misconduct Hearing
NYC Department of Education vs. Ms. Natalie M. Williams
February 25 - May #, 2009
The DOE has failed to meet it's burden of proof.

SPECIFICATION 1:

Ms. Williams was not 'barred' from videotaping herself in her classroom for the purpose of Teacher Certification. Mr. Rotunno never prohibited Ms. Williams from videotaping her class at John F. Kennedy High School. He wrote two letters which contained directives. He gave a directive in 2003 for Ms. Williams to submit the names of students who attended a meeting with her and the Assistant Principal of Organization of the school. She did provide the names. Another directive was to 'return' a videotape. Ms. Williams did.

The documents that the DOE provided assert this:
Rotunno Directive Letter 1, DATE 2003
Rotunno Directive Letter 2, DATE 2003

Ms. Williams' handwritten reply including 5 student names and OSIS numbers,
Mr. Shapiros signature of receipt of the 'returned' video.

The New York State Education Department permits teachers who are applying for permanent certification to prepare and send a classroom video demonstrating their teaching performance. Teachers preparing such a video need not ask permission from anyone - be they administrators, parents or the children in the classroom themselves. This is a provision of NYS Education Law; amended to allow teachers unimpeded access to fulfilling their certification requirement.
NYS certification page regarding videotape permission.

Ms. Williams; however did, in observance of school policy and also, as a precaution, obtain the signatures of approximately 150 students and their parents in her 5 classes. She had them sign a photo / video release form which she had produced on school letterhead.
photo / video release form

None of the DOE assertions contained in Specification 1 are supported by documentation. The witness testimony from Mr. Kent - a classroom co-teacher is full of contradictions. Mr. Kent also readily reported that there was conflict between them and that he had reason to resent Ms. Williams.

Letter Ms. Williams wrote to Mr. Kent and posted in the Teacher's Lounge
Testimony by Mr. Kevin Kent
Testimony by Mr. Robert Colon
Testimony by Ms. Natalie Williams

Ms. Williams chose to record her lesson during period 2 on October 6, 2006. The topic was "Which Elements are important to Life?" (answer: HONC - Hydrogen, Oxygen, Nitrogen and Carbon) was an appropriate topic in Biology which related to her application for a Chemistry Teacher License. Her lesson during 6 th period September 23, 2005 was entitled "What is Pi? - How do we determine the Circumference of the Earth? This was an appropriate lesson in the topic of Earth Science which related to her application for a Math Teacher License. Ms. Williams video taped other classes as well in an effort to obtain a tape which met the State's criteria. Ms. Williams submitted the "What is Pi?" videotape. New York State acknowledged that they had received the recording and in time, Ms. Williams was awarded her Chemistry Teacher Professional Certification.

postcard acknowledging receipt of ATS-P video
Chemistry Teacher License
Who's Who Award Among America's Teachers Awarded to Ms. Williams in 2004-5

SPECIFICATION 2

Ms. Williams did not "encourage students to cut class". Ms. Williams' own testimony makes it clear that at the end of class period 2 on October 6, 2005; some students lingered and talked with her as she packed away her video equipment. A student, Fantanguah Kaba, asked to speak with her privately. Ms. Williams rolled her equipment cart across the hall and into room 618 and Fantanguah - and unbeknownst to her - Mr. Kent followed. Fantanguah briefly reported to her that Mr. Kent 'took your papers'. This was a reference to a collection of period 2 permission forms that Ms. Williams was searching for on her desk after she had been called out of the classroom for a short while. Ms. Williams scanned through her video camera search for the instance in which she might find Mr. Kent near the Teacher's desk taking the photo / video release forms. Fantanguah also made other comments regarding Mr. Kent. Ms. Williams saw the Mr. Colon was by the door peering at them through the door window as he stood in the hallway. Moments later Mr. Kent opened the door from the outside and asked Fantanguah where was she supposed to be? The girl realized that she should be in Social Studies Class and Ms. Williams escorted her there. Fantanguah was only a few minutes late to her next class and Ms. Williams informed the teacher that she was with her.

The sworn testimony of DOE witness Mr. Kevin Kent conflicts with that of Mr. Robert Colon. Mr. Kent claims that both he and Mr. Colon were inside room 618 and overheard and saw the conversation. Mr. Kent claimed that Ms. Williams videotaped the girl. Mr. Colon stated that he viewed the two from a window in the hallway, could not hear what they were saying and that Ms. Williams held a camera in her hands, but he could not tell if it was on. Clearly, one of these witness testimonies is false. Additionally, we ought to consider the fact that the DOE had access to Fantaguan's phone number and address, yet they failed to call this crucial eye-witness for their claim in Specification 2. This omission in itself, is suspect. Additionally Mr. Kent admitted that he held resentment against Ms. Williams; stating that "she thought that she was a better teacher than I was", and "she wrote a letter to me describing my religion and my supposed opinion of women and posted it in the teachers lounge". DOE witness Principal Rotunno was not a witness to any of the events described in Specification 1-6. He only received hearsay reports and could testify as an eye-witness to nothing.

SPECIFICATION 3

Ms. Williams was indeed arrested on October 27, 2005. In her possession were three parade permits, signs and flyers which she had obtained in support of students; who intended to protest on Open School night. Ms. Williams was surrounded by security guards as she stood some distance away from the school 4th floor entrance. Ms. Williams had intentions of passing off the material to a student and them entering the building to attend Open School Night; where she was expected to be present as a teacher to meet with parents from 6:30 to 8:30 pm. Her name and room assignment are even listed in the Welcome Parents handout.

Welcome Parents print-out showing Ms. Williams schedule to be in room 676.
Parade Permits for October 26, 27 & 28, 2005.

Ms. Williams' testimony reports that she was taken to the 50 th Precinct and processed. The property voucher listed that a video camera, rope , wire, clippers and 'Miscellaneous papers' were taken from her - avoiding clear description of the parade permits. These parade permits were never returned to her. Fortunately, she had copies. The trespass charges were later dismissed by the Bronx Supreme Court. That the DOE persists in claiming a trespass charge when a higher court has already ruled on the matter and dismissed the case should the ridiculous nature of the DOE claim. Their assertion has already been concluded and should never have been addressed here. Ms. Williams' testimony indicates that she believes that the true motivation for this arrest was to avert the planned student protest from occurring on Open School Night.

As for reporting the arrest; the DOE's own witness, Ms. Jean Horan reported that Ms. Williams did report the arrest to OPI (Office of PErsonal Investigation), satisfying C-105.

The 'directive' letter dated November 1, 2005 from local instructional Superintendent Pollina was actually mailed at a later date. The statement that Ms. Williams is not to return to the school without 'prior authorization' could not apply to October 26 as it was written and sent after that date. Ms. Williams is in possession of the envelopes in which Ms. Pollina's directive letter were sent. This is a 'CYA' on the part of Ms. Pollina. It does not hold. How can a pre-dated directive mailed post that date be complied with?

Mr. Rotunno's testimony admits that Ms. Williams' name was likely to have been on the Welcome Parents Teacher List. That list serves as her "prior authorization". None of the DOE accusations regarding Specification 3 hold up.

SPECIFICATION 4a

Ms. Wall's interrogation of DOE witness Principal Rotunno revealed that Ms. Pollina's directive letter to Ms. Williams actually stated that Ms. Williams was prohibited from "contacting students in person or via email". Mr. Rotunno admitted that there was no indication in the letter that Ms. Williams was prohibited from calling students, communicating with students through the US postal service or any other form of communication beyond "in person or via email". Ms. Williams admits in her testimony that she did mail green flyers to two of her former students. She had not been precluded from doing so. No violation of the Superintendent's directive occurred.

SPECIFICATION 4b

Ms. Williams had scheduled Apple School Night in September 2005. She did not pursue having students attend the event planned for November 17, 2005 after having been re-assigned on October 26, 2005. Her testimony make that clear. Upon receipt of promotional flyers from Apple advertising the event, the school reacted by having Ms. Pollina write a letter demanding that Ms. Williams "cease and desist all activities" with respect to JFK HS. Ms. Williams complied with the directive; emailing Mr. Frank Bonobo, Theatre Manager at the Apple Soho Store Theater, to officially cancel the event. The DOE produced no witnesses regarding this.

The Apple School Night flyer for November 17, 2005
Email exchange between Ms. Williams and Mr. Bonobo
Ms. Pollina's cease and desist letter & envelope
The cease and desist letter's envelop indicates - that again, the letter was pre-dated.

SPECIFICATION 4c

Ms. Williams testified that she has arranged for an intermediary to deliver to her former students, two bags of hand-painted t-shirts one morning, outside of the school. DOE witness Charisse Smith testified that "some boy" gave her t-shirts. Surely; Ms. Williams is not "some boy". Ms. Williams did not personally deliver t-shirts to students at JFK HS and therefore, did not disobey the directive of Superintendent Pollina. Ms. Williams did not contact students "in person or via email" - as the directive demanded. The Four corners of the law indicate that had Ms. Pollina wanted to prevent Ms. Williams from indirectly arranging for the students to have a few t-shirts, she should have stated so in her letter. Ms. Williams did not defy her directives "'not to contact students in person or via email" or to "cease and desist activities". The indirect gift of t-shirt was not an 'activity' - although the JFK HS administrative reaction to it made a mountain out of a molehill event of it.

SPECIFICATION 5

Ms. Williams did have 'prior authorization' to return to the school on December 8, 2005. Ms. Williams admits in her testimony that she did stop by the school on December 8, 2005 to attempt to obtain her belongings after having received an email from Senior Regions Counsel for Bronx Region 1; Ms. Dianne Armenikas informing her that she had arranged with Mr. Rotunno for Ms. Williams to return to the school to retrieve her property. Ms. Williams arrived at the security desk of the school and awaited to be 'greeted' by Assistant Principal of Security Mr. Volkert. He stated to her that she require a written permission letter. As Ms. Williams did not have the approval in paper form, she left without incident.

Armenikas email arranging for Ms. Williams to return for her belongings

SPECIFICATION 6

Ms. Williams was arrested at JFKHS, again - on December 13, 2005. This time, she held Ms. Armenikas' email permission letter. This was after all, the 'prior authorization' so demanded in the Ms. Pollina directive. Her testimony reports that there was no security at the guard desk and she proceeded to the 6th floor. As she was looking through her files in room 620, Mr Kent saw her and school security stopped her and brought her downstairs. Ms. Williams showed them her permission letter. She was held in a security station and spoke with various deans, school security officers, her union representative and police before being officially arrested. Again - her permission letter 'disappeared' from the items that were taken from her. The property voucher lists a plastic cover and miscellaneous papers - intentionally avoiding acknowledgement that she held a permission letter. Again, the Supreme court dismissed this case of claimed trespass. That the higher court has already cleared Ms. Williams on this issue puts the appropriateness of addressing it here - in a teacher misconduct hearing - in question. DOE witness Ms. Jean Horan has stated that Ms. Williams did report arrest number 2 to OPI - satisfying Chancellor's Regulation C-105.

So, Specifications One through Six hold no water. There's a hole in the bucket.

These accusations are baseless. Ms Williams and her legal Representative have proven every charge made here to be false. Further, any thinking person can clearly see through the JFK HS administrative plot to try to fire Ms. Williams on these false transgressions. What is also clear, is that Ms. Williams, in her testimony - believes that Mr. Rotunno took actions to rid them of her influence in the school - 'by any means necessary'. She believes that she was retaliated against for her outspokenness, her student advocacy and her union activism. All of these are part of her rights to free speech guaranteed to her as a citizen of the United States of America. There was no improper videotaping of a classroom lesson, no encouragement of students to cut class, no improper back room videotaping of a student, no defiance of the Principal's or the Superintendent's directives, no valid claim of trespass on school grounds and no to failure to report the arrests.

Much of DOE witness testimony involved unspecified claims regarding Ms. Williams. These distractions to the case reveal that the true reasons for the Principal's ire is that Ms. Williams passed out blue 'student strike' flyers on Wednesday October 26, 2005. Ms. Williams reports that shortly thereafter, she was assaulted by Mr. Rotunno and given a series of letters, ultimately landing her in 'Teacher Jail' - aka 'The Rubber Room'. From there, Mr. Rotunno demanded, through Ms. Pollina; that Ms. Williams undergo a psychological evaluation - which she passed. Principal Rotunno played a petty game of keep-away with Ms. Williams' possessions, only allowing for her to regain a scant amount of her teaching material possessions - three months later; after obtaining a court order. Ms. Williams has now sat for three and a half years awaiting a hearing on these 'trumped up' charges. In my opinion, this hearing is yet another means to punish Ms. Williams for the proper exercise of her first amendment rights. All of Principal Rotunno's attempts to malign Ms. Williams and ruin her teaching career have failed. THE DOE has failed to meet it's burden of proof. Ms. Williams remains innocent of all to the charges - and she has proven so - by their own witnesses and documentation.

It is time to return her to the children that she has served so well. And to the teaching of science which she has won awards for. Hearing Officer Reigel - 'Let's End This' - and find for the defendant. Justice Demands that Ms. Williams be completely exonerated of all these charges.

The six specifications of charges preferred against me by the New York State Department of Education were weak and some were blatantly spurious from the start. Specifications 1, 2, 3 & 6 were legally defective and should never have been brought forth. That the state would again entertain Mr. Rotunno's desperate attempt to 'get' those who he perceives as opposing him with another 3020a trial is ludicrous. **Mr. Reigel, you, however, chose to 'go along with it'.**

I believe that I, (Ms. Natalie Williams, acting as Pro Se), my Legal Advisor Ms. Denyse Walls and my Attorney (Mr. Edward Wolf) successfully revealed this miscarriage of justice. We plainly argued that each charge was without merit.

Specifications of Charges # 1 - 6 were deconstructed; one by one, such that any true impartial witness or arbitrator could see that the charges were not meritorious.

In Charges # 1 and 2; Ms. Williams, Mr. Kent , Mr. Rotunno and Mr. Colon spoke of the NYS DOE rules regarding videotaping for the purposes of teacher certification. The evidence was clear that Ms. Williams has the right to videotape her classroom for the purpose of obtaining permanent certification in a new license area. The NYS guidelines declare that there is no requirement for permission to be obtained by the school administration or by the students in the class. The testimonies revealed that other teachers or administrators were 'suspicious' or uninformed of the State Law. The arbitrator precluded the evidence which would have demonstrated Ms. Williams' claim. Ms. Wall's opening statement expressed that she intended to show this in order to refute Specification # 1. The hearing officer refused to admit the ATS -P Video booklet and the resulting videotape of Ms. William's lesson into evidence. This videotape would have clearly demonstrated what occurred during the session.

Regarding Specification #2; it was not conclusively proven that Ms. Williams ever privately videotaped the student Fantasia. Ms. Williams', Mr. Kent's and Mr. R. Colon's testimony place in question whether, how and why this might have been done. Further, the testimonies of what happened when Ms. Williams was seen in the science prep area with Fantasia holding a video camera are conflicting. Mr. Kent's claim proved to be inconsistent with that of Ms. Williams, Mr. Colon, and the school floor plan. Yet, **you, Mr. Reigel chose to take the word of 'Rabbi Kent' over the other evidence.**

Regarding Specifications of Charges # 3 & 4 & 6: The DOE witnesses Ms. Horan and Ms. Smith gave testimony which supported Ms. Williams. Testimony by Ms. Jean Horan clearly indicated that Ms. Williams did indeed report the two arrests at the school site on charges of alleged trespass to the Department of Education - according to the required protocol. Given this, your ruling was forced to acknowledge this truth.

Testimony from Ms. Charisse Smith, a student of Ms. Williams' at the time), reveal that Ms. Williams was a good teacher. "Strong". And that she got along with her Teacher Colleagues.

She went further to indicate that the students in her class could detect harassment of Ms. Williams by school administrators. Charisse also spoke on that fact that she wrote a statement directed to the principal regarding controversies surrounding allegations of teacher led cheating on the Regent Exams. (The green flyer, which was admitted into evidence, holds her letter; entitled 'Dear Mr. Rotunno'.)

Regarding Specifications of Charges # 5 and 6: Ms. Williams admits to handing

out flyers advertising a planned; police permitted student protest. Her first amendment rights allow for her to do so. I also note that the arranging for the gifting of T-shirts is also not a crime; nor did it go against any directive from a supervisor. Ms. Smith testified that she received T-shirts from 'some boy' and that she had not had contact with Ms. Williams since her leaving the school. **Your findings, therefore, prove to be 'irrational' in stating that Ms. Williams is "guilty of giving t-shirt to students".**

Mr. Rotunno admits that he actually saw 'nothing'. Ms. Walls' interrogation of him revealed that he only received hearsay testimony from subordinate administrators; but he himself did not witness anything in relation to the distribution of flyers or the gifting of the t-shirts. Mr. Rotunno, also was forced to acknowledge, during Ms. Walls' cross examination of him; that the letter from Ms. Pollina did not explicitly 'direct' Ms. Williams against mailing documents to students, or arranging for them to receive t-shirts as gifts. Further; the mailing of the green flyers to students in order to inform them of her status immediately after having been falsely arrested and before the receipt of Superintendent Pollina's letter, to a student did not go against the directive. Ms. Williams was directed 'not to contact students, in person or via email. She did not. **Your finding that Ms. Williams used addresses that were 'illegally obtained'** (without citing any proof) **is also in error.** Ms. Williams used public listings of addresses which she has every right to utilize.

Mr. R. Colon later explicated on the chase of Ms. Williams that ensued on October 27, 2005. It is interesting to note that Mr. Volkert; the chaser, carefully avoided the issue and made no reference of it in his testimony. Why did Ms. Williams run? Well, because Mr. Volkert ran. He had fully witnessed Mr. Rotunno slam her in the doorway of the Principal's office the day before. Who reasonably, would wait around? Was she supposed to chat with him under the threat of more physical violence? **Really, Mr. Reigel; your logic is twisted.** Mr. Wolf pointed out that, as Ms. Williams was in the school voting at a UFT election preceding 'the chase'; her First Amendment Rights once again must be honored. (July 22, 2009 Hearing)

Mr. Bellotti, head school custodian, was caught lying on record, (as was Mr. Kent). Mr. Bellotti's description of where Ms. Williams was located when she handed out blue flyers conflicts with that of both Ms. Williams and A.P. of Security Mr. Volkert's testimonies. The color of the flyers has also changed in the school foreman's; version - white flyers were not distributed by Ms. Williams (perhaps she go a bit of xeroxing help from someone inside). She readily admits to handing out blue ones during period one on the corner of Tibbitts avenue and 230th street; as her parade permit had allowed. This is noted by documentation which was admitted into evidence and other DOE witnesses.

Mr. Kent boldly lied. His description of his and Mr. Colon's viewing point of Ms. Williams conversing with 'Fantasia' conflicts with the school map; and with the testimony of Assistant Principal of Science, Mr. Robert Colon's. As any lawyer and judge knows; **once you catch a witness in one lie, you can reasonably expect that they have lied in other areas of testimony as well.** A prudent person, would not take their testimonies seriously at all. **Neither Mr. Kent nor Mr. Bellotti have proven to be credible witnesses.**

Ms. Williams' cross-examination of Mr. Rotunno revealed that **her reply letters in response to his accusatory letters on file - were missing; In contradiction to NYC DOE policy.** The arbitrator (you,) did allow for these to be placed on record. You later precluded them unfairly; using you no tiresome trick of claiming that the evidence was presented to you 'late'. Anyone reading these letters would conclude that the feud between Mr. Rotunno and Ms. Williams has been long-standing. **It is clear from these documents that Mr. Rotunno has been 'after' Ms. Williams since his principalship at Kennedy High School began. (And so, you refused to enter them into evidence).**

Mr. Wolf also pointed out that **Mr. Rotunno failed in his administrative procedure for hearing charges to be filed against Ms. Williams when the case was at the school level. NYS Education Statutes were clearly violated.** Mr. Rotunno failed to hold an in-school hearing with Ms. Williams to discuss the issues surrounding the videotaping of her class. **Had she the opportunity to explain and prove her point** regarding state videotaping procedures for additional teacher certification areas; **perhaps these 3020a hearings would have been averted.**

Mr. Rotunno's testimony expressed that he did not see Ms. Williams engage in any of the actions that she was charged with. (Yet, he signed off on criminal trespass complaints). **Rotunno was also mistaken as to what the actual contents of the re-assignment letter that he submitted to Ms. Williams under force were.** Ms. Williams clearly did not defy Mr. Rotunno's directive. She promptly reported to room 845 at One Fordham Plaza; as the letter dictated. (Mr. Rotunno seemed to think that the letter had stated that Ms. Williams could not return to the school, This is yet another regrettable error on his part).

III. MISSING DOE WITNESSES

In retrospect, one must ask why certain key witnesses for the NYC DOE did not appear.

Why was Fantanguah K. not called to testify as a prosecution witness? The DOE had student addresses and phone numbers. How come "Fanta" was not found

as easily as was Charrisse Smith; so as to testify on issues regarding Specifications 1 and 2? Surely; F.K.'s testimony would have clarified the matter. That the DOE failed to present her at the hearing points to the fact that their case sought to subvert the truth.

As for teachers; Ms. Amalia Garcia, a chemistry teacher was called in by the prosecution to testify. When her testimony was delayed, she was not called back. Only, Mr. Kevin Kent, a teacher known to hold resentments against Ms. Williams, came forward. In retrospect, this provides further evidence that **the charges were motivated by ill-feelings; not facts.**

Also absent at the hearings was Ms. Kathleen Pollina, the now retired Local Instructional Supervisor (LIS) of Bronx District # 1. As Mr. Rotunno's direct supervisor; she wrote numerous back dated letters to me. I responded to each one with my characteristic insight. After I was 'gone', she had barred me from any activities associated with the school and later demanded that I receive a medical evaluation by the DOE's doctor's. Surely, the DOE would have wanted her to testify so as to fortify their arguments. Why then; did she choose not to? I posit that they feared cross-examination by the defense - that's why.

And, then; the DOE's much promoted closing witness did not show up. NYPD Officer Mario Badia; for whatever reason, chose not to take part in this little charade. Mr. M. Badia; was the arresting officer in Ms. Williams' second trespass arrest at the school. He later acted as her police escort in January 2006, when she returned to her school in order to finally obtain some of her vandalized belongings. The testimony of the police officer was critical to the prosecution. One must reasonably question why he chose not to testify.

IV. REVENGE OF THE WEAK CASE

I'm sure that Mr. Rotunno was disappointed that his little plot to ruin my career had failed so miserably. But that again; was by his own hand.

My point is: **Mr. Rotunno's skull-duggary has been long standing and continues to this day. I charge that he has used you as a conduit for the meeting out of 'his revenge'.** I believe that he is intent on continuing to malign my career as a teacher in the NYC Department of Education, regardless of the facts. **Ms. Williams IS an excellent teacher - beloved by her students and hated my Mr. Rotunno. That is the core fact of the case. That the hearings went off** within this backdrop - involving all of these people and expense **to satisfy the Napoleonic self-esteem driven pay-back vendetta of Mr. Rotunno is ridiculous.** I loosely allude to a quote by him when I say: Mr. Rotunno's malfeasance "is egregious, more so, as he sought to involve the" courts in his misguided campaign.

V. JUSTICE CALL FOR THE HEARING OUTCOME - ON APPEAL

The DOE's case is 'full of holes' and in the end, 'they've got nothing'.

The great efforts that DOE prosecutor, Ms. John-Stull expressed in objecting to the admission of certain defense material has brought me - a layman to the law - to question whether '**the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth**' - would be revealed in these hearings. But, one thing is clear to me: **how can a trail be fair without evidence from both sides being presented?**

As arbitrator, the decision as to 'what to do with Ms. Williams' had fallen on you. Mr. Wolf has already pointed out that the DOE's application was defective; and that the preclusion of evidence and witnesses is not within the power of the arbitrator in 3020a hearings. That Ms. Williams was questioned by Ms. John-Stull without the aid of her legal advisor is also problematic.

There seems to have been numerous improprieties by all parties involved in the hearing. The Respondent: in her unfamiliarity with legal procedures. The Prosecution: with their faulty wording of the specifications and the on record false testimonies of witnesses for the school. And with **the Hearing Officer**; who **improperly precluded** to the defense evidence, witnesses and a legal advisor. **Given all of this, even a layman should question whether these hearings are legitimate or valid.**

Mr. Reigel, when you, as arbitrator denied the defense the admission of documents into evidence, barred the Respondent from being legally represented and even blocked the testimony of certain witnesses; I openly wondered whether I would receive a fair trial and a just ruling. Also suspect in my mind is the fact that manipulations in the time schedule resulted in confusions which subverted the public's ability to witness the hearings. I may not be a lawyer; **but I know a set-up when I see one.** I believe that in the refusal to allow Ms. Williams to put forward some proof; Hearing Officer Reigel created a default situation. I and my lawyers believe **that these documents exonerate me. Failure to allow them in undercuts my ability to have a fair hearing based on all of the evidence and witnesses available.**

I believe that your conduct, as a hearing officer is at major issue in this case. You have stated to me that you believed that I "have been disrespectful" to you, "disrespectful to the DOE attorney, and even disrespectful to your own legal advisor." I respectfully conclude that you have treated me in a biased manner. Mr. Reigel, I believe that you; along with DOE attorney; Ms. Minerva John-Stull participated in a "demonization" of Ms. Williams.

In addition to your claims that I was "disrespectful", you were also incensed that I was "late". You later claimed 'lateness' as a basis to preclude just about everything and everyone that the defense presented. **Indeed; we did "get off on the wrong foot". And your findings attempt to kick me in the ass.**

That you prevented the introduction of evidence by me further stymied the case for the defense; hindering my opportunity to prove my innocence in specifications of charges #1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. May I also remind you of the UFT contract with respect to 3020a hearings - 'reciprocal discovery does not call for reciprocal preclusion.'

Quite simply; **you should be aware that procedural determinations made by you strangled the truth from coming out.** At question is the factor that blocked that proof: It is you, serving in your capacity as hearing officer. Nowhere in the language of 3020a law is there the power of the arbitrator to preclude evidence (documents or witnesses).

When you stood as hearing officer, the decision was yours. **Now, an appeal is necessary.** I must inform you that **I will challenge the decision** on the grounds that the arbitrator himself created an 'iron curtain' to prevent defense information from coming in. There will be some serious appeal issues to address.

Mr. Wolf had previously encouraged you to keep the record open so as to allow the defense documents to be placed among the evidence. You refused; and chose instead to close out the hearings. Such decisions must be called into question. That is why **I have called for your removal. I will relish exposing you as the bigot that you have proved to be.**

I look forward to the appeal.

I hope that I have provided you with **a most memorable arbitration experience** and that, when all is said and done; **a 'fair and impartial' second hearing officer, will rule on the side of justice.**

VI. CREATIVITY RESULTS

For me, one outcome of this experience has been a fortification of creativity - in the form of prose, poetry and song. I have enclosed some of the songs and poems which have sprung from this saga. It is entitled '**Poems and Lyrics by Ms. Natalie Williams**'.

Take a Stand - is a song in honor of Mr. Alton Maddox Jr.; Chairman of the

United African Movement. A number of people from the UAM organization were in attendance at my public hearings.

Too Much, Too Little, Too Late - refers to my decision to decline the services of NYSUT appointed attorney Mr. Mitchell Rubenstein.

She's Got My Back is a tribute to Ms. Denyse Walls; former director of the South Carolina American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). She served as my legal advisor through part of my hearings.

Let It Be A Lesson - is an acknowledgement to Bronx Middle School Computer Teacher Mr. Francisco Garabitos. His struggles are similar to mine. I requested that Mr. Garabitos testify for the defense at my hearings, but you ruled against it.

The Powers That Be - is directed at those who are - or who *think* that they have - authority over me.

If Loving You is Wrong, I Don't Want to Be Right - is my love song to the students of John F. Kennedy High School; where I served as a science teacher from 1994-2005.

My Voice - speaks to *my truth* and challenges others to do the same.

We, We, We Are Kennedy - is my Ode to Kennedy High School. It is a call to youth for the liberation and education of themselves and their community. References to Mr. Rotunno, Ms. Pollina, and Mr. Kent are embedded within it. I read this poem aloud, as part of the defenses' closing comments to the hearings.

Please read my songs and poems and consider them as you weigh in on the implications of your decision.

Sincerely,

www.natwilliams.com

Ms. Natalie Williams
Pro Se
NYCDOE vs. N.Williams
natwilliams@mac.com
(212) 9260-1989