

CHARTER SCHOOL APPEAL COMMISSION
Recommendation to State Board of Education, March 16, 2004

PROGRESSIVE RANCH SCHOOL, INC.

Petitioner,

v.

SCHOOL BOARD OF
SARASOTA COUNTY

DOE Case No. 2003-964

RECOMMENDATION

On November 18, 2003 the School Board of Sarasota County (School Board) voted to deny the charter application of Progressive Ranch School, Inc. (Charter applicant). The School Board's letter of denial was dated November 26, 2003. The Charter applicant filed this appeal on December 24, 2003. On February 26, 2004, the Charter School Appeal Commission heard the appeal of this matter. **Thereafter, the Commission voted 8 to 1 to recommend to the State Board of Education to deny the appeal of the Charter applicant.** The Commission's justifications for its recommendation were as follows:

- A. The Commission voted 7 to 2 to recommend that the School Board **did** have competent, substantial evidence to support that the **Educational Design** area of the Charter Application was insufficient.
- B. The Commission voted 9 to 0 to recommend that the School Board's denial of the charter application based on the insufficient Educational Design area **is statutory good cause for denial** under §1002.33 Florida Statute.
- C. The Commission voted 8 to 1 to recommend that the School Board **did** have competent, substantial evidence to support that the **ESE and LEP** area of the Charter Application was insufficient.
- D. The Commission voted 9 to 0 to recommend that the School Board's denial of the charter application based on the insufficient ESE and LEP area **is statutory good cause for denial** under §1002.33 Florida Statute.
- E. The Commission voted 8 to 0 to recommend that the School Board **did not** have competent, substantial evidence to support that the **Admissions Procedures** area of the Charter Application was insufficient.

- F.** The Commission voted 8 to 1 to recommend that the School Board **did** have competent, substantial evidence to support that the **Performance Outcome** area of the Charter Application was insufficient.
- G.** The Commission voted 9 to 0 to recommend that the School Board's denial of the charter application based on the insufficient Performance Outcome area **is statutory good cause for denial** under §1002.33 Florida Statute.
- H.** The Commission voted 7 to 2 to recommend that the School Board **did** have competent, substantial evidence to support that the **Reading** area of the Charter Application was insufficient.
- I.** The Commission voted 8 to 1 to recommend that the School Board's denial of the charter application based on the insufficient Reading area **is statutory good cause for denial** under §1002.33 Florida Statute.
- J.** The Commission voted 9 to 0 that the School Board **did not** have competent, substantial evidence to support their concerns regarding the alleged conflict of authority between board members and operating officers contained in the Charter Application.
- K.** The Commission voted 9 to 0 that the School Board **did not** have competent, substantial evidence to support their concerns regarding perceived vague and evasive evidence of community support and need contained in the Charter Application.

Kim McDougal, Commissioner's Designee
Charter School Appeal Commission

FILED with the Agency Clerk of the Department of Education this _____ day of March, 2004.

AGENCY CLERK