

CHARTER SCHOOL APPEAL COMMISSION
Recommendation to State Board of Education, January 17, 2006

GOOD START UNIVERSITY

Petitioner,

v.

SCHOOL BOARD OF
ST. JOHNS COUNTY

DOE Case No. 2005-1123

RECOMMENDATION

On October 11, 2005, the School Board of St. Johns County (School Board) voted to deny the charter application of Good Start University (Charter School). The Charter School filed this appeal on November 17, 2005. On January 5, 2006, the Charter School Appeal Commission heard the appeal of this matter. **Thereafter, the Commission voted 6 to 0 to recommend to the State Board of Education to deny the appeal of the Charter School.** The Commission's justifications for its recommendation were as follows:

1. The Commission voted 5 to 1 that the Charter School **did** receive a full and complete charter application with instructions from the School Board.
2. The Commission voted 6 to 0 that the School Board **did not** utilize review standards that were contrary to state guidelines.
3. The Commission voted 6 to 0 that the School Board **did** act reasonably and in good faith with the Charter School Applicant.
4. The Commission voted 6 to 0 that the School Board **did** send the Applicant a statutorily sufficient Letter of Denial.
5. The Commission voted 4 to 2 that the School Board **did not** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the Application was statutorily deficient in the area of "Principles".
6. The Commission voted 6 to 0 that the School Board **did not** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the Application was statutorily deficient in the area of "Educational Program".
7. The Commission voted 3 to 3 with the Chair casting the deciding vote that the School Board **did** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the Application was statutorily deficient in the area of "Student Assessment".

8. The Commission voted 4 to 2 that the School Board's denial of the Application based on its finding that the Application was statutorily deficient in the area of "Student Assessment" **is** statutory good cause for denial.
9. The Commission voted 6 to 0 that the School Board **did** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the Application was statutorily deficient in the area of "Finances".
10. The Commission voted 6 to 0 that the School Board's denial of the Application based on its finding that the Application was statutorily deficient in the area of "Finances" **is** statutory good cause for denial.
11. The Commission voted 4 to 2 that the School Board **did** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the Application was statutorily deficient in the area of "Class Size Requirements".
12. The Commission voted 5 to 1 that the School Board's denial of the Application based on its finding that the Application was statutorily deficient in the area of "Class Size Requirements" **is** statutory good cause for denial.
13. The Commission voted 5 to 1 that the School Board **did not** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the Application was statutorily deficient in the area of "Human Resources".
14. The Commission voted 4 to 2 that the School Board **did** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the Application was statutorily deficient in the area of "Transportation".
15. The Commission voted 5 to 1 that the School Board's denial of the Application based on its finding that the Application was statutorily deficient in the area of "Transportation" **is** statutory good cause for denial.

Kim McDougal, Commissioner's Designee
Charter School Appeal Commission

FILED with the Agency Clerk of the Department of Education this _____ day of January, 2006.

AGENCY CLERK