

CHARTER SCHOOL APPEAL COMMISSION
Recommendation to State Board of Education, February 21, 2006

ACADEMIES OF EXCELLENCE, INC.
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Petitioner,

v.

SCHOOL BOARD OF
GADSDEN COUNTY

DOE Case No. 2005-1145

RECOMMENDATION

On October 31, 2005, the School Board of Gadsden County (School Board) voted to deny the charter application of Academies of Excellence, Elementary School (Charter School). The Charter School filed this appeal on December 13, 2005. On February 3, 2006, the Charter School Appeal Commission heard the appeal of this matter. **Thereafter, the Commission voted 7 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 7 to 0 that the School Board **did not** fail to provide Applicant with sufficient good cause reasons for denial in a timely manner as required by Florida Statute §1002.33(6)(b)(3).
2. The Commission voted 5 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 "Governance and Management".
3. The Commission voted 7 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 "Length of Charter and Implementation Timetable".
4. The Commission voted 5 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 "Recruiting and Marketing Plan".
5. The Commission voted 4 to 3 that the School Board's denial of the Application based on its finding that the Application was statutorily deficient in the area of "Recruitment and Marketing Plan" **is** statutory good cause for denial.
6. The Commission voted 7 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 "Finance".
7. The Commission voted 7 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 "Finance" **is** statutory good cause for denial.

8. The Commission voted 7 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 “Academic Design”.
9. The Commission voted 7 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 Programs”.
10. The Commission voted 7 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 “Student Assessment”.
11. The Commission voted 4 to 3 that the School Board **did** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the Application was statutorily deficient in the area of “Transportation”.
12. The Commission voted 5 to 2 that the School Board’s denial of the Application based in its finding that the Application was statutorily deficient in the area of “Transportation” **is not** statutory good cause for denial.
13. The Commission voted 7 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 “Admissions and Regulation Plan”.
14. The Commission voted 4 to 3 that the School Board’s denial of the Application based on its finding that the Application was statutorily deficient in the area of “Admissions and Registration Plan” **is not** 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 February, 2006.

AGENCY CLERK