

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

SUMMIT ACADEMY MANAGEMENT

Petitioner,

v.

SCHOOL BOARD OF
SARASOTA COUNTY

DOE Case No. 2005-1146

RECOMMENDATION

On October 18, 2005, the School Board of Sarasota County (School Board) voted to deny the charter application of Summit Academy Management (Charter School). The Charter School filed this appeal on December 15, 2005. On February 1, 2006, the Charter School Appeal Commission heard the appeal of this matter. **Thereafter, the Commission voted 5 to 1 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 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 "School's Ability to Provide Certified Teachers".
2. The Commission voted 5 to 1 that the School Board **did not** have competent, substantial evidence that the Application was statutorily deficient in the area of "Student Performance".
3. 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 "Student Proficiency".
4. 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 "Performance Outcomes".
5. The Commission voted 5 to 1 that the School Board **did** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the Application was statutorily deficient in the area of "Local Community Support".
6. 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 "Local Community Support" **is not** statutory good cause for denial.
7. 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 "Budget Errors".

8. The Commission voted 3 to 3 with the Chair casting the deciding vote that the School Board's denial of the Application based on its finding that the Application was statutorily deficient in the area of "Budget Errors" **is** statutory good cause for denial.
9. 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 "Educational Design".
10. The Commission voted 3 to 3 with the Chair casting the deciding vote that the School Board's denial of the Application based on its finding that the Application was statutorily deficient in the area of "Educational Design" **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 February, 2006.

AGENCY CLERK