

CHARTER SCHOOL APPEAL COMMISSION
Recommendation to State Board of Education, February 20, 2007

GOOD START UNIVERSITY AND
GOOD START ACADEMY

Petitioner,

v.

SCHOOL BOARD OF
ST. JOHNS COUNTY

_____ / DOE Case No.2006-1245

RECOMMENDATION

On November 21, 2006, the School Board of St. Johns County (School Board) voted to deny the charter application of Good Start University and Good Start Academy (Charter applicant). The School Board's letter of denial was dated November 21, 2006. The Charter applicant filed this appeal on December 14, 2006. On February 12, 2007, 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 applicant.** The Commission's justifications for its recommendation were as follows:

1. The Commission voted 7 to 0 that the School Board **did** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the Charter School Applicant's application did have a perceived inability based on the information provided in the application to sustain the schools until or unless the start-up monies arrive.
2. The Commission voted 7 to 0 that the School Board's denial of the charter school application, based upon the Charter School Applicant's application did have a perceived inability based on the information provided in the application to sustain the schools until or unless start-up monies arrive, **is** statutory good cause for denial of the charter application.
3. The Commission voted 7 to 0 that the School Board **did** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the Charter School Applicant did have the intent to pay himself rent for the use of his home as "headquarters" for the schools, and this is an unnecessary drain on and potential misuse of public funds.

4. The Commission voted 7 to 0 that the School Board's denial of the charter school application, based upon the Charter School Applicant's intent to pay himself rent for the use of his home as "headquarters" for the schools, and this is an unnecessary drain on the potential misuse of public funds, **is** statutory good cause for denial of the charter application.
5. The Commission voted 7 to 0 that the School Board **did not** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the Charter School Applicant did have intent to pay members of the charter school governing board for consulting services and grant writing.
6. The Commission voted 6 to 1 that the School Board **did** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the Charter School Application lacked an adequate amount of funds to support the area of instruction.
7. The Commission voted 6 to 1 that the School Board's denial of the charter application, based on its lack of adequate amount of funds to support the area of instruction **is** statutory good cause for denial.
8. The Commission voted 7 to 0 that the School Board **did** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the charter school application did not have adequate curriculum as prescribed in 1002.33, Florida Statutes.
9. The Commission voted 7 to 0 that the School Board's denial of the charter application based upon the charter school application not having adequate curriculum as prescribed in 1002.33, Florida Statutes **is** statutory good cause for denial.
10. The Commission voted 6 to 1 that the School Board **did** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the charter school application has no curriculum and strategy set for students reading at or above grade level, nor is there a separate curriculum and strategy set for students who are reading below grade level, as required by 1002.33, Florida Statutes and did not have adequate curriculum as prescribed in 1002.33, Florida Statutes.
11. The Commission voted 6 to 1 that the School Board's denial of the charter application, based upon the charter school application not having a curriculum and strategy set forth for students reading at or above grade level, nor is there a separate curriculum and strategy set for students who are reading below grade level, as required 1002.33, Florida Statutes **is** statutory good cause for denial.
12. The Commission voted 7 to 0 that the School Board **did** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the district lacked confidence in the proposed governance and management of those schools.
13. The Commission voted 7 to 0 that the School Board's denial of the charter application based upon the finding that the district lacked confidence in the proposed governance and management of those schools **is** statutory good cause for denial.
14. The Commission voted 7 to 0 that the School Board **did not** violate the School's due process rights during the charter application proceedings.

Kim McDougal, Commissioner's Designee
Charter School Appeal Commission

FILED with the Agency Clerk of the Department of Education this _____ day of February
2007.

AGENCY CLERK