

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

UNIVERSAL EDUCATION SERVICES
d/b/a OSCEOLA UNIVERSAL SCHOOLS

Petitioner,

v.

SCHOOL BOARD OF
OSCEOLA COUNTY

DOE Case No.2006-1252

RECOMMENDATION

On October 24, 2006, the School Board of Osceola County (School Board) voted to deny the charter application of Universal Education Services d/b/a Osceola Universal School (Charter applicant). The School Board's letter of denial was dated October 26, 2006. The Charter applicant filed this appeal on December 15, 2006. On February 12, 2007, the Charter School Appeal Commission heard the appeal of this matter. **Thereafter, the Commission voted 4 to 2 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 6 to 0 that the School Board **did** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the Charter School Applicant's bylaws failed to comply with Sunshine Law requirements.
2. The Commission voted 6 to 0 that the School Board's denial of the charter school application, based upon the Charter School Applicant's bylaws failing to comply with Sunshine Law requirements **is not** statutory good cause for denial.
3. The Commission voted 4 to 2 that the School Board **did** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the charter school application's educational program did lack specific details regarding implementation of the ESE program and failed to identify the specific services to be provided to disabled students.
4. The Commission voted 3 to 3 and was unable to reach a decision regarding whether the School Board's denial of the charter application, based upon the Charter School Applicant's educational program lacking specific details regarding implementation of the ESE program and failing to

identify the specific services to be provided to disabled students **is** statutory good cause for denial. Therefore the chair rendered the decision by voting that the School Board's denial of the charter application, based upon the Charter School Applicant's educational program lacking specific details regarding implementation of the ESE program and failing to identify the specific services to be provided to disabled students **is** statutory good cause for denial.

5. The Commission voted 4 to 2 that the School Board **did not** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the charter school application demonstrates a lack of proper student assessment.
6. The Commission voted 6 to 0 that the School Board **did not** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the charter school application did demonstrate a lack of proper school governance.
7. The Commission voted 6 to 0 that the School Board **did not** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the charter school application did have inadequate funding for facilities.
8. The Commission voted 6 to 0 that the School Board **did not** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the charter school application did fail to provide registration requirements.
9. The Commission voted 6 to 0 that the School Board **did not** have competent, substantial evidence to support its finding that the charter school application did have an inadequate human resource plan.

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