

RECEIVED

DEC 01 2015

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COURT OF APPEALS

SC Court of Appeals

APPEAL FROM SOUTH CAROLINA ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT

John D. McLeod, Judge

Case No. 2014-002372

Lake City College Preparatory Academy (LCCPA)Appellant,

V.

South Carolina Public Charter School DistrictRespondent.

SUPPLEMENTAL RECORD ON APPEAL

Johnny E. Watson, Sr., Esquire
Watson Law Firm
Post Office Box 2305
2715 Edgewood Drive
Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 400-1600
Co-Counsel for Appellant


Erik T. Norton
Nelson, Mullins, Riley & Scarborough, LLP
1320 Main Street, Meridian Building
Post Office Box 11070 (29211)
Columbia SC 29201
(803) 799-2000
Counsel for Respondent

Willcox, Buyck and Williams
Mark Buyck, III
248 West Evans St.
Florence SC 29501
P.O. Box 1909 –
Florence SC 29503
843 664-3362 |Direct
843 664-3372 |Fax
Main Counsel for Appellant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE 212 OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT TRANSCRIPT 1
PAGE 213 OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW COURT TRANSCRIPT 2

Respectfully submitted,



Johnny E. Watson, Sr., Esquire
Watson Law Firm
Post Office Box 2305
2715 Edgewood Drive
Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 400-1600
(803) 400-1200

Co-Counsel for Appellant

Florence SC 29501
Willcox, Buyck and Williams
P.O. Box 1909
248 West Evans St.
Florence SC 29501
843 664-3362 |Direct
843 664-3372 |Fax

Main Counsel for Respondent

December 3, 2015
Columbia, South Carolina

212

1 document and didn't have the whole file, you wouldn't
2 know if annual reviews were overdue or had been done or
3 not?

4 A. I could know that by the IEP and any reviews.

5 Q. When it's due?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. But you don't know if it's actually done or
8 not in the past?

9 A. Not in the past, but what -- you know, when
10 they were working with the teachers now I would know.

11 MR. NORTON: Okay. No more questions.

12 MR. MCLAURIN: Okay. Thank you.

13 I assume that's your last witness?

14 MR. BUYCK: Yes, it is.

15 MR. MCLAURIN: Then we'll have -- each side
16 can make a five-minute closing presentation.

17 Erik.

18 MR. NORTON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I'll
19 try to be brief.

20 I know we've heard a lot of information
21 today. You know, it's your job as the Board to
22 evaluate that information, the credibility of the
23 witnesses and the credibility of the information. I
24 would submit to you that when you weigh that
25 information, what you have is a lot of conclusory

1 information not supported by a lot of documentation
2 from the school. And, in fact, some contradictory
3 information.

4 Just since it's fresh in our mind, special
5 education right here, we heard from Ms. Brown sometime
6 ago that, you know, reports were being provided
7 biweekly by the consultant to the District, and we just
8 heard there's no contact with the District.

9 I think when you sit down and put the
10 information -- I would encourage you to look at the
11 information that's been submitted in writing that's
12 already before this Board, particularly Exhibit 18,
13 which was the renewal of the report provided by staff
14 at the prior meeting that laid out a lot of this kind
15 of information. That it's pretty clear that what the
16 District has provided is information that really it
17 can't be refuted. It's provided by the State
18 Department of Education.

19 Just by way of quick example, the highly
20 qualified information that they're fussing about, and
21 we got conclusory testimony, that data came straight
22 from the State Department of Education at 54.7 percent.
23 There's no issue of credibility there. The District
24 doesn't come up with that information.

25 It's the same thing with your HSAP scores and