IN THE SUPREME COURT OF FLORIDA

Case No. SC 18-67

CITIZENS FOR STRONG SCHOOLS, INC., et al.,

Appellants,

v.

FLORIDA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, et al.,

Appellees.

On Appeal from the First District Court of Appeal

AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF APPELLANTS

Dena H. Sokolow
Florida Bar No.: 30856
dsokolow@bakerdonelson.com
Renee Meenach Decker
Florida Bar No.: 60384
redecker@bakerdonelson.com

Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC
100 S.E. Third Ave
Suite 1620
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33394
Telephone: 954.768.1600
Facsimile: 954.333.3930
Counsel for the Amicus Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

FLORIDA CONSTITUTION

OTHER AUTHORITIES

STATEMENT OF IDENTITY AND INTEREST IN THE CASE

I. Statement of Interest in the Case

The *Amici Curiae's*[1] interest in this case is to advocate for the education provided to certain students–including the subpopulations of homeless students, Black students, Hispanic students, English Language Learners ("ELL"), and students receiving free or reduced lunch ("FRL students")–who are underachieving in disparate numbers compared to the overall population in Florida. These students make up a numerically large and important subset of the students whose achievement scores demonstrate that they are not receiving a high quality education, as mandated by Florida's Constitution. As organizations that are committed to serving those at-risk students, the *Amici Curiae*'s interest in this case is whether the First District Court of Appeal incorrectly found the courts of this state incapable of enforcing the constitutional mandate that the State provide a high quality education for ***all*** students. The *Amici Curiae* submit that the court of appeal's refusal to require Florida to comply with its constitutional mandate leaves these students without equal access to a quality public education.

[1] The *Amici Curiae* are comprised of four organizations and one professor of law: (1) National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty; (2) Florida's Children First; (3) the Children and Youth Law Clinic at the University of Miami School of Law; and (4) FSU College of Law, Children's Advocacy Clinic and Michael J. Dale, professor of law at Nova Southeastern University.

II. The *Amici Curiae*'s Respective Interests

The National Law Center of Homelessness & Poverty (the "Law Center") is the only national organization dedicated solely to using the power of the law to end and prevent homelessness. Through policy advocacy, public education, and impact litigation, the Law Center addresses the symptoms and root causes of homelessness by developing, advocating for, and implementing effective laws and policies that meet the immediate and long-term needs of those who are homeless or who are at risk of becoming homeless.

Florida's Children First ("FCF") is a non-profit organization dedicated to advancing the rights of at-risk children, especially those who are in in foster care. FCF works to improve government and private systems that exist to serve children through advocacy of the executive and legislative branches of government as well as training of attorneys representing at-risk youth.

Florida State University College of Law, Children's Advocacy Clinic, is a leading educational organization advocating for children's rights in Florida. The Clinic started in 1991 and provides full legal representation for children with foster care, juvenile delinquency, health care, special education, school discipline , disability, social security and criminal law issues. State court judges routinely appoint the Clinic to represent disadvantage children throughout the state of Florida. The Clinic has extensive experience representing children in special

education and school discipline cases before school districts in the Florida Panhandle. Also the Director of the Children's Advocacy Clinic routinely publishes on special education issues and has provided trainings on special education for Florida Guardian Ad Litem Programs and Legal Services Programs around the state.

The Children and Youth Law Clinic ("CYLC") is an in-house legal clinic staffed by faculty and students of the University of Miami School of Law. Established in 1995, the CYLC engages in individual and law reform advocacy to serve the legal needs of vulnerable children, with a particular emphasis on the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. Many of CYLC's clients experience homelessness as children or young adults, and a significant focus of their policy advocacy has been improving educational outcomes for foster children and addressing youth homelessness. CYLC has appeared as amicus curiae in numerous federal and state court cases implicating the constitutional interests of children.

Michael J. Dale is a professor of law at Nova Southeastern University College of Law in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. The focus of his litigation practice and scholarship over the past 40 years has been on the rights of children including their right to educational benefits in a variety of contexts including racial discrimination, special education, and due process in public schools and

institutions. Professor Dale is the former attorney in charge of the Special Litigation Unit of the Juvenile Rights Division of the Legal Aid Society of the City of New York and Executive Director the Youth Law Center in San Francisco, CA. where he litigated cases involving a variety of rights to education in both state and federal courts. At the Nova College of Law he has litigated cases involving educational rights through the law school's family and children's clinic. Professor Dale is the author of over 75 articles focusing primarily on the legal rights of children and the author of the two-volume Matthew Bender text "Representing the Child Client".

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Florida's Constitution makes education in this state a fundamental value, and requires a uniform system of education to be provided to all children in its borders. The appellate court erred in finding that those requirements of the Constitution are non-justiciable. Rather, the court should have looked to state-mandated performance assessments and the language of the Constitution itself for the guidelines to follow in determining whether the State has complied with its constitutional duty.

Moreover, evidence from trial shows great disparities in the academic performance of Florida's children such that Disadvantaged Children perform significantly worse than their peers in state assessments. These disparities indicate that not all children are provided with a high quality education, as the Florida Constitution requires. These disparities present the State with an opportunity to act to move toward fulfilling the requirements of the Constitution. The trial record is replete with evidence showing that providing additional funding and resources to address the educational needs of Disadvantaged Children would correct these disparities, getting the State closer to providing a uniform education.

Florida would not be the first state to hold the legislature accountable to constitutional standards. Other states have looked at the performance of all children within their education system and have found that their states have failed

to provide the uniform, quality education mandated by their constitutions based on the failure to address the disparities among the children in the school system. These states were held accountable by their high courts for violating their constitutional mandates. *Amici* ask this Court to do the same - use the standards approved by the people of Florida in its Constitution and hold the State accountable to the performance standards it adopted. Merely assessing whether all children in the State are learning the core content the State selected as evidence of a "high quality" education is well within this Court's power.

ARGUMENT

I. HEIGHTENED SCRUTINY IS WARRANTED TO MEASURE WHETHER THE STATE HAS FULFILLED ITS CONSTITUTIONAL DUTY TO PROVIDE HIGH QUALITY EDUCATION TO ALL STUDENTS.

A. The Citizens of Florida Voted to Strengthen the Mandate on Education

In 1998 the people of Florida voted to bypass the legislative process to strengthen the State's obligation to provide a system of high quality public education by amending the Florida Constitution. *See Bush v. Holmes*, 919 So.2d 392, 403 (Fla. 2006) ("[I]n 1998… the Constitutional Revision Commission (the "CRC") proposed and the citizens of this state approved an amendment to article IX, section 1 to make clear that education is a "fundamental value" and "a

paramount duty of the state"). Specifically, the 1998 amendment, referred to as "Revision 6," modified the former education clause to the present clause:

> The education of children is a fundamental value of the people of the state of Florida. It is, therefore, a *paramount duty* of the state to make adequate provision for the education of *all children* residing within its borders. Adequate provision shall be made by law for a uniform, efficient, safe, secure, and high quality system of free public schools that allows students to obtain a high quality education.

Art. IX, 1(a), Fla. Const. (emphasis supplied). The clear intent of the revision was to raise the standard for the public education received by Florida's students. Jon Mills & Timothy McLendon, *Setting a New Standard for Public Education: Revision 6 Increases the Duty of the State to Make 'Adequate Provision' for Florida Schools*, 52 Fla. L. Rev. 329 (2000), http://scholarship.law.ufl.edu/facultypub/520.

In addition to heightened duty to provide a high quality education, the inclusion of the phrase "all children" mandates that a constitutionally adequate education be provided to children across all counties, economic circumstances, housing statuses, disabilities, English language proficiencies, races, and ethnicities. Mills, 52 Fla. L. Rev. 329 at 370 (2000).

The incorporation of "all children" and "paramount duty" was not inadvertent, but rather, reflects the intent of the CRC to emphasize both the importance of education in Florida and the accessibility to education for every student in the state. Those terms are reflective of the ones adopted in the 1868

Florida Constitution, which declared "[i]t is a paramount duty of the State to make ample provision for the education of all children residing within its borders, without distinction or preference." Art. VIII, 2, Fla. Const. A review of the history leading up to the constitutional revision of 1868 shows that the intent of the drafters was to require free education without regard to race. David Tyack and Robert Lowe, *The Constitutional Moment: Reconstruction and Black Education in the South*, American Journal of Education, Vol. 94, No. 2, at 244 (1986). The 1868 Florida Constitution was drafted with the belief that all students, regardless of race, required a public education to succeed as citizens in a post-civil war era. Jamie S. Dycus, *Lost Opportunity: Bush v. Holmes and the Application of State Constitutional Uniformity Clauses to School Voucher Programs* (2006), Student Scholarship Papers, Paper 29, http://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/student_papers/29.

Both terms "paramount duty" and "all children" disappeared from subsequent versions of the Constitution and was replaced with pro-segregation language. *See* Dycus, Student Scholarship Papers, Paper 29 (2006) (explaining that the only guiding principles for Florida's public education system after the 1885 amendment was a vague requirement for uniformity and a mandate for segregation). Thus, the re-inclusion of both the "all children" and "paramount

duty" language into the Florida's Constitution must be considered in the historical context of Florida Constitutional law.

B. The State's Paramount Duty to All Children Requires Heightened Scrutiny

The paramount duty the State has to make sure every child has access to a high quality education must be read in *pari materia* with other parts of the Florida Constitution *See State v. Div. of Bond Fin. of Dep't of Gen. Servs.*, 278 So.2d 614, 618 (Fla. 1973) ("A constitutional amendment becomes a part of the Constitution and must be construed in *pari materia* with all of those portions of the Constitution which have a bearing on the same subject"). Thus, the paramount duty set forth in the Education Article must be read in conjunction with Florida's equal protection clause.

For example, the Supreme Court of Arkansas was presented with the question of whether the funding of its public schools violated the state's equal protection clause, and therefore, had to determine whether its equal protection clause applied to the state's duty to provide a public school system. *DuPree v. Alma Sch. Dist. No. 30 of Crawford Cty.*, 651 S.W.2d 90, 91 (Ark. 1983). The Arkansas Supreme Court held that its equal protection clause did apply such that the state funding system that provided a disparate amount of funds among its school districts, based largely on the local tax base, failed to provide equal educational opportunities to all students. *Id.* at 92. The court cited many similar

cases from other jurisdictions, including *Horton v. Meskill* in which the Connecticut Supreme Court, relying on the persuasive authority of holdings in similar Supreme Court cases, held that their respective state equal protection clauses require equal education opportunities for all. 376 A.2d 359, 375 (Conn. 1977).

This Court should find that Florida's equal protection clause applies to the State's obligation to fulfill its paramount duty to all children attending public school. In doing so, this Court must reject the application of the rational basis test, as applied by the First District Court of Appeal. This Court should instead apply the strict scrutiny test, as applied by this Court in *State of Florida v. J.P.*, explaining that "once a constitutional right has been recognized, its exercise by minors should be protected by strict scrutiny." 907 So.2d 1101, 1108 (Fla. 2004). It is clear by the legislative history that the CRC and people of Florida intended to create a constitutional right to a high quality education for all children. Therefore, this Court should use strict scrutiny to determine whether the state is abiding by its constitutional mandate.

C. The 1998 Amendment Provided Standards That Can Be Judicially Enforced

Not only did the people of Florida vote to strengthen the constitutional mandate to provide a high quality education through the 1998 amendment, but they also sought to provide judicially manageable standards of review of the State's

obligation to provide a system of high quality public education. *See Bush*, 919 So.2d at 403 (Fla. 2006) (explaining that "in 1998… the Constitutional Revision Commission proposed and the citizens of this state approved an amendment to article IX, section 1 . . . *to provide standards by which to measure the adequacy of the public school education provided by the state*.") (emphasis supplied). As further noted by this Court, "the addition of 'efficient, safe, secure, and high quality' represents an attempt by the 1997-1998 CRC to provide constitutional standards to measure the 'adequacy' provision found in the second sentence of section 1." *Id.* at 404.

In holding that Article IX lacks judicially manageable standards, the First District not only ignored the plain language of the Constitution and the intent of Florida Citizens that the judiciary enforce the standards set forth therein, but also ignored the clear evidence before it which demonstrates a measuring stick for the State's compliance with its obligations: the existing disparities in the academic performance among the students of Florida. Whether the State has provided a high-quality education can be measured by looking at the results of state assessments, which are designed to measure the content standards created by the Legislature and the State Board of Education. Rec. 3437 ¶ 108, 3419-20 ¶¶ 53-56. Disparities in performance on these assessments will guide the adjudication of

claims challenging whether the legislature carried out its constitutionally mandated obligations. Rec. 3438 ¶ 108.

As set forth below, other states have looked at the disparities among schools and students to guide them in determining whether their legislatures are meeting their constitutional burdens. The State's inability to address existing disparities violates both the Florida and the United States Constitutions by failing to provide for equal protection in accessing education.

II. DISPARITIES AMONG FLORIDA'S STUDENTS AND SCHOOL DISTRICTS DEMONSTRATE THAT THE STATE IS FAILING TO MEET ITS CONSTITUTIONAL BURDEN

A. Disparities in Performance Demonstrate That the State Has Failed Its Paramount Duty to *All* Children

The record on appeal is replete with examples that demonstrate the State is failing to meet its constitutional burden to all children, as measured across subgroups of students. For example, wide disparities exist on achievement scores based on race and economic status. While 58% of the general student population could read at grade level, as evidenced by the 2014 assessments, only 38% of Black students, 54% of Hispanic students, and 27% of ELL students read at grade level. Rec. Ex. 2907, at 72050-72072. These failing rates demonstrate that minority students are at higher risk of failure to meet the standards set by the State for measuring a "high quality" education. Similarly, there is a clear disparity among children of varying socioeconomic statuses. Rec. 3404, ¶ 2. For example,

nearly half of Florida students (approximately 47%) of students are FRL students and only 37% of homeless students could read at grade level in 2014. Rec. Ex. 1833; Tr.v.3, 375:8-11; v.8, 1203:6-10; v.9, 1352:13-18; v.12, 1799:16-17; v.13, 1970:13-14; v.19, 2842:1-6; v.29, 4396:24-25; v.33, 4965:12-13; Exs. 4320, at 123529; 3588, at 96689.

Minority subgroups in some districts fared even worse. For example, in Lafayette and Madison Counties, ESE students had a 0% passing rate on state assessments, and English language learners had an 11% passage rate for tenth grade reading. Rec. Exs. 4162 (3rd grade) and 4168 (6th Grade); Ex. 4050.

It is clear from the legislative record that the CRC intended the State to be measured not by the aggregate or average child's performance, but that the State be evaluated on whether it is providing a high quality education to *all* children. Yet it is equally clear that both the trial court and the appellate court ignored this mandate, even as the Plaintiffs demonstrated gross discrepancies between subsets of children in this State. For example, despite the tremendous evidence on the plight of the education of homeless students, the Trial Court dedicated a paltry two out of the 169 pages of the findings of fact to homeless students. R. 3776-3777. If the Florida Constitution is to have any meaning at all, the very disparate performance of a large subset of students in the Florida public school system must be determinative of whether the State is meeting its burden to all children.

B. Compliance with the Constitution Can Be Achieved by Addressing the Disparities

Addressing existing disparities in the Florida education system can help the State meet its constitutional duty to provide a uniform, efficient, safe, secure, and high quality system of free public education. Empirical evidence shows that addressing disparities in school performance can help states provide high quality education that is uniform across the population of students.

For example, according to studies conducted by the Educational Testing Service, which provides standardized tests such as the GRE and the TOEFL, equalization of spending levels leads to a narrowing of test score outcomes across family background groups. Tom Ewin, *Study: To Close the Achievement Gap, Close the Resource Gap*, Educational Testing Service (2016), http://news.ets.org/press-releases/study-to-close-the-achievement-gap-close-the-resource-gap/. The authors of the study concluded that "[a]s a rule of thumb, for a state finance system to provide equal educational opportunity, that system must ensure sufficiently higher resources in higher need settings than in lower need settings." *Id.*

A similar research project, which involved the compilation of over twenty years of National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data on revenue and expenditures for schools, explored the relationship between school finance

reforms and improved student outcomes. Bruce D. Baker, et al., *Minding the Gap: Twenty Years of Progress and Retrenchment in School Funding and Achievement Gaps*, Policy Information Report and ETS Research Report Series No. RR-16-15 at __ (2016), https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1124843.pdf. The authors found that increased staffing in schools with higher numbers of low-income students is directly related to closing the achievement gap between low-income and non-low-income students. *Id.* at 27. The authors ultimately concluded that a uniform education requires focus not necessarily on equal funding, but on funding that provides all students equal access to education. As the above-referenced study demonstrates, by focusing on disparities in performance, and what is needed to overcome those disparities, the State can act to ensure a uniform education is provided to all students, as required by the Florida Constitution.

At trial, evidence was presented to the court establishing that students in lower socioeconomic groups can perform as well as their more advantaged peers if they receive additional support. Rec. 3414, ¶ 35. In fact homeless students, the students demonstrating the lowest scores and the students most unlikely to achieve the standards mandated by the State, can achieve performance scores closer to the scores of the general population of their peers if they are given the proper tools and additional support. Tr. v. 2, 218: 1-25; 219:1-13, 21920-25, 220:1-18. Given that there are empirically based remedies available to help close the achievement gap

that exists among the differing socioeconomic statuses, races, and ethnicities, it is incumbent upon the State to utilize those tools in order to satisfy the requirements of the uniformity requirement of the Florida Constitution.

III. OTHER STATES HAVE CONSIDERED DISPARITIES WHEN APPLYING LEGISLATIVE STANDARDS TO DETERMINE WHETHER THOSE STATES COMPLIED WITH THE CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

State supreme courts all over the U.S. have held states to the standards set forth in their constitutions and have intervened when the state education systems have failed to adhere to the mandates therein, finding such claims to be undoubtedly justiciable. *See e.g. Abbeville County School Dist. v. State*, 767 S.E.2d 157, 163 (S.C. 2014); *Gannon v. State*, 319 P.3d 1196, 1202 (Kan. 2014); *Martinez v. State*, 2014 WL 12729852, at *2 (N.M. Dist. Nov. 14, 2014); *Rose v. Council for a Better Educ., Inc.*, 790 S.W.2d 186, 189 (Ky. 1989) (denying that the interpretation of the constitution constitutes an intrusion of the separation of powers).

A. State Courts Have Held Their Educational Systems Accountable for Disparities in Performance Among Sub-Groups of Children

The constitutions of Alaska, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin all explicitly mandate that "**all children**" have access to education. Many of these states' judiciaries have gone

through the laborious process of interpreting their constitutions word-by-word in an effort to extract the true intent of the legislature. Most of these states have construed a literal interpretation of “all children” in the education articles of their respective constitutions and have determined that "all children" encompasses each and every public school student. *See e.g. McCleary v. State*, 269 P.3d 227, 249 (Wash. 2012) (determining "all children" includes "'each and every child since each will be a member of, and participant in, this State's democracy, society, and economy.' No child is excluded.") Therefore, these courts have held state education systems responsible for failing to ensure equal educational opportunities to "all children" in the state, especially minorities.

To illustrate, the Supreme Court of North Carolina in *Hoke County Bd. of Educ. v. State* held the state’s board of education had denied students their constitutional right to education as evidenced by widespread poor standardized test scores, high drop-out and low graduation rates, high demand for remediation, and deficient post-secondary education success. 599 S.E.2d 365, 372 (N.C. 2004). In this case, numerous boards of education serving low-income school districts brought suit against the State of North Carolina and the State Board of Education, asserting the state had failed to ensure equal educational opportunities to students in a particular low-wealth community. *Id.* The court found that the evidence supported a conclusion that students had been denied access to a constitutionally

adequate education as they "trailed their statewide counterparts for proficiency by a considerable margin" (approximately 14.7% below-average passing rate in the state). *Id*. at 383. The Supreme Court of North Carolina held that the state must "assume the responsibility for, and correct, those educational methods and practices that contribute to the failure to provide students with a constitutionally-conforming education." *Id*. at 373.

Similarly, the New Hampshire Supreme Court held in *Claremont School Dist. v. Governor* that the state's constitution "imposes a duty on the State to provide a constitutionally adequate education to ***every*** educable child in the public schools in New Hampshire and to guarantee adequate funding." 635 A.2d 1375, 1376 (N.H. 1993). The plaintiffs, including five low-income school districts, filed for declaratory judgment against the Governor for failing "to spread educational opportunities equitably among its students and adequately fund education." *Id*. at 1377. The court ultimately found that the language of its constitution "commands, in no uncertain terms, that the State provide an education to all its citizens and that it support all public schools." *Id.* at 1378.

The Kentucky Supreme Court explained the state's obligation to provide an "efficient" education system in *Rose v. Council for a Better Educ., Inc.*. 790 S.W.2d 186, 189 (Ky. 1989). Plaintiff corporation – made up of 66 different school districts and public school students – brought a declaratory judgment action against

the Kentucky General Assembly for noncompliance with the state's "constitutional mandate to 'provide an efficient system of common schools throughout the state.'" *Id*. (quoting KY. Const. § 183). The state's definition of "efficient," as interpreted by the court, means, among other things, that "[e]ducation must be provided to the children of the rich and poor alike," "[e]ducation of children is essential to the prosperity of our state," "[e]ducation of children should be supervised by the [s]tate," "[the state] must not finance our schools in a *de minimis* fashion," and "[a]ll schools and children stand upon one level in their entitlement to equal state support." *Id.* at 206.

Upon reviewing the evidence presented, the Kentucky Supreme Court found that "achievement test scores in the poorer districts [were] lower than those in the richer districts, and expert opinion clearly established that there is a correlation between those scores and the wealth of the district." *Rose*, 790 S.W.2d at 197. The court further determined that "Kentucky's children, simply because of their place of residence are offered a hodgepodge of educational opportunities. The quality of education in the poorer local school districts is substantially less." *Id.* at 198. Ultimately, the court clarified the duty of the General Assembly in facilitating a state education system equally accessible by all students:

> The system of common schools must be adequately funded to achieve its goals. The system of common schools must be substantially uniform throughout the state. Each child, *every child,* in this Commonwealth must be provided with an equal opportunity to have

> an adequate education. Equality is the key word here. The children of the poor and the children of the rich, the children who live in the poor districts and the children who live in the rich districts must be given the same opportunity and access to an adequate education. This obligation cannot be shifted to local counties and local school districts.

Id. at 211 (emphasis in original).

Similarly, in *Abbeville County School Dist. v. State*, the South Carolina Supreme Court ordered the state to present a comprehensive education plan in order to satisfy the constitutional mandate of providing "all children" equal access to education. 780 S.E.2d 609, 610 (S.C. 2014). The Court's intervention followed a finding that respondents, including the state governor and legislative branch, "violated their constitutional duty to ensure that the students of South Carolina receive a minimally adequate education." *Id*.

B. Courts Have Held the Funding Schemes of States With Similar Constitutional Language as Florida to Be Insufficient and Unconstitutional for Failing to Account for the Unique Needs of "All Children"

State courts have found the funding of their public school systems unconstitutional due to the disparate educational resources provided to school districts of varying socioeconomic statuses, oftentimes finding the distribution of education funds discriminatory. *See e.g. Tennessee Small School Systems v. McWherter*, 851 S.W.2d 139, 155 (Tenn. 1993); *see also Gannon v. State*, 319 P.3d 1196, 1204 & 1227-28 (Kan. 2014) (holding that the constitutionality of the

state's school funding formula itself and whether the state failed to fully or adequately fund the formula are both judiciable matters). States have begun realizing the significance in providing accessible education to disadvantaged children and the positive outcomes on the community at large. *See Campaign for Fiscal Equity, Inc. v. State*, 801 N.E.2d 326, 341 (N.Y. 2003) (establishing the causal link between funding a sound basic education and the resulting benefits to not only the students but also the community according to correlative data showing lower crime rate in more educated communities).

For instance, in 2014, the Supreme Court of Kansas held in *Gannon v. State* that the state "created unconstitutional, wealth-based disparities by withholding all capital outlay state aid payments to which certain school districts were otherwise entitled." 319 P.3d 1196, 1204 (Kan. 2014). Adopting Kentucky's "adequate" education standards as set forth in *Rose*, the Court held that "its adequacy component is met when the public education financing system provided by the legislature for grades K-12–through structure and implementation–is reasonably calculated to have all Kansas public education students meet or exceed the standards set out in *Rose* and presently codified." *Id*. at 1236-1237.

Though some defendant parties argue that rather than the State accounting for the unique learning barriers confronted by underprivileged students in education, such barriers should be mitigated by social services, not the education

system, the Supreme Court of New Jersey found in *Abbott v. Burke* rejected that conclusion. Rather it found that through effective education, children of poorer urban districts will have equal opportunity to perform at the level of their more privileged peers and be productive members of society. 575 A.2d 359, 369-371 (N.J. 1990). The key conclusion made by the Court was that the "poorer the district and the greater its need, the less the money available, and the worse the education. That system is neither thorough nor efficient." *Id*. at 363. Holding the education system unconstitutional, the Court ordered its education act "be amended to assure funding of education in poorer urban districts at the level of property-rich districts. . . and that the level of funding must also be adequate to provide for the special educational needs of these poorer urban districts in order to redress their extreme disadvantages." *Id*.

CONCLUSION

As intended by the 1998 revision to the Florida Constitution, this Court should hold the State accountable for complying with the demands of the Education Article. That the State is failing to provide a high quality education to all children is evident in the disparities that exist in school performance across racial and socioeconomic status and across school districts. As other state supreme courts have found, the blatant disregard for performance of some of the Florida's students falls well short of compliance with a constitutionally recognized duty.

Without intervention by this Court, the most vulnerable of the children in Florida will have no means by which to enforce their right for a "high quality education."

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

We hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was furnished via electronic means and/or U.S. Mail to the persons on the attached service list, this 14th day of June, 2018.

Respectfully submitted,

By: *Renee Meenach Decker*
Renee Meenach Decker
Florida Bar No.: 60384
redecker@bakerdonelson.com

SERVICE LIST

Counsel for Respondents

Ari Bargil
999 Brickell Avenue, Suite 720
Miami, FL 33131
abargil@ij.org

Richard Kromer
901 N. Glebe Road, Suite 900
Arlington, VA 22203
rkomer@ij.org

Timothy D. Keller
398 S. Mill Avenue, Suite 301
Tempe, AZ 85281
tkeller@ij.org

Rocco Testani
Stacey McGavin Mohr
Lee A. Peifer
Sutherland, Asbill & Brennan, LLP.
999 Peachtree St. NE, Ste. 2300
Atlanta, GA 30309-4416
Rocco.Testani@sutherland.com
Stacey.Mohr@sutherland.com
Lee.Peifer@sutherland.com
Cynthia.Garrett@sutherland.com

Counsel for Florida State Board of Education

Judy Bone, General Counsel
Mari Presley, Assistant General Counsel
Matthew Mears
Florida Department of Education
1244 Turlington Building
325 W. Gaines Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399
judy.bone@fldoe.org
mari.presley@fldoe.org
matthew.mears@fldoe.org
cara.martin@fldoe.org

Counsel for Speaker of the Florida House of Representatives Richard Cocoran

Adam S. Tanenbaum, General Counsel
Office of the General Counsel
Florida House of Representative
422 The Capital
Tallahassee, FL 32399
adam.tanenbaum@floridahouse.gov

Jonathan Glogau, Special Counsel
Office of the Attorney General
PL-01, The Capitol
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0400
Jon.glogau@myfloridalegal.com
Joann.mrazek@myfloridalegal.com

Senate President Joe Negron

Christie Letarte, Deputy General Counsel
The Florida Senate
302 The Capitol
404 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1100
letarte.christie@flsenate.gov

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I certify compliance with Fla. R. App. P. 9.210(a)(2) and that the font of this brief is Times New Roman 14-point font.

Dena H. Sokolow
Florida Bar No.: 30856
dsokolow@bakerdonelson.com
Renee Meenach Decker
Florida Bar No.: 60384
redecker@bakerdonelson.com

Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC
100 S.E. Third Ave
Suite 1620
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33394
Telephone: 954.768.1600
Facsimile: 954.333.3930
Counsel for the Amicus Curiae