ELECTRONICALLY FILED

2016 Oct 03 PM 2:27 CLERK OF THE APPELLATE COURT CASE NUMBER: 113267

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

CASE NO. 113,267

LUKE GANNON, By his next friends and guardians, et al.,

Plaintiffs/Appellees, County Appealed From: Shawnee

v. District Court Case No.: 10-C-1569

STATE OF KANSAS, et al.

Defendants/Appellants.

REPLY IN SUPPORT OF RULE 6.09(b) LETTER

The data within Exhibit A to Plaintiffs' Rule 6.09(b) letter is already before this Court. The data, however, was presented at oral argument in a different format than it was presented in briefing. Therefore, Plaintiff provided this Court with Exhibit A to allow it to view the assessment data in the format used at oral argument.

Plaintiffs have never presented the data in Exhibit A for purposes of comparison, as made clear in briefing and argument. *E.g.* Plaintiff's Supplemental Brief, pp.15-20. The data was instead presented to demonstrate that in both 2011 and 2015, a significant number of Kansas students were not receiving an education that met the State's *own* standards, as measured by *the State's* assessments. The State's new assessments are specifically designed to measure whether students are "college ready." *See id.*, Appx. C. Results on these assessments demonstrate the current level of funding is not reasonably calculated to meet the *Rose* factors, specifically those codified at K.S.A. 2015 Supp. 72-1127(c)(1),(6),(7). *Id.* at pp.15-20.

Regardless, the points made by Plaintiffs' counsel at oral argument remain true:

Now the standard is different today, and frankly I would say that standard aligns nicely with what some people call common core - what I would call the *Rose* factors, and that is college-ready, vocational-ready . . . In terms of whether there has been a breach of that duty the constitution imposes, according to your test when you look at the standard, even when it was at trial, or today, we're falling short and we're leaving massive numbers of kids behind . . . So my point is that the State argues that Kansas students are doing well and neither the data from trial nor the data available now supports that conclusion.

This data is demonstrative of the fact that *Rose* standards are not being met. Whether this Court looks at the data presented at trial or the assessment data under the most recent standards adopted by the State, a significant number of students are not receiving an education that demonstrates compliance with the adequacy test.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Alan L. Rupe

Alan L. Rupe, #08914
Jessica L. Skladzien, #24178
LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP
1605 North Waterfront Parkway, Suite 150
Wichita, KS 67206-6634
(316) 609-7900 (Telephone)
(316) 462-5746 (Facsimile)

John S. Robb, #09844 SOMERS, ROBB & ROBB 110 East Broadway Newton, KS 67114 (316) 283-4650 (Telephone) (316) 283-5049 (Facsimile)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 3rd day October, 2016, I electronically served the foregoing

to:

Derek Schmidt
Jeffrey A. Chanay
Stephen R. McAllister
M.J. Willoughby
Memorial Building, 2nd Floor
120 SW 10th Ave.
Topeka, KS 66612-1597
Derek.Schmidt@ag.ks.gov
Jeff.Chanay@ag.ks.gov
stevermac@fastmail.fm
MJ.Willoughby@ag.ks.gov

Arthur S. Chalmers
Hite, Fanning & Honeyman, L.L.P.
100 North Broadway, Suite 950
Wichita, KS 67202-2209
chalmers@hitefanning.com

Attorneys for Defendant State of Kansas

Steve Phillips Assistant Attorney General Office of the Attorney General Memorial Building, 2nd Floor 120 S.W. 10th Ave. Topeka, KS 66612-1597 Steve.Phillips@ag.ks.gov

Attorney for State Treasurer Ron Estes

Philip R. Michael
Daniel J. Carroll
Kansas Dept. of Administration
1000 SW Jackson, Suite 500
Topeka, KS 66612
philip.michael@da.ks.gov
dan.carroll@da.ks.gov

Attorneys for Secretary of Administration Jim Clark

/s/ Alan L. Rupe

Alan L. Rupe, #08914