

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA  
COUNTY OF WAKE

IN THE GENERAL COURT OF JUSTICE  
SUPERIOR COURT DIVISION  
95 CVS 1158

HOKE COUNTY BOARD )  
OF EDUCATION, et al., )  
Plaintiffs-Appellees, )  
)  
and )  
)  
ASHEVILLE CITY BOARD )  
OF EDUCATION, et al., )  
Plaintiffs-Intervenors, )  
)  
v. )  
)  
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA; )  
STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, )  
Defendants. )

**SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM OF LAW AS *AMICI CURIAE*  
THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF NORTH CAROLINA  
LEGAL FOUNDATION, ADVOCATES FOR CHILDREN’S SERVICES OF  
LEGAL AID OF NORTH CAROLINA, CAROLINA LEGAL ASSISTANCE,  
NORTH CAROLINA JUSTICE CENTER, THE RURAL SCHOOL &  
COMMUNITY TRUST and UNC CENTER FOR CIVIL RIGHTS**

The American Civil Liberties Union of North Carolina Legal Foundation,  
Advocates for Children’s Services of Legal Aid of North Carolina, Carolina Legal  
Assistance, the North Carolina Justice Center, the Rural School & Community Trust and  
the UNC Center for Civil Rights (together “*amici curiae*”), submit this supplemental  
memorandum of law in anticipation of the Court’s September 14, 2005 hearing.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Hurricane Katrina is a powerful reminder that there are times and circumstances in our society when there simply are no substitutes for swift, effective governmental action.

Children left without the benefits of a sound basic education are in harm's way right now all across North Carolina. The harm being done to them is less sudden, complete and dramatic than that done to the survivors of Hurricane Katrina. However, condemning children to face the 21<sup>st</sup> century bereft of a sound basic education is throwing away our state's ideals and goals as surely as it is profoundly diminishing their life chances.

The children were the winners in the *Leandro* case. And yet, 11 years after the lawsuit was filed, eight years after their first North Carolina Supreme Court victory, three years after this Court's clear Findings and Rulings and one year after their second unanimous triumph at the N.C. Supreme Court, tens of thousands of children across North Carolina are only marginally closer to benefiting from their victories than they were at the outset.

Prior to 1997, the State took the position that the North Carolina Constitution did not offer any substantive educational promise to the state's children. In *Leandro v. State*, 346 N.C. 336 (1997), as this Court and every North Carolina citizen well knows, the North Carolina Supreme Court decisively disagreed. It both recognized a "guarantee [to] every child of this state an opportunity to receive a sound basic education," *id.* at 347, and also imposed upon "the General Assembly, under Article IX, Section 2(1) . . . the

duty of providing the children of every school district with access to a sound basic education.” *Id.* at 353.

On remand, this Court was asked to determine whether children in low-wealth districts were in fact being denied their *Leandro* rights, and whether the State was violating its duty to them. The N.C. Supreme Court described this Court’s charge as follows:

‘If . . . [the trial] court makes findings and conclusions from competent evidence to the effect that defendants in this case are denying children of the state a sound basic education, a denial of a fundamental right will have been established.’ 346 N.C. at 357, 488 S.E. 2d at 261. The Court then went on to conclude that if such a denial [of a fundamental right] is indeed established in the evidence, and defendants are unable to justify such denial as necessary to promote a compelling government interest, ‘it will then be the duty of the [trial] court to enter a judgment granting declaratory relief and such other relief as needed to correct the wrong while minimizing the encroachment upon the other branches of government.’ *Id.*

*Hoke County Bd. of Educ. v. State*, 358 N.C. 605, 609-10, 599 S.E.2d 365, 373 (2004) (quoting *Leandro v. State*, 346 N.C. 336, 488 S.E.2d 249 (1997)).

On remand, this Court undertook a searching inquiry and concluded that the State had indeed violated its *Leandro* duties. The North Carolina Supreme Court largely affirmed that judgment on appeal and emphasized the need for speedy final relief, noting:

The children of North Carolina are our state’s most valuable renewable resource. If inordinate numbers of them are wrongfully being denied their constitutional right to the opportunity for a sound basic education, our state courts cannot risk further and continued damage because the perfect civil action has proved elusive. We note that the instant case commenced ten years ago. If in the end it yields a clearly demonstrated constitutional violation, ten classes of students . . . will have already passed through our state’s school system without benefit of relief. *We cannot similarly imperil even one more class unnecessarily.*

*Hoke County Bd. of Educ.*, 358 N.C. at 616, 599 S.E.2d at 377 (emphasis added).

The Supreme Court then affirmed the clear showing that “an inordinate number of students in Hoke County are failing to obtain a sound basic education and that defendants have failed in their constitutional duty,” *id.* at 647, 599 S.E.2d at 396, and it “remand[ed] to the lower court and ultimately into the hands of the executive and legislative branches.” *Id.* at 649, 599 S.E.2d at 397.

Since that time, this Court has held at least seven hearings -- on July 22, 2004, October 7, 2004, October 25, 2004, December 7, 2004, January 11, 2005, February 15, 2005, and March 7, 2005 -- to learn what comprehensive remedy the State might propose to meet its *Leandro* duties. Moreover, earlier this year, the Court issued its “Report from the Court: The High School Problem,” directed explicitly to “the Governor, the Leadership of the General Assembly, the Chair of the State Board of Education, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction,” May 24, 2005 Order at 45, offering various alternative means by which to address their *Leandro* duties to high school students in the State.

The September 14, 2005 hearing has been designated by the Court as the occasion to assess, “once the dust has settled,” the adequacy of the State’s collective responses. The good news is that the State is finally off the dime; there is visible forward motion.

The *bad* news, very bad news indeed, is that there is still no comprehensive plan to assure that at-risk and other children in districts throughout the State will receive a sound basic education at any point in the foreseeable future. Nor are there sufficient State funds authorized to begin the comprehensive remedy that *Leandro*, *Hoke County*, and this Court have clearly directed. *Amici* are certainly aware of the creation of the new North Carolina lottery; however, its ostensible revenues are years away. Further, even if those

revenues remain channeled toward educational ends, and do not simply supplant other governmental funds already expended or needed, they are statutorily targeted to goals that do not meet the direct needs of middle or high school students; do not increase the supply of competent certified teachers emerging from North Carolina schools of education; and do not address many other essential educational needs necessary to achieve full *Leandro* compliance.

What we do know, moreover, is that even a modest bill to authorize comprehensive educational planning was defeated in the General Assembly at the close of the 2005 session. In short, no adequate plan is presently guiding the State in carrying out its *Leandro* compliance duties. The moment has arrived, we believe, for the judicial branch, which has patiently stayed its hand to permit executive and legislative action, to grasp the nettle and direct the necessary constitutional relief.

This memorandum offers the judgment of *amici curiae* on the basic, minimum steps that, at this juncture, this Court should take, on behalf of North Carolina's children, to accomplish the promise of *Leandro*. Compliance with the North Carolina Constitution demands no less at this time.

## **II. LEGISLATIVE RESPONSE DURING THE 2005 SESSION**

This year, the Court gave the General Assembly the chance to craft a *Leandro* remedy to offer all children throughout the State the opportunity for a sound, basic education. In their August 2, 2005 submission to the court, *amici* largely predicted how the General Assembly would respond to *Leandro* in the final 2005-2006 budget. The final budget contains limited funding for low-wealth schools, funding for only 16 school districts under the DSSF, limited expansion of the LEEAP Teams, and no meaningful

program to obtain, place and retain quality teachers in all North Carolina classrooms. In addition, the budget fails to restore \$44 million in previous education cuts. These legislative half measures do not meet *Leandro*'s mandate and can be summed up in four words -- "too little, too late."

The State may contend that the eleventh-hour passage of a state lottery with a promise that proceeds will be channeled towards education should be accepted by this court as an adequate response to *Leandro*. The lottery, however, does not offer a remedy for the unconstitutional harm being inflicted now on school children in North Carolina. No lottery revenue will fund education in 2005-06, during which time the State proposes to underfund the Disadvantaged Student Supplemental Fund (DSSF) and Low Wealth School Fund in drastic fashion. Assuming the lottery begins to generate revenues following the year-long start-up period, 35% of its profits will fund education, in comparison to 50% for prizes, 7% in commissions to lottery ticket vendors, and 8% for management of the lottery. N.C. Gen. Stat. §18C-162(a).

The 35% of lottery proceeds earmarked as education funding are to be distributed as follows: 1) 5% will go into reserve for the years when lottery revenues are down; 2) after the 5% reduction, the remaining revenues will be split among school construction (40%), More at Four and class size reduction *for lower grades only* (50%), and college scholarships (10%). N.C. Gen. Stat. §18C-164(c). Under this formula, twice as much revenue is apportioned to commissions for vendors as to college scholarships. N.C. Gen. Stat. §18C-164(b) (setting forth that 10% of Education's 35%, or 3.5% of the total lottery revenue, goes for scholarships, while vendors get a straight cut of 7% of total lottery revenue).

The lottery hardly represents a windfall for education. For one, much of the money from the lottery is earmarked for school facilities -- an area of education that this Court has previously found to comply with the requirement of a sound basic education. Moreover, even if inadequate school facilities should surface as a “new” *Leandro* violation, the lottery proceeds earmarked for school facilities will not come close to meeting statewide needs, last estimated by DPI to be \$6.2 billion.<sup>1</sup>

Limited proceeds aside, provisions in the recently-ratified budget defy the legislature’s promise that it will never hide behind the lottery and otherwise reduce education spending. Changes that go into effect automatically with the signing of the lottery bill allow legislators to allocate designated lottery money to education and then eliminate an equal amount of general revenue funding from those same education programs.

Supplantation of education funds was a problem in North Carolina before the lottery ever passed in the legislature. After the Supreme Court’s ruling last July that the North Carolina Constitution requires that an estimated \$102.5 million in revenues generated from civil fines and forfeitures be given to schools, lawmakers promptly cut general fund spending for school construction rather than allow the court ruling to result in a net gain for education. In addition, in its proposed budget, the Senate would have used lottery proceeds to justify a \$50 million cut in state corporate income taxes earmarked for the School Building Capital Fund.<sup>2</sup> Finally, nothing in the lottery legislation binds future lawmakers. The experience in other states, where lawmakers

---

<sup>1</sup> Elaine Mejia, BTC Budget Brief, Aug. 22, 2005, available at [http://ncjustice.org/media/library/448\\_budbriefschcons08222005.pdf](http://ncjustice.org/media/library/448_budbriefschcons08222005.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> Sorien Schmidt, Legislative Update, Aug. 30, 2005, available at [www.ncjustice.org](http://www.ncjustice.org).

have notoriously promised a lottery would not result in budget cuts for education, saw subsequent legislatures make the very cuts their predecessors promised would not happen.<sup>3</sup>

The lottery is not the answer to *Leandro*. The opportunity for a sound basic education legally entitles every student to: (1) a competent, well-qualified teacher in every classroom; (2) a competent, well-qualified administrator in every school; and (3) the resources necessary to learn. The lottery may provide for new classrooms, new preschool programs, college scholarships, and reduced class size for elementary school students. It does not improve, however, the dire teacher shortage or improve the training and competence of school administrators. Further, it does not address the “high school problem” currently facing the state. The current academic crisis in our high schools will not dissipate because elementary school students have smaller class sizes.

Neither this Court nor the state Supreme Court has made children’s *Leandro* rights contingent upon any particular source of state revenue. The State has a constitutional obligation to expend whatever resources are demonstrably necessary to secure every child’s right to the opportunity to receive a sound basic education. How the State generates those funds is not the realm of the judicial branch. *Amici* trust that this Court will not be distracted by the fanfare surrounding the passage of the lottery bill; but, instead, will remain relentlessly focused on holding the State accountable in the here and now for meeting its *Leandro* obligations.

---

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., Charlotte Advocates for Education, “North Carolina Lottery for Education: What Are the Odds Our Schools Would Win?” (May 2003), available at <http://www.advocatesfored.org/publications/Lottery%20Paper%202003.pdf>.

The problems identified through the *Leandro* case are too complex to be remedied by money alone. Sufficient state funding must be accompanied by solid planning and firm accountability measures. A comprehensive *Leandro* remedy is vital to reverse the tide of mediocrity and make North Carolina schools into true learning environments. For the foregoing reasons, *amici* argue that the legislature's failure to provide a sufficient *Leandro* remedy through the budget process is not abated by its passage of the lottery.

### **III. THE POWER OF THE JUDICIARY AND ITS DUTY TO ACT**

This Court repeatedly has expressed its hope and expectation that the executive and legislative branches would act to remedy the constitutional deficiencies identified in this Court's 1992 rulings in the *Leandro* case. Instead, the executive branch chose to appeal this Court's rulings back to the North Carolina Supreme Court and the legislative branch has appropriated hundreds of thousands of dollars each year to continue this resistance. Even after two North Carolina Supreme Court decisions upholding the right to a sound basic education, the State has consistently been recalcitrant about planning and implementing adequate remedies.

This Court has shown great restraint in the face of the delaying tactics, minimal actions and passive behavior of the executive and legislative branches. Far from seeking a confrontation with these branches, this Court studiously has avoided issuing orders that might provoke the "constitutional train wreck" it has warned against for the past year. And yet, the massive, documented failure of the executive and legislative branches to provide each child with his/her fundamental constitutional right to a sound basic education is not an acceptable outcome. North Carolina's failure grievously harms children and this Court now must protect the rights and best interests of our children.

In remanding this case, the North Carolina Supreme Court wrote that, if a denial of the right is established “...it will then be the *duty* of the [trial] court to enter judgment granting declaratory relief and such other relief as needed to *correct the wrong* while minimizing the encroachment upon the other branches of government.” *Leandro v. State*, 346 N.C. 336, 373 (1997) (emphasis added). This duty was underscored in *Hoke County v. State*, 358 N.C. 605, 642 (2004) (internal cites omitted and emphasis added): “Certainly, when the State fails to live up to its constitutional duties, a court is *empowered to order* the deficiency remedied, and if the offending branch of government or its agents either fail to do so or have consistently shown an inability to do so, a court is empowered to provide relief by *imposing* a specific remedy and *instructing* the recalcitrant state actors to implement it.”

Other courts have faced similar challenges. Almost a month ago, believing it “must act, and act immediately,” the court in *Vaughn G. v. Mayor and City Council of Baltimore*, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16922 (D. Md. Aug. 12, 2005), placed the special education services of Baltimore schools in receivership. The court’s decision was issued “on an emergency basis due to the imminence of the 2005/06 school year on August 29, 2005 and the devastating likelihood that the massive failure to deliver services and violation of students’ legally protected rights will once again re-occur without prompt remedial intervention.”

In Kansas, school-age children recently faced a similar failure of their legislature to provide the plans and resources constitutionally mandated. The Kansas Supreme Court minced no words: “Although the balance of power may be delicate [between branches], ever since *Marbury v. Madison* . . . it has been settled that the judiciary’s

sworn duty includes review of legislation for constitutional infirmity. We are not at liberty to abdicate our own constitutional duty. . . Specifically, no later than July 1, 2005, for the 2005-2006 school year, the legislature shall implement a minimum increase of \$285 million above the funding level for the 2004-2005 school year, which includes the \$142 million presently contemplated in H.B. 2247.” *Montoy v. State*, 112 P.3d 923, 930 (Kan. 2005).

Finally, the Arkansas Supreme Court, faced with a recalcitrant legislative response, wrote: “This Court’s refusal to review school funding under the state constitution would be a complete abrogation of our judicial responsibility and would work a severe disservice to the people of this state. We refuse to close our eyes or turn a deaf ear to claims of a dereliction of duty in the field of education.” *Lake View School Dist. No. 25 v. Huckabee*, 91 S.W.3d 472, 484 (Ark. 2002).

Given the specific record in this case and the latest mandate from the North Carolina Supreme Court, see *Hoke County*, 358 N.C. at 397 (“Assuring that our children are afforded the chance to become contributing, constructive members of society is paramount.”), there would be nothing precipitous or premature about this Court ordering specific remedies at this time.

The reasonable, measured remedies described below are precisely the steps contemplated by our Supreme Court. It is time to move beyond efforts to cajole and coax the State into acting adequately and effectively in response to its constitutional duty toward every child. Political choices by the executive and legislative branches can be difficult or unpopular. The entire point, however, is that there is no “choice” when the fundamental constitutional right to the opportunity to receive a sound basic education is

on the line. Under our system of “rule of law” and the record of this case, the judiciary has the duty to enforce the people’s charter and order relief without further delay.

**IV. THE COURT SHOULD ORDER A REMEDY THAT ENSURES TIMELY AND EFFECTIVE RELIEF TO THE STATE’S CHILDREN.**

At this juncture, *amici* urge the Court to require the State to undertake a remedy that fulfills its *Leandro* duties by providing timely and effective relief to the children of North Carolina. *Amici* see at the heart of such a remedy the following measures: (1) requiring the State to produce a viable accountability plan and process; (2) ordering the State to fund the DSSF with no less than \$100 million no later than January 2006; (3) ordering the State to provide full 2005-06 low wealth funding; (4) ordering the State to restore \$44 million in funds to public schools no later than January 1, 2006; and (5) directing the State to submit a compliance report and findings about the need for additional financial resources no later than November 15, 2005.

**A. Leandro Remedies must be Firmly Grounded in Research-Validated Practices.**

As this Court has repeatedly asserted and has been confirmed by a large body of education research, there is no single plan that will ensure that all children receive a sound basic education. While there are multiple strategies and approaches that are effective in propelling all students towards academic success, as this Court has noted, however, there are core elements essential to providing all children with access to a sound basic education.

The *Leandro* mandate requires that every child be afforded the opportunity to attend a public school, which, at a minimum, has the following educational resources:

- Every classroom must be staffed with a competent, certified, well-trained teacher who is teaching the Standard Course of Study by implementing effective educational methods that provide differentiated, individualized instruction, assessment and remediation to the students in that classroom.
- Every classroom must be led by a well-trained competent principal with the leadership skills and the ability to hire and retain competent, certified and well-trained teachers who can implement an effective and cost-effective instructional program that meets the needs of at-risk children so that they can have the equal opportunity to obtain a sound basic education by achieving grade level or above academic performance.
- Every school must be provided, in the most cost effective manner, the resources necessary to support effective instruction within that school so that the educational needs of all children, including at-risk children, to have the equal opportunity to obtain a sound basic education, can be met.

See Order, Section Four-Hoke County and Beyond-Judgment, at 109-10 (April 2002).

**1. State Lacks Plan for Statewide Implementation of Essential Core Elements**

A meaningful *Leandro* remedy must include a comprehensive plan for implementing the afore-mentioned elements on a statewide basis. At this time, there is no evidence that the State has created such a plan. Rather, the State continues to focus on a piecemeal process that cobbles together a variety of ideas, practices and policies that may (or may not) accomplish the goal of improving student learning.

**2. State Fails to Focus on the Substantive Heart of the Case**

*Amici* are concerned that the State has lost sight of the heart of this lawsuit -- namely, providing all children with an equal opportunity to obtain a sound basic education. While this Court has identified the core elements necessary to begin accomplishing the task, the State has failed to specify how it will ensure that every school is ready, willing and able to provide these core elements.

Certainly, the State has plans to implement remedial programs for low-performing students, but how will these efforts differ from existing remediation strategies?

Remediation is nothing new and based on the number of students that continue to perform below grade level, current strategies have been less than effective.

In the years of testimony and the reams of paper reviewed by this Court, there has been a constant affirmation that at the core of successful student learning are quality teachers and administrators. Exactly how does the State plan to improve the quality of its teachers and administrators? Simply declaring that North Carolina will have highly qualified and competent teachers in every classroom will not make it so.

In addition, the State has not presented any assessment of why a significant number of students are not learning in our public schools. Accurately identifying the problem is the logical first step toward efficacious solutions. Does the problem lie with the ways we teach, what we teach, who is doing the teaching or a combination of these factors? Are our methods for assessing student learning appropriate or do they need reassessment themselves?

### **3. State's Focus must be on Adequate Resources Coupled with a Strong Accountability System**

*Amici* urge this court to exercise its authority to ensure that the State stays focused on both adequacy of resources and accountability. The measure for determining the adequacy of allocated resources must be outcomes. The measure of a *Leandro* implementation plan must be its effectiveness in raising student achievement levels.

*Amici* respectfully ask that the Court require the State to go beyond its accountability rhetoric and produce a viable accountability plan and process for the Court's consideration. Specifically, *amici* encourage this Court to hold the State itself

accountable on a regular basis for ensuring that, within a court-determined time-frame, there will be:

- Substantial opportunities for public input on education needs and quality;
- A process for evaluating the efficacy of current education practices with a focus on the ways we teach and strategies for improving the delivery of instruction;
- A plan for improving the quality of teaching; and
- A plan for improving the effectiveness of school administrators.

**B. The Court Should Order a Remedy that Ensures Timely and Effective Relief to the State’s Children.**

Lottery or not, the legislature has reneged on its duty to reverse the constitutionally deficient education now received by thousands of North Carolina public school students. Its final budget reflects no appreciation for the magnitude of the education crisis our State faces and the unjustifiable harm to so many of our schoolchildren. *Amici* urge the Court to place the interests of the State’s at-risk children front and center as it considers how best to redress the ongoing violation of their right to a sound, basic education. At a minimum, the financial portion of a *Leandro* remedy should order full funding of the DSSF and the Low Wealth School Fund; restoration of the \$44 million cut from the school districts’ general operating funds in 2003; and, the new funds necessary to comply with N.C.G.S. §115C-105.41 fully and effectively, which requires school districts to create and follow a Personal Education Plan for each of its at-risk students.

**1. The Disadvantaged Student Supplemental Fund**

The legislature has limited DSSF funding to \$22.5 million and earmarked it only for the 16 counties receiving DSSF funds last year. This amount is plainly inadequate. In

the fall of 2004, the Defendant State Board of Education acknowledged that the DSSF would need a minimum of \$223 million in statewide funding to address the educational needs of at-risk learners in all 115 school districts.

Plaintiffs have proposed statewide DSSF funding of \$1,000 per at-risk student, for a total of \$300 million phased in over three years. *Amici* support Plaintiffs' proposal and, as a first step towards full funding for the DSSF, respectfully request the Court to order the State to fund DSSF with no less than \$100 million no later than January 2006.

## **2. The Low Wealth School Fund**

The Low Wealth School Fund exists to bring each district as close as possible to the statewide average of per pupil funding. The \$20 million the Legislature appropriated for the Low Wealth School Fund is \$46 million short of the \$66 million needed for full low wealth funding. Plaintiffs have urged the Court to order complete 2005-06 low wealth funding, calling for an additional \$46 million in low wealth funding. *Amici* join Plaintiffs in urging Court enforcement of full low wealth funding.

## **3. Restoration of the \$40,000,000 Education Cut**

Two years ago, the legislature forced districts to cut a total of \$44 million from their state funding for education. Some of these funds were apparently used to help reduce class size and for preschool programs. Plaintiffs and *Amici* have advocated for the restoration of this \$44 million to the districts on the grounds that forced cuts of this nature undermine the general educational foundation necessary for a sound basic education. The legislature did not restore the cut in this year's budget. As a result, schools will likely lose 1,650 positions, including 413 teachers, 255 teacher assistants, and 114 instructional support positions, according to an analysis done by the Department of Public

Instruction's Division of School Business Services. At the individual school district level, the cuts will be significant. For example, the Wake County Schools will be forced to cut between \$3.5 and \$4 million and, for Johnston County Schools, the state budget represents a cut of \$1.2 million at the local level. See *News & Observer* (Aug. 12, 2005). In light of the legislature's failure to restore these cuts, *amici* urge the Court to order the State to restore \$44 million in state funds to public schools no later than January 1, 2006.

**4. Compliance with Statutory Requirements for Personal Education Plans for At-Risk Students**

In its August 22, 2005 Memorandum, *amici* brought to the attention of the Court N.C.G.S. §115C-105.41, which entitles every at-risk student to a Personal Education Plan (PEP). *Amici* urge the Court to order the State Board of Education and the Department of Public Instruction to take immediate steps to ensure that each school district is either in full compliance with the PEP statute or, where districts are not complying with the statute, determine in detail what additional financial resources are need to accomplish full compliance with the law. The Court should direct the State to provide the Court and parties with a compliance report and findings about the need for additional financial resources no later than November 15, 2005.

Respectfully submitted on this the 9th day of September 2005.

*The American Civil Liberties Union Of North  
Carolina Legal Foundation, Inc.*

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Shelagh Rebecca Kenney  
N.C. State Bar No. 28202  
P.O. Box 28004  
Raleigh, NC 27611  
(919) 834-3466  
Email address: aclukenney@nc.rr.com

*Advocates For Children's Services Of Legal  
Aid Of North Carolina*

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Lewis Pitts  
N.C. State Bar No. 20592  
201 W. Main Street, Ste. 400  
Durham, NC 27702  
(919) 226-0051 ext. 422  
Email address: LEWISP@legalaidnc.org

*Carolina Legal Assistance, Inc.*

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Susan Pollitt  
N.C. State Bar No. 12648  
P.O. Box 2446  
Raleigh, NC 27602  
(919) 856-2195  
Email address: spcla@mindspring.com

*North Carolina Justice Center*

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Sheria Reid  
N.C. State Bar No. 24477  
P.O. Box 28068  
Raleigh, NC 27611  
(919) 856-3192  
Email address: sheria@ncjustice.org

*The Rural School & Community Trust*

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Gregory C. Malhoit  
N.C. State Bar No. 6275  
3344 Hillsborough St., Suite 302  
Raleigh, NC 27602  
(919) 833-4541  
Email address: gmalhoit@ncsu.edu

*UNC Center for Civil Rights*

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
S. Ashley Osment  
N.C. State Bar No. 22238  
UNC School of Law, CCB #3380  
Chapel Hill, NC 27599  
(919) 843-5463  
Email address: osment@email.unc.edu