



SOUTH CAROLINA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION
LEGISLATIVE PREVIEW
WEBCAST

OCTOBER 2, 2014
6-7:15 P.M.

inside

General webcast information 2
Boardmanship Institute 2
Agenda..... 2

Legislative issues, position statements and talking points

- S.C. Freedom of Information Act revisions 3
- Education funding reform - SCJET 4
- Teacher issues 6
- Tuition tax credits and vouchers..... 8
- Standards and testing..... 9

Education votes 2014

- Actions board members can take 10
- State candidates list Appendix

general webcast information

SCSBA looks forward to your participation in our Legislative Preview live webcast at 6 p.m. on Thursday, October 2, 2014.

The purpose of the webcast is to review some of the issues likely to be debated during the legislative session in 2015.

View/participate online free of charge

The link to the webcast is scsba.org/legislative-preview-webcast-2014/ and can be accessed from scsba.org. It will be presented using Livestream. It is recommended that prior to the the webcast, you click on the webcast link to be sure that you are able to connect.

A high speed internet connection is highly recommended to adequately view the live streaming video and sound capability is a must.

Questions, comments

Questions and comments can be made during the webcast by typing them into the chat box that can be seen on the screen. Keep in mind that your questions and comments will be seen by everyone viewing the program.

View online afterwards

A link of the recorded program will be emailed to members about two weeks after the webcast for those who could not participate in the live program.

boardmanship institute

Board members who view the webcast will receive 5 points and 1.5 hours credit in the Boardmanship Institute. Board secretaries are asked to email the names of participating board members in their district to Sandy Poole at spoole@scsba.org by Friday, October 31, 2014 to receive credit.

agenda

1. **Welcome and purpose**
2. **Legislative issues discussion**
 - S.C. Freedom of Information Act revisions
 - Education funding reform
 - Teacher issues
 - Tuition tax credits and vouchers
 - Standards and testing
3. **Education votes 2014 and leadership changes**
4. **Closing comments**

Presenters: Scott Price, *SCSBA Executive Director-elect*; Damon Jeter, *Lobbyist*; and Debbie Elmore, *Communications Director*

legislative issues, position statements, talking points

Freedom of Information Act revisions

Overview

As public bodies, school boards and how they conduct their meetings are governed by the state Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). In recent years, the legislature and the state's courts have considered changes to the FOIA. In the case of the courts, rulings have been issued that impact how the FOIA is implemented by public bodies.

This past June, the South Carolina Supreme Court ruled in *Lambries v. Saluda County Council* that a public body may amend the agenda during a regularly scheduled meeting and, further, that a published agenda is not required for regularly scheduled meetings. The Supreme Court's opinion reversed a 2012 ruling by the SC Court of Appeals. The Appeals Court ruled that agendas are required for all meetings of public bodies and that amendments of the agenda during a meeting are not allowed.

In September, a Senate Freedom of Information Act Study Committee was convened to begin looking at implications of the *Lambries* rulings and determine what, if any, FOIA changes need to be made by the General Assembly in 2015. According to Committee Chairman Sen. Larry Martin of Pickens County, there is some legislative interest in changing the law to require that agendas be produced for all public meetings. The committee also is considering some kind of limitation, such as a unanimous or a 2/3-vote requirement of the public body, to amend agendas during a meeting.

During the 2013-2014 legislative session, the General Assembly considered – but failed to

enact – changes to the FOIA outlined in then House bill H.3163. As originally filed, proposed FOIA revisions included:

- changing the current “15-day rule” for providing a response to a FOIA request to 7 calendar days;
- prohibiting governmental bodies from charging for staff time associated with gathering or reproducing records and limiting copying costs to the local market rate;
- establishing a 30-day limit to provide materials beginning on the date of the original request (45 days for records more than two years olds); and,
- permitting requestors to file an FOIA complaint with the magistrate's court for enforcement of a request.

It is anticipated that lawmakers will file legislation in 2015 similar to H.3163, in addition to legislation to address the *Lambries* case.

Position statement

SCSBA supports changes to the FOIA that reflect fairness to the public in accessing, requesting and receiving public information, as well as to the public bodies that, in many cases, must devote taxpayer-funded time and resources to fulfilling voluminous and overly burdensome requests for information. SCSBA does not support overly restrictive limitations on a board's ability to efficiently conduct its business.

Talking points

- School boards are dedicated to following the Freedom of Information Act, exhibiting transparency in operations and conducting efficient meetings.
- School boards are committed to issuing agendas for all meetings within 24-hours, as well as limiting agenda amendments to urgent, critical or unanticipated matters.
- While school boards understand and respect the right of the public to have access to

meetings, upon occasion matters arise that are emergency in nature or otherwise unanticipated.

Education funding reform - SCJET

Overview

For several years, SCSBA and other education organizations, have advocated the need to reform the way South Carolina funds public schools. The plan, SCJET or South Carolina Jobs, Education and Tax Act, addresses both changes in state laws governing the way taxes are collected and an overreliance on taxes on businesses to fund school operations. As a package plan, SCJET restructures three main components:

- the process for generating state revenues;
- the allocation of state funding to districts; and,
- the options for local school boards to generate local revenue.

The key phrase for SCJET is “a package plan.” The plan will not work if only pieces of it are incorporated into the existing funding plan because the distribution of funds is dependent on the generation of stable revenues.

Parts of SCJET were included in this year’s state budget as part of the governor’s education funding plan. Some school districts have already raised questions about the impact of the funding changes. In addition to providing school districts with additional funding for technology (\$29 million) and reading coaches (\$29 million), this year’s state budget includes a revision in the formula used to distribute state funding to school districts under the Education Finance Act (EFA). This is known as the Base Student Cost (BSC). The weighting for students on free and reduced lunch or Medicaid, students in gifted and talented programs and students requiring specialized instruction were increased. These are a component of SCJET.

However, the weights for primary, kindergarten, high school and homebound students were decreased. School districts so far have given mixed reviews of the new formula’s impact. While still early, some districts cite that while they have gained money from one source, they are losing money from another.

It is anticipated that SCJET will be refiled in 2015. In fact, education funding reform was profiled recently in a news story concerning the gubernatorial race and the idea of a state uniform tax millage was cited.

How SCJET works:

- The state levies a uniform millage (SUM) rate of 100 mills on all taxable property, excluding homestead or owner-occupied property, in every school district statewide. Millage rates currently range from more than 300 mills in Hampton Two to less than 100 mills in Beaufort County. SCJET would lower the millage rate for nearly all school districts and provide millions of dollars in tax relief to businesses and industries and for other non-owner occupied properties. Lower millage rates would provide a level playing field for school districts to recruit businesses and industries. It would also create a stable and sound revenue source for schools to better manage budgetary dips in the economy and limit local government’s ability to negotiate away school property taxes through business incentives such as fee-in-lieu of taxes (FILOT) and multi-county parks.
- Existing state revenues, including the Education Finance Act (EFA), Homestead Exemption Fund (HEF), some of the Education Improvement Act (EIA) funds and other state funds are combined and allocated to districts per student. This would simplify funding by reducing about 70 separate state funding sources to 12 and providing more funding flexibility to districts.
- State allocates additional funding to make up the difference between the amount

of property taxes currently generated for schools statewide and what the SUM (100 mills) would generate.

- Once all of the state funds are combined and totaled, funding is distributed to districts on a per student basis, known as the Base Student Funding (BSF). The amount each district receives is determined by totaling all of the state funds and dividing it on a Weighted Pupil Units (WPU) formula. WPUs are weightings assigned to students for various factors including grade level, poverty, gifted and talented, special needs and more. SCJET uses WPUs that are recommended by the South Carolina Education Oversight Committee and were essentially included in the governor's plan.
- Transition or hold harmless funding will be necessary from the state to ensure that districts spending more than the BSF under SCJET do not receive less funds, .
- All other EIA and other state funding for programs not included in the EFA rollup are retained as separate, categorical funds. These are funds not allocated on a per pupil basis and include transportation, national board certification, 4K, etc.
- Local funding would be restructured as follows:
 - Local school boards would have the authority to levy local millage of up to 8% of the assessed value of taxable property, excluding owner-occupied property (4%) as required under Act 388, to fund district operations above what the state allocates. This is similar to the authority boards now have to fund capital expenses (8% constitutional debt limit).
 - Local school boards needing to go above the 8% limit would be required to call for a referendum seeking voter approval. If approved, the property tax millage would apply to ALL taxable properties.
- Finally, SCJET incorporates a framework for

establishing a statewide infrastructure bank to pay for school facility needs.

Position statement

SCSBA supports the passage of the SC Jobs, Education and Tax Act (SCJET) as a package plan. SCSBA believes it is imperative for the General Assembly to comprehensively reform the state's education funding structure, which includes revamping the tax structure, to provide more adequate and stable revenue sources.

Talking points

- The time is now to restructure the way our state funds education. We appreciate the General Assembly's actions in recent years to increase the base student cost. However, this year's \$2,120 BSC is still well below the statutorily required amount of \$2,742. This brings the total number of years since the last time the BSC was fully funded to six (2008).
- Funding inequities, as a result of changes in state taxes and revisions to the formula for distributing funds, will only increase over time. While we applaud the increased weightings to recognize differing student needs, the continuation of funds to hold "harmless" going forward is not guaranteed unless we have comprehensive tax reform that provides adequate and stable revenue sources.
- SCJET is a sustainable, stable funding plan that:
 - increases funding for a majority of the state's students and maintains existing funding levels for all other students
 - provides much needed tax relief for local businesses, which could encourage economic growth
 - provides local school boards options for generating local funds
- SCJET radically simplifies the state's funding system by:
 - abolishing the index of taxpaying ability that is no longer relevant due to changes in property tax values

- abolishing the required EIA local minimum effort
- establishing a uniform school operating millage rate
- eliminating conflicts between property tax limits and funding requirements
- eliminating the gap between homestead operating taxes and reimbursement
- abolishing complicated funding tiers and growth formulas

Teacher issues

Overview

Public school teacher effectiveness is at the forefront of state and national discussions on how best to improve student achievement and public education. Recent debates in South Carolina have centered on holding teachers accountable through the evaluation process, recruiting and retaining the best teachers for the state's classrooms (including measures to affect teacher salaries), and streamlining the dismissal process to make it less cumbersome and fairer to the parties involved.

These and other teacher-related issues could come before the General Assembly beginning in January. During the 2013-2014 Legislative Session, a number of teacher-related bills were filed and debated but were not enacted before the session ended. These proposals, which could be refiled in January, would do the following:

- require districts to adopt reduction in force (RIF) policies that may not include seniority as the most significant factor or teacher compensation as a factor;
- provide that if a teacher is dismissed or does not have his/her contract renewed, the teacher is terminated and has no rights to appeal or protest the termination;
- require a principal or district to notify parents whose children are being taught by an an-

nual contract teacher undergoing a highly consequential evaluation or a continuing contract teacher undergoing a formal summative evaluation; and,

- require that teachers be listed in a school district database (available to potential district employers) for such things as failing to pass certain evaluations, having a certificate suspended or revoked, or for a just-cause dismissal per statute.

SCSBA did NOT support these proposed bills.

In August, a Senate Select Committee on Public School Teachers in South Carolina was appointed to take a comprehensive look at several named issues. Committee members include Senators Wes Hayes (chair), Darrell Jackson, Paul Thurmond, Larry Martin and Brad Hutto. During the organizational meeting, committee members began to assess the current environment for the teaching profession in South Carolina. In September, the committee discussed teacher evaluations, due process, and the dismissal process. The agenda for the October 14 meeting includes teacher pay, incentives, and the teacher pipeline.

Teacher evaluations

The State Board of Education (SBE) gave second reading approval in June to the guidelines proposed by the State Department of Education (SDE) for expanding the state teacher and principal evaluation system. The expansion and guidelines are the result of a requirement by the U.S. Department of Education that teacher and principal evaluations must include student growth measures (test, student learning objectives). The requirement is part of the state's waiver from No Child Left Behind. Under SDE's plan, a 30 percent weighting for student test scores over three years would be used to rate classroom teachers of subjects that are state tested and a 50 percent measure for principals. SDE plans to fully implement this new system in all districts during the 2015-16 school year.

Recruiting/retaining teachers

Teacher recruitment and retention has long been an issue in the State House. In general, there are state-level programs aimed at teacher recruitment, as well as budget proviso language directing lawmakers to fund teacher salaries at the Southeastern average, while the Legislature “remains desirous” of raising the average teacher salary in South Carolina to be equal with the national average teacher salary. The senate select committee has heard testimony that the state’s teacher education programs are simply not producing enough graduates to fill the needed slots. Further, professional longevity, especially for teachers early in their career, is an issue in South Carolina. Finally, the state needs to investigate ways to attract teachers to high-poverty or otherwise high-need schools.

Teacher dismissals/due process

It is very likely that lawmakers in 2015 will take a close look at the current SC Teacher Employment and Dismissal Act (TEDA) with an eye toward making it easier for districts and schools to terminate under-performing teachers. Options that the select committee is looking at include the following:

- Removing local school boards from the appeals process. The final decision relating to a teacher dismissal would reside with the district superintendent.
- Modifying the time period in which continuing contract board hearings must be held from 15 days to 45 days, or as otherwise agreed to by the parties involved.
- Modifying the rules of evidence as they relate to board hearings on teacher dismissals.
- Allowing local boards to appoint a hearing officer to hear teacher dismissal cases.

Position statement

SCSBA believes that the state’s Teacher Em-

ployment and Dismissal Act should be amended with the goal of providing greater flexibility in the appeals process to better serve the interests of teachers, school districts and the taxpayers.

Further, SCSBA believes in raising teacher pay to the national average and establishing a salary structure that would be appropriate and consider differentiated responsibilities to compensate teachers in relation to skills and performance.

Talking points

- South Carolina’s TEDA sets forth a detailed process for notifying teachers about their contract status for the ensuing school year as well as a board’s intent not to renew. Due process under the law requires that teachers not re-employed for the next school year be given the opportunity to appeal before the local school board. While SCSBA supports the appeals process, some districts can experience significant case backlogs relating to teacher appeals, resulting in increased expense for the district and taxpayers and a prolonged process that serves none of the parties in a fair manner. A comprehensive review of the TEDA is long overdue.
- In the state’s quest to improve student achievement, we must not overlook the importance of qualified, effective teachers in every classroom. If South Carolina is serious about raising student achievement, then a salary structure must be developed that is competitive with neighboring states and will allow us to hire and retain qualified teachers. A plan to compensate teachers on a differentiated scale according to responsibilities, skills and performance will allow districts to keep master teachers and teacher leaders in the classroom.

Tuition tax credits and vouchers

Overview

After years of battling tuition tax credit/voucher proposals, an \$8 million private school tuition tax credit program for “exceptional needs students” was created through a budget proviso in 2013 and reauthorized in this year’s state budget. The main components of the program are as follows:

- Individuals and businesses are awarded a dollar-for-dollar state tax credit for contributions to nonprofit scholarship funding organizations. The statewide cap on total tax credits awarded is \$8 million.
- To qualify for the scholarship, students must be designated by the state as having “exceptional needs.” Previous public school enrollment is not required.
- Scholarship funding organizations must spend at least 95% of their revenue on scholarships.
- Participating schools must administer state assessments, or an equivalent exam, and must be in good standing with a designated regional private school association.

There may be a move to codify or put into permanent law the program. This could mean opening up the program for debate and possibly expanding the program to include tuition tax credits for all students to attend private schools. In addition, a recent study of the state’s tuition tax credit program by a Charleston newspaper columnist discovered that taxpayers can get up to \$1.42 in tax savings for every \$1 they donate through the scholarship program - a 42 percent return on investment. The writer notes, “A donation to a qualifying scholarship funding organization is matched by a dollar-for-dollar South Carolina tax credit, but that donation is also a federally tax-deductible charitable contribution (even though you get all of the money back, as a state tax credit). Then, the federal tax deduction reduces your income that’s subject to South Caro-

lina income tax, because the state’s income tax is based upon your federal tax return.” One donor contributed \$1.52 million last year, which he calculates netted a nice profit of between \$100,000 and \$638,000.

Position statement

SCSBA opposes any state or federally-mandated efforts to directly or indirectly subsidize elementary or secondary private, religious or home schools with public funds. It is a long held position approved by the school boards governing the 81 public school districts in our state.

Talking points

Unaffordable

- The state has not funded public schools at the level required by its own law for years, yet lawmakers continue to consider tuition tax credit/voucher programs that primarily benefit children already enrolled in private schools.
- Nothing now in law prevents individuals or organizations from forming an SFO as a charitable organization to accept donations for scholarships for low-income students to attend private schools, homeschools, or out-of-district tuition. However those donations would be considered charitable and provide taxpayers with a percentage reduction from their taxes versus a dollar-for-dollar credit. According to a study of the current program by a newspaper columnist, one donor contributed \$1.52 million last year, which he calculates netted a nice profit of between \$100,000 and \$638,000.
- The current program is inconsistent with fiscal conservative “limited government” principles by expanding duties for two state agencies.
- There has been no truth in proponents’ cost savings claims for public schools.

Unproven

- Tuition tax credit/voucher programs have

not been proven effective in improving the academic performance of students who use them to switch to private school. Research indicates that when student demographics are taken into account, public school students perform as well as, if not better than, private school students.

- In March of 2009, the first research since the mid-1990s compared the academic progress of students in Milwaukee's private school voucher program with students in Milwaukee Public Schools and showed no major differences in success between the two groups. The study was conducted by researchers mostly from the University of Arkansas.
- In June 2008, a U.S. Education Department study of the Washington D.C. school voucher program showed students using private school tuition vouchers generally did no better on reading and math tests after two years than their public school peers. This mirrors findings of previous studies of the program.

Unaccountable

- Public dollars are being used to fund private school education for a select few students.
- Private schools do not have to adhere to academic accountability requirements, financial transparency measures, and school safety measures that public schools are required to follow. These include, but are not limited to, grade level state specific course standards, annual state specific testing in four subject areas and high school end-of-course tests, annual publication of school and district report cards that grade the academic achievement of its students, hiring highly qualified teachers, public disclosure of employee salaries, financial transactions and more.
- Proponents claim to be empowering parents by providing choices, but parents don't get to choose which private school their child attends; it is the private schools that choose which students they will accept.

Standards and testing

Overview

This past legislative session, the General Assembly took steps to clearly define South Carolina's role in the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) by requiring the following:

- a review and revision of the standards to create new, college and career-ready English language arts and mathematics standards
- a withdrawal from participation in the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, organized to create an assessment for CCSS
- the purchase a new college and career ready state test for students in grades 3 through 8 and for students in grade 11 before September 30.

The new college and career ready standards developed by the State Department of Education (SDE) must be approved by the State Board of Education (SBE) and the SC Education Oversight Committee (EOC). Currently there are differences of opinions by the SDE and some members of the SBE about whether the existing standards should be completely rewritten or revised.

The SC Budget and Control Board on September 19 awarded a contract to ACT as the provider for the statewide assessment. This spring, students in grades 3 – 8 will take the ACT Aspire in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics and students in grade 11 will take the ACT. In 2015-16, ACT Aspire will be given in grades 3-9 and ACT in grade 11. In school year 2016-17, ACT Aspire will be given in grades 3-10 and ACT in grade 11.

In addition, the EOC is charged with recommending one accountability system that incorporates requirements of both the federal accountability system and state's accountability system.

Position statement

SCSBA supports revising, rather than rewrite

from scratch, the existing state standards. This will better assist students and teachers who have invested time and resources in learning the standards.

SCSBA is concerned about the increased amount of testing for students. Testing has been expanded to include a test for kindergarten students. We're also increasing the number of subjects tested to four for students in grades 4 - 8, and adding two assessments for students in grade 11.

Talking points

- Schools that have invested thousands of dollars in CCSS do not have the time or resources to completely change the standards, especially when those standards are to be implemented next school year and must meet the federal definition of college and career ready or risk loss of the waiver from No Child Left Behind requirements.
- We are concerned that tests have been purchased before for the new standards have been developed. While we appreciate the fact that the results of the test will not be used to rate schools and districts under the state accountability system, they will be used to rate schools, districts, teachers and principals beginning next school year under the federal accountability system. This is a major concern.
- The amount of testing is a huge concern. Some schools in Florida, which have similar testing requirements, have reported as many as one out of every three school days is interrupted by some sort of testing, test drills or test preparation.

Education Votes 2014

The 2014 elections could be a "change election" in South Carolina. The entire South Carolina congressional delegation, state constitutional officers and the state House of Representatives are up for election this year. The outcome of these races could dramati-

cally impact public education.

To assist board members and other education advocates, SCSBA has created an Education Votes 2014 webpage at scsba.org that includes lots of helpful information, including a list of candidates with links to their campaign websites, instructions for absentee voting, downloadable flyers from the SC Elections Commission and ideas for ways to get involved in the election process.

Actions board members can take

- Support pro-public education candidates. Contribute/donate to pro-public education candidates. Campaigns need money to be successful. Any donation, no matter the amount, can have a significant role in successful campaigns.
- Volunteer. All successful campaigns have canvassing (door-to-door) efforts, phone bank efforts, letters to the editor and other activities that require the commitment and work of volunteers. If time does not permit you to volunteer, encourage your friends and family to do so. As public officials, consider activating your local political machines to support pro-public education candidates.
- Educate the community about the importance of the primaries and general election by hosting candidate forums and/or writing letters to the editor or opinion columns

online resources

SC Election Commission (www.scvotes.org)

SC Ethics Commission (www.ethics.sc.gov)

Appendix: 2014 Candidates

Highlighting indicates incumbent

Governor	Steve	French	Jr.	Libertarian
Governor	Vincent	Sheheen		Democratic
Governor	Morgan Bruce	Reeves		United Citizens
Governor	Tom J	Ervin		Petition
Governor	Nikki R	Haley		Republican
Lieutenant Governor	Bakari	Sellers		Democratic
Lieutenant Governor	Henry	McMaster		Republican
Secretary of State	Ginny	Deerin		Democratic
Secretary of State	Mark	Hammond		Republican
State Treasurer	Curtis	Loftis		Republican
Attorney General	Parnell	Diggs		Democratic
Attorney General	Alan	Wilson		Republican
Comptroller General	Kyle	Herbert		Democratic
Comptroller General	Richard	Eckstrom		Republican
State Superintendent of Education	Tom	Thompson		Democratic
State Superintendent of Education	Molly Mitchell	Spearman		Republican
State Superintendent of Education	Ed	Murray		American
Adjutant General	James	Breazeale		Republican
Adjutant General	Bob	Livingston	Jr.	Republican
Commissioner of Agriculture	David	Edmond		United Citizens
Commissioner of Agriculture	Hugh E	Weathers		Republican
Commissioner of Agriculture	Emile	DeFelice		American
U.S. Senate	Victor	Kocher		Libertarian
U.S. Senate	Brad	Hutto		Democratic
U.S. Senate	Lindsey	Graham		Republican
U.S. Senate (Unexpired Term)	Joyce	Dickerson		Democratic
U.S. Senate (Unexpired Term)	Tim	Scott		Republican
U.S. Senate (Unexpired Term)	Jill	Bossi		American
U.S. House, Dist. 01	Mark	Sanford		Republican
U.S. House, Dist. 02	Phil	Black		Democratic
U.S. House, Dist. 02	Harold	Geddings III	III	Labor

Appendix: 2014 Candidates

Highlighting indicates incumbent

U.S. House, Dist. 02	Joe	Wilson		Republican
U.S. House, Dist. 03	Barbara Jo	Mullis		Democratic
U.S. House, Dist. 03	Jeff	Duncan		Republican
U.S. House, Dist. 04	Curtis E	McLaughlin	Jr.	Libertarian
U.S. House, Dist. 04	Trey	Gowdy	III	Republican
U.S. House, Dist. 05	Tom	Adams		Democratic
U.S. House, Dist. 05	Mick	Mulvaney		Republican
U.S. House, Dist. 06	Kevin R	Umbaugh		Libertarian
U.S. House, Dist. 06	James E "Jim"	Clyburn		Democratic
U.S. House, Dist. 06	Anthony	Culler		Republican
U.S. House, Dist. 07	Gloria	Bromell-Tinubu		Democratic
U.S. House, Dist. 07	Tom	Rice	Jr.	Republican
State House, Dist. 1	Bill	Whitmire		Republican
State House, Dist. 2	Bill	Sandifer	III	Republican
State House, Dist. 3	Travis	McCurry		Libertarian
State House, Dist. 3	Gary E	Clary		Republican
State House, Dist. 4	Davey	Hiott		Republican
State House, Dist. 5	Neal	Collins		Republican
State House, Dist. 6	Brian	White		Republican
State House, Dist. 7	Michael	Gambrell		Republican
State House, Dist. 8	Jonathon	Hill		Republican
State House, Dist. 9	Anne	Thayer		Republican
State House, Dist. 10	Joshua A	Putnam		Republican
State House, Dist. 11	Tombo	Hite	III	Democratic
State House, Dist. 11	Craig A	Gagnon		Republican
State House, Dist. 12	Anne	Parks		Democratic
State House, Dist. 12	Tony	Wideman		Republican
State House, Dist. 13	Robert Shannon	Riley		Republican
State House, Dist. 14	Mike	Pitts		Republican
State House, Dist. 15	Marian	Redish		Democratic
State House, Dist. 15	Samuel	Rivers	Jr.	Republican
State House, Dist. 16	Mark N	Willis		Republican
State House, Dist. 17	Mike	Burns		Republican
State House, Dist. 18	Tommy	Stringer		Republican
State House, Dist. 19	Dwight A	Loftis		Republican
State House, Dist. 20	Jon	Eames		Democratic
State House, Dist. 20	Jon	Eames		Green
State House, Dist. 20	Dan	Hamilton		Republican
State House, Dist. 21	Phyllis J	Henderson		Republican
State House, Dist. 22	Dan	Ruck		Democratic

Appendix: 2014 Candidates

Highlighting indicates incumbent

State House, Dist. 22	<u>Wendy</u>	<u>Nanney</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 23	<u>Chandra</u>	<u>Dillard</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 24	<u>Bruce W</u>	<u>Bannister</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 25	<u>Leola</u>	<u>Robinson-Simpson</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 25	<u>Tony</u>	<u>Boyce</u>		Independence
State House, Dist. 26	<u>Jeremy C</u>	<u>Walters</u>		Libertarian
State House, Dist. 26	<u>Raye</u>	<u>Felder</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 27	<u>Garry R</u>	<u>Smith</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 28	<u>Eric M</u>	<u>Bedingfield</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 29	<u>Dennis Carroll</u>	<u>Moss</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 30	<u>Steve</u>	<u>Moss</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 31	<u>Harold</u>	<u>Mitchell Jr</u>	Jr.	Democratic
State House, Dist. 32	<u>Matt</u>	<u>Iyer</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 32	<u>Derham</u>	<u>Cole</u>	Jr.	Republican
State House, Dist. 33	Shelia Antley	Counts		Democratic
State House, Dist. 33	<u>Eddie</u>	<u>Tallon</u>	Sr.	Republican
State House, Dist. 34	<u>Michael R</u>	<u>Thompson</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 34	<u>Mike</u>	<u>Forrester</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 35	<u>Bill</u>	<u>Chumley</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 36	<u>Rita</u>	<u>Allison</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 37	<u>Donna Hicks</u>	<u>Wood</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 38	<u>N Douglas</u>	<u>Brannon</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 39	<u>Ralph Shealy</u>	<u>Kennedy</u>	Jr.	Republican
State House, Dist. 40	<u>Walt</u>	<u>McLeod</u>	III	Democratic
State House, Dist. 40	<u>Richard</u>	<u>Martin</u>	Jr.	Republican
State House, Dist. 41	<u>MaryGail</u>	<u>Douglas</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 42	<u>Mike</u>	<u>Anthony</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 42	<u>David</u>	<u>Tribble</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 43	<u>Greg</u>	<u>Delleney</u>	Jr.	Republican
State House, Dist. 44	<u>Mandy</u>	<u>Powers Norrell</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 45	<u>Deborah</u>	<u>Long</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 46	<u>Gary</u>	<u>Simrill</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 47	<u>Tommy</u>	<u>Pope</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 48	<u>Barry</u>	<u>McGrew</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 48	<u>Ralph W</u>	<u>Norman</u>	Jr.	Republican
State House, Dist. 49	<u>John R</u>	<u>King</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 49	<u>Robert Bobby</u>	<u>Walker</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 50	<u>Grady</u>	<u>Brown</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 51	<u>David</u>	<u>Weeks</u>		Democratic

Appendix: 2014 Candidates

Highlighting indicates incumbent

State House, Dist. 52	<u>Laurie Slade</u>	<u>Funderburk</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 53	<u>Amy M</u>	<u>Brown</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 53	<u>Richie</u>	<u>Yow</u>	I	Republican
State House, Dist. 54	<u>Patricia M</u>	<u>Henegan</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 55	<u>Jackie E</u>	<u>Hayes</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 56	<u>Mike</u>	<u>Ryhal</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 57	<u>J Wayne</u>	<u>George</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 58	<u>Jeff</u>	<u>Johnson</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 59	<u>Terry</u>	<u>Alexander</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 60	<u>Phillip</u>	<u>Lowe</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 61	<u>Roger K</u>	<u>Kirby</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 61	<u>Raleigh O</u>	<u>Ward Jr</u>	Jr.	Republican
State House, Dist. 62	<u>Robert</u>	<u>Williams</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 62	<u>Chippy</u>	<u>Johnson</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 63	<u>Kris</u>	<u>Crawford</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 64	<u>Robert L</u>	<u>Ridgeway III</u>	III	Democratic
State House, Dist. 64	<u>Robert A</u>	<u>McFadden Sr</u>	Sr.	Republican
State House, Dist. 65	<u>Jay</u>	<u>Lucas</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 66	<u>Gilda</u>	<u>Cobb-Hunter</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 67	<u>Murrell</u>	<u>Smith</u>	Jr.	Republican
State House, Dist. 68	<u>Heather Ammons</u>	<u>Crawford</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 69	<u>Robert Louis</u>	<u>Vanlue</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 69	<u>Rick</u>	<u>Quinn</u>	Jr.	Republican
State House, Dist. 70	<u>Joe</u>	<u>Neal</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 71	<u>Nathan</u>	<u>Ballentine</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 72	<u>James</u>	<u>Smith</u>	Jr.	Democratic
State House, Dist. 73	<u>Christopher R</u>	<u>Hart</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 74	<u>J Todd</u>	<u>Rutherford</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 74	<u>Donna</u>	<u>McGreevy</u>		American
State House, Dist. 75	<u>Joe</u>	<u>McCulloch</u>	Jr.	Democratic
State House, Dist. 75	<u>Kirkman</u>	<u>Finlay III</u>	III	Republican
State House, Dist. 76	<u>Leon</u>	<u>Howard</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 77	<u>Joe</u>	<u>McEachern</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 78	<u>Beth</u>	<u>Bernstein</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 78	<u>Jeff</u>	<u>Mobley</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 79	<u>Mia</u>	<u>McLeod</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 80	<u>Jimmy C</u>	<u>Bales</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 81	<u>Don</u>	<u>Wells</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 82	<u>William Bill</u>	<u>Clyburn</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 83	<u>Bill</u>	<u>Hixon</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 84	<u>Rosie</u>	<u>Berry</u>		Democratic

Appendix: 2014 Candidates

Highlighting indicates incumbent

State House, Dist. 84	Chris	Corley		Republican
State House, Dist. 85	Chip	Huggins	Jr.	Republican
State House, Dist. 86	Bill	Taylor		Republican
State House, Dist. 87	Joan Waggoner	Guy		Democratic
State House, Dist. 87	Todd	Atwater		Republican
State House, Dist. 88	Mac	Toole		Republican
State House, Dist. 89	Kenny	Bingham		Republican
State House, Dist. 90	Justin	Bamberg		Democratic
State House, Dist. 90	Travis Lee	Avant		Republican
State House, Dist. 91	Lonnie	Hosey		Democratic
State House, Dist. 92	Joe	Daning		Republican
State House, Dist. 93	Russell L	Off		Democratic
State House, Dist. 94	Damian	Daly		Democratic
State House, Dist. 94	Jenny	Horne		Republican
State House, Dist. 95	Jerry	Govan	Jr.	Democratic
State House, Dist. 96	L. Kit	Spies		Republican
State House, Dist. 97	Patsy G	Knight		Democratic
State House, Dist. 98	Rebekah	Patrick		Democratic
State House, Dist. 98	Chris	Murphy		Republican
State House, Dist. 99	Jim	Merrill	IV	Republican
State House, Dist. 100	Edward L	Southard	Sr.	Republican
State House, Dist. 101	Ronnie A	Sabb		Democratic
State House, Dist. 102	Joe	Jefferson	Jr.	Democratic
State House, Dist. 102	John	Mondo	Sr.	Republican
State House, Dist. 103	Carl L	Anderson		Democratic
State House, Dist. 104	Greg	Duckworth		Republican
State House, Dist. 105	Kevin	Hardee		Republican
State House, Dist. 106	Nelson	Hardwick		Republican
State House, Dist. 107	Alan	Clemmons		Republican
State House, Dist. 108	Vida	Miller		Democratic
State House, Dist. 108	Stephen L	Goldfinch Jr	Jr.	Republican
State House, Dist. 109	Rodney	Travis		Libertarian
State House, Dist. 109	David	Mack III	III	Democratic
State House, Dist. 110	Chip	Limehouse	III	Republican
State House, Dist. 111	Wendell G	Gilliard		Democratic
State House, Dist. 112	Mike	Sottile		Republican
State House, Dist. 113	J Seth	Whipper		Democratic
State House, Dist. 114	Mary	Tinkler		Democratic
State House, Dist. 114	Sue	Edward		Green
State House, Dist. 114	Bobby	Harrell	Jr.	Republican
State House, Dist. 115	Peter	McCoy	Jr.	Republican

Appendix: 2014 Candidates

Highlighting indicates incumbent

State House, Dist. 116	<u>Robert L</u>	<u>Brown</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 116	<u>Carroll</u>	<u>O'Neal</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 117	<u>Bill</u>	<u>Crosby</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 118	<u>Bill</u>	<u>Herbkersman</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 119	<u>Colin</u>	<u>Ross</u>		Libertarian
State House, Dist. 119	<u>Leon</u>	<u>Stavrinakis</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 119	<u>Chris</u>	<u>Cannon</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 120	<u>Weston</u>	<u>Newton</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 121	<u>Kenneth F</u>	<u>Hodges</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 122	<u>Bill</u>	<u>Bowers</u>		Democratic
State House, Dist. 123	<u>Jeff</u>	<u>Bradley</u>		Republican
State House, Dist. 124	<u>Shannon</u>	<u>Erickson</u>		Republican