



SC Voter

Post Office Box 8453 • Columbia, SC 29202 • Phone & Fax: (803) 251-2726

Website: www.lwvsc.org

Volume 62, Issue 2

Fall 2012

THE STATE OF THE JUDICIARY IN SOUTH CAROLINA

From Research to Reality



Left to right: Senator Larry Martin (Chair, SC Senate Judiciary Committee), Robert Wilcox, Esq. (Dean of the University of SC School of Law), The Honorable Carolyn Matthews (President, SC Women Lawyers Association), Alice Paylor, Esq. (President, SC Bar Association), Rep. Leon Howard (SC House of Representatives), Prof. John Simpkins (Charleston School of Law), Prof. Constance Anastopoulou (Charleston School of Law).

The League's two-year initiative to increase diversity and ensure independence in our state's judicial system concluded on August 7 with a well-attended reception and forum at USC School of Law in Columbia. **Constance Anastopoulou of LWVSC and Charleston School of Law moderated a panel discussion that included: Sen. Larry Martin, Judiciary Committee Chair, Judicial Merit Selection Commission, Vice Chair; Rep. Leon Howard; Dean Robert Wilcox, USC School of Law;**

Judge Carolyn Matthews, President, SC Women Lawyers Assoc.; Alice Paylor, President-Elect, SC Bar Assoc.; John Simpkins, Professor, Charleston School of Law.

The project's educational focus now shifts toward advocating for changes in the judicial selection process that will heighten diversity and independence. If you are interested in joining the LWVSC's judicial committee, please contact Sarah Leverette at 803-738-3120 or saraheleverette@gmail.com.

Highlights:

- The State of the Judiciary in SC 1
- Co-President's Message 2
- Women's Suffrage History 3
- League Leader's Day Highlights 4
- "The Widget Effect" 6
- LWVSC Study of Teachers 7
- Letter to the Editor 8
- What is Uniform Millage? 8
- Membership on the Rise 9
- Florence Area Women's Equality Day .. 9
- TÊTE À TÊTE with State Legislators .. 10
- Nuclear Waste & SRS Action 10
- SC Constitutional Amendment Question.. 11
- Important League Dates 11
- Election Protection 12

Website: www.lwvsc.org

Join the League today!



Co-President's Perspectives:

Powering The Vote In South Carolina

For the League of Women Voters, election season is the busiest time of the year. And that holds true in 2012. In South Carolina, our efforts to protect voter rights have been long and tireless. Our three-year battle against South Carolina's discriminatory photo ID law continues in federal court, and in 2012 we successfully beat back legislation that would have restricted voter registration. We believe, quite simply, that government in the world's greatest democracy should not be erecting unnecessary hurdles that prevent eligible citizens from exercising their constitutionally-protected right to vote.

The League's Power the Vote marathon began last spring as our members registered thousands of first-time voters in high schools and community colleges in time to vote in the state's June Primary. Our state and local League leaders haven't slowed down since.

This election season stands out for the unusually widespread confusion about voting procedures that we find among voters across our state. To support our Power the Vote activities and dispel voter confusion we launched a new section of our website, *Time to Vote South Carolina* (<http://lwvsc.org/votesc.html>). This provides information about photo ID litigation, voting procedures and resources, such as the *Voter ID Toolkit* with Power Point presentation and handouts.

In July we initiated an outreach to all public and non-profit colleges and universities to increase the number of students who participate in the election process. The numbers tell the story: While 67 percent of the voting-age population is registered, fewer than 51 percent of college students are registered to vote according to the U.S. Federal Election Commission. The National Voter Registration Act of 1993 mandates that colleges and universities that participate in federal student loan programs provide voter registration applications for their students. LWVSC's website outlines the options that students have.

Nationally and in South Carolina, League volunteers made up a major portion of the "workforce" that made National Voter Registration Day on September 25 a tremendous success. Total registration and volunteer numbers are still being calculated. But groups have already reported leveraging more than 7,000 volunteers to collect 300,000+ new registrations nationwide!

In addition to their work for National Voter Registration Day, South Carolina Leagues have organized a host of events that offer opportunities for citizens to learn about voting and its importance, to register to vote, and to be informed about candidates and issues on the ballot. We're hearing that thousands of new voters are registering at League events.

With the October 6th voter registration deadline behind us, Leagues now are shifting to a full schedule of candidates forums. Here is a small sampling of voters service activities underway by South Carolina Leagues:

- LWVSC produced a voters guide to the constitutional amendment question that is on state ballots (reprinted in this issue).
- LWVSC is participating in the Election Protection phone hotline at 1-866-OUR-VOTE. Voters who experience problems voting can call this number for free assistance. See details in this SC VOTER.
- By October 1st, LWV/Charleston Area had registered about 1200 voters over the previous 6 weeks. They covered almost every college in the Charleston area.
- LWV/Clemson Area has 6 forums scheduled in October for candidates from school board to Statehouse.
- LWV/Hilton Head Island-Bluffton Area registered parent and student voters at local high schools, is hosting forums for school board and county council candidates, and produced voters guides for ballot questions.



Barbara Zia
Co-President, LWVSC

- In addition to candidates forums, LWV/Columbia Area is holding a public forum on the Richland County transportation sales tax ballot question.
- LWV/Horry County hosted a training session with the County Election Director for poll watchers and observers.
- LWV/Greenville County is leveraging League commitment to voter education for a fundraising Trivial Pursuit event, "There's Nothing Trivial About Voting Rights," on October 20. Visit Greenville.co.sc@lwvnet for information.
- LWV/Sumter County President Jeanette Roveri did a TV interview while registering voters on National Voter Registration Day. Enjoy it here: <http://www.wltx.com/news/article/203265/2/Times-Running-Out-to-Register-to-Vote?odyssey=tab|topnews|bc|large>.

As Jeanette remarks in her interview, the LWV urges everyone to vote. Whether you're a Democrat, a Republican or something else all together, "We don't care who you vote for, just vote." Our sincere thanks to all for your tremendous efforts to empower voters and make democracy work in South Carolina.

Barbara

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE HISTORY:

LESSONS FOR TODAY'S LEAGUE LEADERS

By Julie Hussey, President, LWV/Charleston Area



Editor's note: This is reprinted with permission from LWV/Charleston Area's September newsletter. On August 26, the Charleston Area League showed the film One Woman, One Vote at Charleston's Hippodrome Theater to a large audience.

I am still fired up after LWVCA's free screening of "One Woman, One Vote" at the Hippodrome on Women's Equality Day. Watching the fight for our country to allow all of its citizens to vote with a diverse audience of women and men, many of whom are my heroes for their personal commitment to our freedoms, brought the women, meetings, risks, and compromises to life.

Thanks to efforts of the women in the movie and many women after them, I have not had to fight for simply having a seat at the table, and yet, as I told an auditorium full of Coast Guard men and women later in the week, everyone who sees an opportunity for change and fights for it experiences the lessons of the suffragists' story:

1 Go For It - Elizabeth Cady Stanton did not just help to organize the first women's rights convention in Seneca Falls, NY in 1848 to talk about basic living rights for women, she had the audacity to ask for their approval and get it for her Declaration of Sentiments with its "shocking and unnatural" call for women to be able to vote like white men.

2 Movements Need Friends - Elizabeth Stanton's husband may have supported the abolitionists cause - which is how they met - but he was not aligned with her views on women's rights, and with his fragile health and her strong sense of responsibility for the raising of her children, she did not have the freedom to travel around the country fighting for the suffragist cause. How wonderful it

must have been for her to find Susan B. Anthony, who shared Elizabeth's passion, commitment, and determination but was single, childless, and able to travel. With their skills complementing each other so well -- Anthony, the organizer and tactician -- it is hard to believe that either could have been as influential as they were without the other.

3 Getting anything done requires being both radical and consensus building - It is very rare for any movement to be led by just one group and the women's suffrage movement was no different. Creating a demand for change needs multiple approaches and multiple messengers for it to be heard by a diverse population. Building consensus around new ideas is impossible without compromise, and yet without a willingness to be radical, there would not be any new ideas. Stanton and Anthony were considered radicals when they founded the National Woman Suffrage Association that only accepted women and did not support the 15th amendment because it only gave the right to vote to black males; while Lucy Stone's American Woman Suffrage Association followed a more flexible approach by allowed men and supporting the 15th amendments. Eleven years later the two groups merged to create the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA), which Susan Anthony leads for 31 years before handing the leadership to Carrie Chapman Catt (the founder of the LWV). Then

after being seen as the radicals, Harriot Stanton Blatch (Elizabeth Cady Stanton's daughter) decides that NAWSA had become too conservative so she starts The Women's Political Union. Blatch's organization, known for introducing suffrage marches, then merges in 1915 with "radical" Alice Paul's Congressional Union to form the National Women's Party. The National Women's Party is first in the nation's history to protest at the White House; this angers the NAWSA that is focused on lobbying efforts.

Would lobbying efforts have worked alone or was it the picketing and images of women in prison that pushed President Wilson to finally address the US Senate on behalf of the 19th Amendment? No one will ever know if one group could have done it alone, but after Wilson spoke, the 19th Amendment finally passed both chambers and went on to be ratified by two-thirds of the states on the 26th of August 1920.

Leaving the Hippodrome after the movie on Women's Equality Day and looking into the faces of the Coast Guard men and women after my recount of the suffragists' story, I was struck with the reality that all of these lessons mean nothing if I do not vote in November. While the political parties want me to think that my vote is only for one side or against the other, the truth--understood so clearly by the suffragists--is that the real winner is democracy when we vote and it is the only loser when we do not.



League Leaders Day 2012

League leaders from across South Carolina gathered in Columbia on September 15 for the annual LLD. The day highlighted sessions with:

- **Tim O'Brien**, with LWVUS Public Advocacy for Voter Protection (PAVP) project, on the battle over protecting voting rights and what we might expect in 2012 and beyond;
- **Shayna Howell** on how to bring 21st century social media technology to bear on the League's efforts to Make Democracy Work;
- **Janie Shipley and Peggy Appler** offering concrete ideas that League

leaders can use to orient new members and get them engaged from the moment they join the League;

- **Debbie Elmore** with SC School Board Association on her organization's proposal for legislation to ensure that all schools are funded equitably;
- **Elaine Faithful, Lynn Teague and JoAnne Day** on effective legislative action strategies at the organizational and individual level, and anticipated central issues in the 2013 General Assembly session and how these issues impact League positions.



Della Baker, LWVSC Secretary and Clemson Area Member.



Mary Klenz, LWVUS Board and Liaison to LWVSC Board; Peggy Appler, LWVUS Board Director and LWVSC Leadership Training Specialist; Sarah Leverette, LWVSC Director, Governance and Judiciary



Jane Pulling, LWV/Charleston Director/Education; Shayna Howell, LWV/Charleston Area VP.



Left to right: Lynn Teague, LWVSC Advocacy Director; Tim O'Brien, LWVUS Project Manager, Public Advocacy for Voter Protection; Janie White, LWV/ Columbia Area Director and Carol Medich, LWV/Columbia Area Voters Service.

continued on page 5 –

LEAGUE LEADER'S DAY:

continued from page 4 –



Dolores Miller, LWV/Florence Area Director; Frances Elmore LWV/Florence Area Co-President.



Tim O'Brien, LWVUS Project Manager, Public Advocacy for Voter Protection and Paula Egelson, LWVSC Director, Voter Registration.



Elaine Faithful, Coordinator at SC Coalition for Healthy Families, JoAnne Day, LWVSC VP, Barbara Zia LWVSC Co-President.



Sheila Gallagher, LWVSC Education Director; Debbie Elmore, SC School Boards Association, Director of Communications.

THANKS FOR THE SUPPORT:

Our 2011-2012 Member Contributors (through June 30, 2012)

Thanks to all who make the League's work possible through their generous donations in 2011-2012. We depend on the gifts of those people who support the League beyond their membership dues. Gifts of all sizes are very much appreciated. We will spend your money wisely.

Grassroots Club (\$1 to \$49)

Martha F. Barkely
Sylvia Dreyfus
(Memory of Barbara Moxon)

Ralph/Aggie Edwards
Peggy Huchet
Ellen S. Reneke
Ann Robinson
Shan Rose

Voters Club (\$50 to \$149)

Peggy Appler
Keller/Bill Barron
Nancy Cave

Nancy H. Cherry
Mary Lynn Conway
Margaret T. Downard
Glenn & Sherrill Duncan
Frances Elmore
(Memory of Barbara Moxon)

Mr. Lewis Fitch
Dee Goforth
Lynn Greer
Barbara A. Jackson
(Memory of Bob McGarry)
Christe McCoy
Jane A. McGregory
Sarah A. Mellen

Mary Miles
Dolores Miller
Vivian A. Miller
Karen Mitchell
Lucille P. Mould
(Memory of Barbara Moxon)
Frances Plotnik
Sarah Jane & George Polk
Susan B. Richards
Chester Sansbury
Michael G. Stafford
Gale N. Touger
(Memory of Harriet Keyserling)
Holley Ulbrich

Consensus Club (\$150 to \$249)

Mary Elizabeth Baker
Ethel Brody
Duncan A. Buell
Shayna Howell
Rita Paul

Action Club (\$250 to \$499)

JoAnne Day
Martha Bostick
Barbara Zia

President's Club (\$500+)

Eleanor & Bill Hare

What's Behind The Movement To Change The Way America Evaluates Her Teachers?

A Quick Look at The Widget Effect

By Peggy Huchet & Jon Butzon, Co-Chairs, LWVSC Study on Evaluating and Retaining Effective Teachers

The evaluation of teacher performance is receiving much and much needed attention nationwide. As a result, the League of Women Voters of South Carolina has initiated a study into the question of evaluating teacher performance. The South Carolina Superintendent of Education has been plain spoken about his desire to have a new way to evaluate teacher performance and to base compensation on such an evaluation. This is a critical factor in the education of South Carolina's children – every child must have a highly skilled effective – and LWVSC must be able to participate in the discussion. To do that, we must have a position. We hope to have completed the study process, have reached consensus, and have developed a position on this matter by Spring 2013.

South Carolina is not the only state in which the question of evaluating teacher performance has taken center stage. Changes in teacher evaluations are afoot in a number of states. And for some that raises interesting questions, two of which are what is driving this move and why now?

There are a number of factors including the Federal Race to the Top competition and the increasing realization that, more than anything else that schools do, it is the effectiveness of the teacher that makes the difference in student achievement. But if you wanted to point to one precipitating factor, the publishing by The New Teacher Project (TNTP) of [The Widget Effect, Our National Failure to Acknowledge and Act on Differences in Teacher Effectiveness](#) is arguably that factor.

Published in 2001, *The Widget Effect* brought into stark relief some little known, but stunning realities about the way America evaluates her teachers. In the process it started discussions in school districts, state legislatures and communities all over the country. And the discussions have led to action.

So, what is *The Widget Effect*?

The Widget Effect sets out the proposition that our public schools, in failing to systematically evaluate teachers according to their performance, have engendered “a culture of indifference about the quality of instruction in each classroom.” “Put simply, they fail to distinguish great teaching from good, good from fair, and fair from poor. A teacher’s effectiveness – the most important factor for schools in improving student achievement – is not measured, recorded, or used to inform decision-making in any meaningful way.” “Excellence goes unrecognized, development is neglected and poor performance goes unaddressed.” (p. 10). Teachers are treated as if they are “interchangeable parts,” widgets, if you will. Hence, the title of the report.

The authors studied 12 school districts in 4 states. Among their findings:

- Most districts rated teachers in two categories, satisfactory and unsatisfactory. Virtually all tenured teachers consistently were rated as satisfactory. Even when rating systems had more choices, most teachers were placed in the highest one or two categories.
- Evaluations failed to assess the variations in teacher effectiveness. As a result, there was a striking disconnect between student achievement and teacher ratings. Over 90% of teachers were rated as satisfactory even as large percentages of students were failing.
- Teacher evaluation had a low priority and administrators were not trained to do effective evaluations. Evaluations were cursory, infrequent and infrequent. Feedback was minimal and was the same for mediocre and highly rated teachers. They found little evidence of attention to the needs of novice teachers.

- When interviewed, teachers and administrators could identify teachers who were incompetent. However, the dismissal process was onerous, lengthy and often not successful, with the result that fewer than 1% of teachers were dismissed.
- There was no substantial record of performance on which to identify and compensate outstanding teachers or to dismiss incompetent ones. School districts turned to other ways to make personnel decisions, such as training and length of service. Evaluations had no consequences and hence the evaluation process was not considered important.
- In addition, ratings were inflated. Most teachers expected to receive the highest rating and resisted any mention of the need for improvement in their performance. “The result is a dysfunctional school community in which performance problems cannot be openly identified or addressed.” (p. 23)

The Widget Effect sets out the proposition that our public schools, in failing to systematically evaluate teachers according to their performance, have engendered “a culture of indifference about the quality of instruction in each classroom.” “Put simply, they fail to distinguish great teaching from good, good from fair, and fair from poor. A teacher’s effectiveness – the most important factor for schools in improving student achievement – is not measured, recorded, or used to inform decision-making in any meaningful way.” “Excellence goes unrecognized, development is neglected and poor performance goes unaddressed.” (p. 10) Teachers are treated as if they are “interchangeable parts.” Hence, the *widget effect*.

continued on page 7 –



THE WIDGET EFFECT:

continued from page 6 –

So, what do we do? The authors make four policy recommendations:

- Institute a “comprehensive performance evaluation and development system that differentiates teachers based on their effectiveness in promoting achievement.” “This demands clear performance standards, multiple rating options, regular monitoring of administrator judgments, and frequent feedback to teachers.” (p. 7) Provide individualized professional development and intensive support when needed. The authors explain the “value added model” “which employs “various predictive factors to determine how well students are expected to achieve on standardized tests and then measure the positive or negative variation from that expected performance level as a means of evaluating the impact of individual teachers. These models, which have shown both to reliably predict the future impact of many teachers and to correlate with administrator evaluations of classroom performance, are promising. However, they cannot serve as a substitute for a comprehensive evaluation system.” (p. 27)
- Train evaluators thoroughly and hold them accountable for using evaluations effectively to provide constructive support.

- Establish an evaluation system that is perceived as credible, i.e., fair and accurate, and use it to make decisions about tenure, compensation, advancement, retention./dismissal.
- A system that has clear performance standards, frequent evaluations and follow up support will put unsuccessful teachers on notice about their performance. A well-documented evaluation will encourage unsatisfactory performers to voluntarily exit the system or will expedite action to dismiss them.

The authors suggest that, although it may be costly for school districts to initiate new evaluation systems, there are currently “unprecedented opportunities” for schools to attract outside funding for implementing proposed strategies. Major philanthropies are “investing in human capital reform in k-12 and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act contains substantial funding for teacher effectiveness reform.” (p.28)

The Widget Effect. (The Widget Effect, Our National Failure to Acknowledge and Act on Differences in Teacher Effectiveness, 2nd edition, Weisberg, Daniel, Susan Sexton, Jennifer Mulhern, David Keeling, The New Teacher Project, 2001) is worth your time to read. You can find it online at: http://tntp.org/assets/documents/TheWidgetEffect_2nd_ed.pdf?files/TheWidgetEffect_2nd_ed.pdf.

LWVSC Study: *Evaluation and Retention of Effective Teachers*

This two-year study was adopted by delegates at the 2011 state League Convention, and new positions that emerge from the study will be offered for adoption by delegates to the 2013 LWVSC Convention. The study's focus has been on the growing movement toward "results based" evaluation of teachers, nationally and in South Carolina. A study committee has been hard at work, exploring what makes a teacher effective; examining "best practices" in teacher evaluation; and looking for ways to attract and retain effective teachers. This Fall the LWVSC Board will send a Leaders Guide, including questions, to local Leagues for their members to consider in consensus meetings. We ask local Leagues to hold consensus meetings and report results electronically to LWVSC by March 1. Contact Study Co-Chair Jon Butzon with questions (jbutzon@sc.rr.com).

SAVE THE DATE:

2013 LWVSC Convention, April 27-28

The LWVSC's biennial convention is scheduled for beautiful, vibrant "Revolutionary Spartanburg" with LWV of Spartanburg County as convention hosts.

Mark Your Calendars For:

April 27-28, 2013 - Spartanburg

WATCH FOR DETAILS IN THE MAIL AND AT WWW.LWVSC.ORG



Letter to the Editor: *Does Congress Have an Energy Plan?*

By Chester Sansbury, LWV/Columbia Area

It seems Congress has proposed no meaningful energy plan for the country. Recent proposals by SC congressmen for the same old stuff, that is, drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and off SC's shore, are shortsighted.

We need aggressive action that will reduce consumption of oil, stimulate alternate transportation fuels, and stimulate reduction of fossil fuel use for electrical power. Such action will keep more money here and stimulate American jobs.

The costs to our society of climate change have increased dramatically while a dysfunctional Congress dithers. More temperatures records have been set this summer, droughts have increased, crops are failing, shortage of feed is causing

increased slaughtering of cattle, food prices and food shortages are increasing, water shortages are rising, sea levels are rising, and oceans are becoming more acidic. Predictions made decades ago by the world's climate scientists are coming true.

Yet, some members of Congress want to eliminate EPA, cut scientific research funding, and continue tax breaks for fossil fuels. This whole scenario reminds me of the collapse of some past civilizations due to natural resource depletion or climate events in some regions of the globe.

However, current climate change events are now worldwide in scope and over 97% of expert climate scientists agree that human greenhouse gas emissions are a contributing factor.

Recently, at a clean energy business summit in Columbia that I attended, former SC Congressman Bob Inglis proposed that America stop subsidizing the cost of production of all fossil fuels and allow free enterprise to reflect the true cost to society of fossil fuel energy. He believes this will create investment in and increase the use of clean energy sources. However, it begs the question: Will Congress stop tax incentives for big energy corporations? Unfortunately, our Congress is known to act only in case of catastrophic disasters and their main priority is getting reelected. I'm not optimistic that Bob Inglis's plan, while theoretically worthy, will bear great fruit.

What Is Uniform Millage?

By Holley Ulbrich, PhD, LWVSC Off-Board Specialist, State & Local Taxation

A uniform required minimum millage is an alternative to the complex Education Finance Act (EFA) formula for distributing state aid to the state's 85 school districts. EFA has three components – the base student cost, which is set each year by the General Assembly; the adjusted pupil count, which takes into account special needs, poverty, and other factors; and the Index of Taxpaying Ability (ITA), an increasingly imperfect and inaccurate measure of the local district's ability to raise funds for school purposes. Each district is entitled to an amount equal to the base student cost multiplied by the adjusted pupil count. On average, 70% of that amount comes from the state and the other 30% is to be raised locally. Districts get more or less than 70% based on their index of taxpaying ability. They are required to make up the difference between what they get from the state and the total amount to which they are entitled.

EFA is the primary method of redistribution of funds to poorer districts, although it only accounts for about 30% of total operating funds. With Act 388, a significant part of the tax base that is reflected in the ITA, owner-occupied

residential property, is no longer available to provide school operating funds. In addition, there is a two year lag between the ITA and the current distribution of funds.

When South Carolina adopted EFA in the 1970s, it was a fairly typical funding formula. In more recent decades, many states (17-20 depending on how you interpret their formulas) have moved to a simpler measure of local taxpaying ability, called by a variety of names. The name adopted by proponents in South Carolina is uniform required millage. It is simpler to explain and implement, and there is no lag. It still favors poorer districts, but in a more direct way.

Think of state aid to school districts as a bottle of water. The local district imposes millage at the required rate. Right now the conversation is about 100 mills as the required rate. Districts can charge more, but it is the required millage that counts as the local match, the first part of the water bottle to be filled. For some districts, 100 mills would almost fill the EFA bottle; for others, it would just be a bit at the bottom. The state sets a target amount per pupil and makes up the difference between what 100 mills raises

in a particular district and what it takes to fill up the bottle. Federal funds are extra. Funds raised with millage in excess of the required rate are extra. So there will still be differences among districts, but there is a minimum guarantee.

Still to be answered is whether the uniform millage approach will replace EFA or whether it will incorporate other state funding sources as well – EIA, property tax relief, and state grants. Including property tax relief in the formula would undo some of the redistributive effects of Act 388 that greatly favored wealthier districts.

The uniform millage approach was developed in 2007 and 2008 by a task force working with Jim Rex, who was then the State Superintendent of Education. After lengthy discussion in the task force, which included leaders from business, education, and state government, the approach was strongly endorsed by the task force, but until last year no legislation had been introduced. Legislation was introduced in the 2012 session for discussion purposes and is expected to be introduced again in 2013.



Membership . . . *On The Rise*

By Janie Shipley, LWVSC Vice President, Members Services

The League of Women Voters is experiencing a “turn around” in membership numbers, after years of decreasing numbers. This is partly attributed to the Membership and Leadership Development program (MLD) that focuses on coaching support, the intentional use of best practices and dedication to growing the League to make our democracy stronger. Where the MLD program (based on the successful Membership Recruitment Initiative) is being built into state and local League plans, it is successfully rebuilding the League across the country from the grassroots up. Nationally, participating MLD Leagues have experienced a net increase of approximately 1%; this is quite a favorable comparison to a 3% decline in membership among all Leagues.

While the experiences in each League are different, some commonalities have been identified. Most notably, through observation and measured outcomes, we are seeing progress forward- and not just in our increasing membership numbers. This is visible in different ways:

- Stronger connection among levels of League
- Greater internalization of program best practices (i.e., they are doing more of these with less prompting)
- Strengthened community ties
- Expanded relationships with local media and community organizations
- Focused attention on leadership development processes
- More engagement of current LWV members
- Can-do attitude

At the recent League Leader’s Day, Peggy Appler (LWV/Charleston Area, LWVSC Leadership Training Off-Board Specialist, and new member of LWVUS Board of Directors) presented several tools that are in use by SC Leagues to welcome new members; these include a welcome letter, a new member checklist, a member guide, and a survey of interests to determine the specific concerns of new members.

Other techniques being used by SC Leagues to enhance membership recruitment and leadership development include a “Director in Training” position that is being experimented with by the Columbia League. A new member

accepted an appointment as a Director-in-Training. She attends Board meetings but does not have the attendance requirement of elected Board members and learns more about the inner workings of the League.

The Greenville League is encouraging face-to-face meetings with legislators as a means of engaging members and promoting membership retention. See Ted Volskay’s article, A Tête à Tête with State Legislators, in this issue. The Greenville League encourages every League in the state to meet with at least one member of their county legislative delegation. Ted Volskay reports: “*The big advantage of this initiative is that it doesn't cost anything to implement, it is not very time consuming to prepare for, and 2 to 5 people is all you need. Most importantly, if every league in SC met with 2 to 5 of their delegates 2 to 4 times a year, I'm confident that it would make a difference in Columbia.*”

If you have any concerns about membership recruitment or retention and leadership development, contact Janie Shipley at janrel@mindspring.com.



THEY GOT IT!...the joke, as well as the "awards"- Florence City Judge Debra Jackson, left, and Florence County Judge Kimberly Cox, right, react to a description being read of the "Evolution of Authority Awards" (LWV refrigerator magnets) at a Women's Equality Day reception honoring female members of the Florence County judicial system hosted by the Florence League on August 26 at Florary*

LWV of Florence Area Women's Equality Day event is featured on the LWVUS website at the Members Section

Go to www.lwv.org

The League of Women Voters of the Florence Area celebrated **Women's Equality Day** by honoring the **female judges of the county**. There are six female judges in Florence County who were honored at the event: Olanta Town Judge Lucy Coleman of Olanta; Florence County Magistrate Judge Kimberly Cox of Pamplico; Florence County Associate

Chief Magistrate Judge Sandra Grimsley of Lake City; Florence County Magistrate Judge Wendy Lynch of Timmonsville; City of Florence Administrative Judge Debra Jackson of Florence; and Florence County Summary Court Judge Belinda Timmons. Congratulations to the League of Women Voters of the Florence Area and their honorees.

** An ape's footprint followed by a bare footprint of a man, by a man's shoe print, and finally by a dainty high heeled shoe print.*



A TÊTE À TÊTE With State Legislators

By Ted Volskay, LWV/Greenville County Board Director

The League of Women Voters of Greenville County is meeting with some members of the Greenville Delegation to advocate on behalf of League positions that promote democracy and will benefit South Carolina's citizens. Through this initiative, the Greenville County League will demonstrate to the Greenville delegation that the League of Women Voters is an active and growing organization that seeks to establish a respectful but meaningful dialogue with our elected officials. It is also a goal of the Greenville County League to further empower every member of our organization, increase our visibility within our community, and to attract new members who wish to make a difference and know that their voices will be heard in Columbia. Collectively, our voices and influence in Columbia will be leveraged when League organizations throughout South Carolina begin meeting with members of their respective delegations and building constructive relationships

with them.

Greenville League members, **Jan Welch, Ted Volskay, Pat Borenstein and Harriett McIntosh met with South Carolina House of Representatives members Phyllis Henderson and Bruce Bannister**, two members of the Greenville County Delegation. Teacher evaluation, public education funding, and South Carolina Voter ID legislation were discussed. Thoughtful arguments regarding LWV positions on these topics and our concerns about legislative action provided new insights and perspectives to our representatives. We left with promises to keep in touch and meet again.

Our recommendations for other groups interested in initiating a similar project include:

a. Plan to take no more than 5 members to the meeting in order to avoid an intimidating atmosphere.

- b. Include at least one League member who resides within the legislator's district. This member should be the person who contacts the legislator to extend the invitation and make the meeting arrangements.
- c. Accommodate the legislator in setting the time, place, and length of the meeting.
- d. Select the topics to be addressed and let the legislator know what they are.
- e. Prepare your topics so that you are familiar with the legislation, its status, and the League's position. Provide all the participants with copies of that position and data, if possible, to back up League recommendations.
- f. Start the meeting by stressing that the purpose for requesting the meeting is to discuss issues of importance to the League. Keep the meeting focused on a two-way dialogue.
- g. End the meeting with sincere thanks for the opportunity to discuss issues, and then express an interest in further meetings.

Nuclear Waste and SRS Action

By Suzanne Rhodes, LWVSC Off-Board Specialist, Nuclear Issues

Nuclear industry executives, Savannah River Site supporters and our political leaders have been working secretly to pave the way for an "invitation" from the Governor and the Aiken community to bring commercial spent nuclear fuel to SRS. The projects anticipated, in return for the invitation, if they are similar to proposals made public in the past, are very expensive, very long term, probably unrealistic, and usually linked to "demonstrating" that reprocessing of commercial spent fuel is affordable. The promised projects depend upon future Congressional appropriations, which cannot be assured by the current players.

In September an obscure announcement by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has postponed the development of regulatory activities to support reprocessing until at least 2040. That is good news for skeptics, who trust independent reports that reprocessing

is more expensive than the value of the materials retrieved.

Funds for waste management at SRS have been reduced, and schedules have begun to slip. It is likely to take another



Our overriding concern has been that federal funding for SRS cleanup would be compromised by other, more glamorous, "jobs" promises.



15-20 years to clean up the mess. Some of the cleanup challenges are unproven. Old tanks are in the process of being closed, but continue to leak. At the Governor's

Nuclear Advisory Council meeting September 6th, the NAC Chair Karen Patterson described in detail the effects to date of reduced waste management funding at SRS. She urged DOE representatives present at the meeting to urge their leaders to make appropriations requests to Congress to accomplish their responsibilities.

The League and concerned citizen groups are advocating the establishment of a permanent geologic repository. "Temporary" storage at sites such as SRS will surely detract from the geologic program. The nuclear industry in general would be delighted to be able to tell its clients that waste will be sent "away." Communities in general are also concerned; we ALL need to work together to keep up the pressure for a permanent site.

November 6, 2012 - General Election

SC CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT QUESTION

The League of Women Voters of South Carolina wants to make the PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT more easily understood by the voters of South Carolina.

The League of Women Voters only supports or opposes issues that our members have studied and reached consensus on. We have not taken a position for or against this proposed amendment.

The following Constitutional Amendment Question will appear on November 6, 2012, General Election Ballots:

Amendment

Beginning with the general election of 2018, must Section 8 of Article IV of the Constitution of this State be amended to provide that the Lieutenant Governor must be elected jointly with the Governor in a manner prescribed by law; and upon the joint election to add Section 37 to Article III of the Constitution of this State to provide that the Senate shall elect from among the members thereof a President to preside over the Senate and to perform other duties as provided by law; to delete Sections 9 and 10 of Article IV of the Constitution of this State containing inconsistent provisions providing that the Lieutenant Governor is President of the Senate, ex officio, and, while presiding in the Senate, has no vote unless the Senate is equally divided; to amend Section 11 to provide that the Governor shall fill a vacancy in the Office of Lieutenant Governor by appointing a successor with the advice and consent of the Senate; and to amend Section 12 of Article IV of the Constitution of this State to conform appropriate references?

Explanation

A "Yes" vote will require, from 2018 onward, the Governor and Lieutenant Governor to run on the same ticket and be elected to office jointly. The Lieutenant Governor will no longer preside over the Senate and the Senate will elect their presiding officer from within the Senate body.

A "No" vote maintains the current method of electing the Governor and Lieutenant Governor separately. The Lieutenant Governor shall continue to serve as President of the Senate.

Explanation of the Office of Governor and Lieutenant Governor, South Carolina

The Governor is the Chief Executive Officer of the State. The Lieutenant Governor is the second ranking executive officer of the Executive branch. Both are elected every four years by a plurality vote and are limited to two terms.

The chief responsibility of the Lieutenant Governor is to assume the duties of the governor should the Governor die, leave the State for a significant length of time, become ill or disabled; i.e., be unable to complete the term. Otherwise, the Lieutenant Governor has only two

responsibilities: to preside over the Senate (entitled to a vote only in case of a tie) and to oversee and operate the state Office on Aging.

The office of Lieutenant Governor is unique in that (s)he is the only state elected official who is a part of both the legislative and the executive branches of government.

Under the current provisions of the Constitution, the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor run and are elected on separate tickets (may or may not be members of the same political party).

This amendment proposes two major changes:

1. Requires that a candidate for Governor select a candidate to serve as Lieutenant Governor to run for election on a joint (single) ticket.
2. Removes the Lieutenant Governor as presiding officer of the Senate.

What Adoption of the Constitutional Amendment Would Mean

Beginning with the General Election of 2018 "a person seeking the office of Governor" . . . "shall select a qualified elector to serve as Lieutenant Governor . . . (c)andidates for the office of Governor and Lieutenant Governor must be elected jointly" . . . "so that each voter casts a single vote for the office of Governor and Lieutenant Governor."

In case of a vacancy in the office of Lieutenant Governor, the Governor would appoint a successor subject to the "advice and consent of the Senate."

The amendment would remove the Lieutenant Governor as the presiding officer of the Senate and provides that the Senate shall elect from its own members a President to preside over the Senate.

By running on the same ticket as the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor would be squarely in the executive branch of government, helping to ensure that the Governor's agenda would be carried out in case the Governor should be unable to complete the term.

Similarly, by requiring that the Senate choose its own leadership as opposed to being presided over by the Lieutenant Governor, the amendment would place the Senate on the same footing as the House of Representatives. Legislative leadership and decisions would be maintained in the legislative branch without crossover in the proceedings of the General Assembly by a member of the executive branch.

IMPORTANT LEAGUE DATES:



<http://www.facebook.com/pages/League-of-Women-Voters-of-South-Carolina/251544131543145>

November

3rd Saturday, *LWVSC Board Meeting*, 10 a.m. - 3 p.m., at IMG (Laurel Suggs' office), 1600 St. Julian Place, Columbia.*

6th Tuesday, 7 a.m. - 7 p.m., *General Election*

9th Friday, *County Election Commissions hear provisional ballots and canvass votes.*

10th Saturday, Noon, *Deadline for County Election Commissions to certify results & submit to State Election Commission.*

* All members of the League of Women Voters of South Carolina are welcome to attend LWVSC board meetings.



LWV SC Voter

Post Office Box 8453
Columbia, SC 29202

The SC Voter

Fall 2012
Volume 62 Issue 2

Established in 1951, the League of Women Voters of South Carolina is a nonpartisan, political organization that encourages citizens to play an informed and active role in government. At the local, state, and national levels, the League works to influence public policy through education and advocacy. Any citizen of voting age, male or female, may become a League member. All members receive the National Voter, the SC Voter, and a newsletter from their local League.

Co-Presidents: Barbara Zia
Peggy Brown
Editor: Laurel Suggs
Published by: *The League of Women Voters of SC*
PO Box 8453
Columbia, SC 29202
Phone & Fax:
(803) 251-2726
Website: www.lwvsc.org

Nonprofit Org.
U.S. Postage
P-A-I-D
Columbia SC
Permit #1365

★ Have questions about voting?

ELECTION PROTECTION
YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Volunteers from America's largest non-partisan voter protection coalition are ready to answer your voting questions.

Call the Election Protection Hotline

1-866-OUR-VOTE

1-866-687-8683 www.866OurVote.org

Vote on November 6!

Make your vote count.

- ✓ Get Registration Help
- ✓ Report Voting Problems
- ✓ Get Absentee Ballot Info
- ✓ Understand ID Requirements
- ✓ Find Your Polling Place
- ✓ And More...

