

# **MNEA**

**2005**

# **Legislative Report Card**

## **CONTENTS:**

- 1) Senate Grades**
- 2) House Grades**
- 3) Explanation of votes used**

# MNEA Legislative Report Card 2005

*By Otto Fajen, MNEA Legislative Director*

## EXPLANATION OF VOTES USED

The 2005 MNEA Legislative Report Card focuses on issues addressed in the Association's Legislative Platform. As in previous report cards, each legislator receives a percentage score for key floor votes decided by a roll call vote. In addition, the 2005 Report Card includes additional adjustments (each either positive or negative) in three key areas: 1) sponsorship of bills and amendments, 2) behind the scenes advocacy and 3) committee work and committee votes.

Along with adjustments for sponsorship, advocacy and committee work, Missouri NEA used five key roll call votes in the Missouri Senate and eight key votes in the House of Representatives to evaluate the support of legislators for children and public education in the 2005 legislative session. The detailed voting records are grouped by chamber along with a percentage grade for each legislator. The calculation excludes missed votes. A vote of "present" on 3<sup>rd</sup> Reading has the same effect as a "No" vote and is treated as a "No" vote, since passage requires a Constitutional majority of 82 "Yes" votes in the House or 18 "Yes" votes in the Senate. However, a vote of "Present" on an amendment does not affect the outcome and the calculation excludes such votes.

These votes were selected based upon the four main themes of our legislative platform: safe and up-to-date schools, universal free public education, highly qualified teachers and respect for the rights of school employees.

The following discussion lists the votes used to determine the Legislative Report Card, along with a brief synopsis of the issue, MNEA's position on that issue and the outcome of the recorded vote. Please note that the designation of the outcome refers only to the outcome of the ranked vote, and, unless so noted, may not reflect, for example, that a supported or (opposed) measure did or did not become law.

## SENATE VOTES

### 2005 SESSION

#### 1) **Formula - SA 16/SB 287 Requires Full Formula Funding**

**Issue** – SA 16/SB 287 would have required full funding of the newly adopted funding formula, rather than allowing the amount of appropriations for the foundation formula to limit the adequacy level.

**MNEA position – YES** – MNEA strongly supported attempts to guarantee that appropriations levels would not arbitrarily limit the adequacy funding level for public education.

**Outcome – Unfavorable** – The amendment was defeated on a vote largely along party lines.

## 2) **Workers' Comp - SB 1 3rd Reading**

**Issue** – SB 1 substantially weakened worker's compensation protections. Key changes will make work related injuries significantly more difficult to prove and will skew the balance of the process for the selection and review of hearing officers against the interests of workers. The Senate debated and revised the initial bill at length and made compromises that reduced the negative impact of the bill. Senate leaders promised that the final conference committee version would be substantially the same bill, but the House rewrote the bill to include many onerous provisions and, after strong lobbying pressure from the Governor's office and key pro-business lobbyists, the conference committee bill retained those onerous provisions. This is the final Third Reading vote in the Senate on the Conference Committee Substitute that included the more damaging provisions from the House version of the bill.

**MNEA position – NO** – MNEA opposed SB 1 in all its forms, but most strongly opposed the onerous provisions in the House version and in the Conference Committee Substitute

**Outcome – Unfavorable** – The bill was Third Read and passed and signed into law.

## 3) **Retirement - HB 443 3rd Reading**

**Issue** – This bill contains several school retirement provisions, including additional buyback options for prior Social-Security-covered service.

**MNEA Position – YES** –MNEA supported the provisions of the final bill.

**Outcome – Favorable** – The Senate passed HB 443 and the bill became law.

## 4) **Medicaid - SB 539 3rd Reading**

**Issue** – SB 539 authorized significant cutbacks in Medicaid eligibility and terminates the entire Medicaid program in three years. Key among the changes was authority for radical cutbacks in eligibility for the adult Medicaid program that provides

healthcare for working poor, including thousands of parents. The bill moved the adult Medicaid income eligibility from 75% to 23% of federal poverty level. These changes will hurt real, working parents and affect their ability to support their children's development and educational success. Cuts to social programs and higher education funding have been primary ways that legislative leaders have maintained roughly level or slightly increased funding of K-12 education over the last three years without increasing state tax revenues.

**MNEA position – NO** – MNEA strongly opposed the effort to balance the budget on the backs of Missouri's poor, elderly and disabled and urged the legislature to enact measures to increase revenues by comprehensive, fair tax reform. The cuts authorized by SB 539 will make it harder for poor, working parents to ensure their children come to school healthy and ready to learn.

**Outcome – Unfavorable** – The Senate passed SB 539 and the bill ultimately became law.

#### 5) **ECSE Placement - SB 42 3rd Reading**

**Issue** – SB 42 eliminated the private placement preference for Early Childhood Special Education students. SB 874 (2002) enacted this placement preference.

**MNEA Position – YES** – MNEA supported and requested the bill to correct the placement preference. SB 42 restores a process in line with federal law and allows the IEP team to make the appropriate placement decision without artificial financial constraints or an arbitrary placement preference.

**Outcome – Favorable** – The Senate passed SB 42. The Senate passed SB 42, and the same provision was included in SB 500 and did become law.

## **HOUSE VOTES**

### **2005 SESSION**

#### 1) **Formula - HSA 2/HA 2 Small Schools Grants**

**Issue** – The legislature spent considerable time debating and revising a new foundation formula in SB 287. However, the Governor's office and legislative leaders placed strict limits on the overall cost and thus the adequacy of the new formula. When the House took up SB 287, numerous amendments were drafted and distributed in an effort to improve the adequacy and equity of the proposed formula. However, new House rules required all amendments to be drafted and distributed prior to the bill being

taken up for debate. Further, the House rules committee voted HB 287 out “without a time limit for debate”. Unfortunately, this meant that all amendment sponsors had to be recognized by the Speaker, rather than having equal time for both the bill sponsor and minority floor leader to recognize amendment sponsors. The Speaker recognized a carefully scripted list of sponsors who offered a sequence of amendments carefully designed to procedurally “lock out” amendments that would have increased the adequacy, equity and cost. The vote on HSA 2/HA 2 is representative of this effort to stifle meaningful debate. HA 2 revised the flawed “small schools” provision in the bill. This provision ostensibly is to help provide needed funds to very small schools that have particularly inadequate funding due to high fixed costs. HA 2 still would have provided less aid to the very small districts that most need the additional aid and created an incentive for small districts to consolidate into districts with just under 350 pupils. HSA 2 would have greatly improved the small schools provision by targeting more funds to the smallest districts while phasing the aid out smoothly at 350 pupils.

**MNEA Position - YES** – MNEA supported HSA 2 as a way to correct the fundamental flaw in the small schools provision and allow it to truly compensate for the breakdown of the per pupil funding model for the very smallest districts.

**Outcome – Unfavorable** – The amendment was rejected by the same voting bloc that supported the carefully scripted amendments that locked out meaningful debate. The House defeated HSA 2 and adopted HA 2. SB 287 was passed by the House and signed into law.

## 2) **Vouchers - HA 2/HB 639 Requires MAP Testing**

**Issue** – HB 639 would have created a tax credit voucher to provide indirect state aid to private religious and home schools. HA 2 addressed a key flaw in the tax credit voucher concept: the lack of public accountability of private, religious and home schools receiving public funds through a tax credit voucher. The HA would have required any school accepting the voucher funds to participate in MAP assessments for its students.

**MNEA Position - YES** – The Association supported this amendment as a way to highlight the fundamental problem of providing public funds to unaccountable private, religious and home schools.

**Outcome – Favorable** – The HA was adopted. HB 639 was further amended, but was not put to a final vote by the House, nor was the language enacted in any other bill.

## 3) **HA 3/HB 639 – No Intent to Reduce State Aid for Schools**

**Issue** – The fiscal note for HB 639 erroneously showed a neutral impact on state revenues despite the added tax credits of up to \$40 million authorized by the bill. The bill would have reduced state aid for districts that lost students due to the vouchers, and

the legislative oversight staff erroneously interpreted this as implying a legislative intent to reduce formula appropriations by a like amount. HA 3 clarified that the bill would not be interpreted to express an intent to reduce state formula aid, thus clarified that the fiscal note for the bill should reflect the loss of up to \$40 million in state revenues.

**MNEA Position - YES** – MNEA supported HA 3, since it clarified the harmful fiscal impact of HB 639 and gave the legislature the opportunity to state an intention not to reduce state formula aid.

**Outcome – Favorable** – HA 3 was adopted. HB 639 was further amended, but was not put to a final vote by the House, nor was the language enacted in any other bill.

#### 4) **Vouchers - HA 4/HB 639 Must Fully Fund Formula**

**Issue** – HA 4 stated that the tax credit vouchers of HB 639 would only go into effect once the school aid formula is fully funded.

**MNEA Position - YES** – MNEA supported this amendment to ensure that the tax credits of HB 539 would not be in effect unless the formula was fully funded, thereby ensuring that the loss of state revenues from the tax credit voucher could not cause the school formula to be underfunded. .

**Outcome – Favorable** – HA 4 was adopted. HB 639 was not put to a final vote by the House, nor was the language enacted in any other bill.

#### 5) **Merit Pay - HB 539 3rd Reading**

**Issue** – HB 539 would have repealed the current law requirement that teachers be paid according to a salary schedule. This would allow districts to adopt so-called “merit pay.”

**MNEA position – NO** – MNEA strongly opposes so-called “merit pay.” “Merit pay” has been tried in districts in several states and has usually been unpopular and quickly abandoned due to the perceived subjectivity of the process and the narrow focus used to evaluate an employee.

**Outcome – Unfavorable** – The House passed HB 539. However, the bill was not passed by the Senate and was not enacted in any other bill.

#### 6) **Workers' Comp - SB 1 3rd Reading**

**Issue** – SB 1 substantially weakened worker’s compensation protections. Key changes will make work related injuries significantly more difficult to prove and will skew the balance of the process for the selection and review of hearing officers against the interests of workers. The Senate debated and revised the initial bill at length and made compromises that reduced the negative impact of the bill. The House rewrote the bill to include many onerous provisions deleted or modified by the Senate.

**MNEA position – NO** – MNEA opposed SB 1 in all its forms, but most strongly opposed the onerous provisions from the House version.

**Outcome – Unfavorable** – The bill was Third Read, passed by the House, and enacted into law in substantially the form passed by the House.

## 7) Retirement - HB 443 3rd Reading

**Issue** – This bill contains several school retirement provisions, including additional buyback options for prior Social-Security-covered service.

**MNEA Position – YES** –MNEA supported the provisions of the final bill.

**Outcome – Favorable** – HB 443 was passed by the House and Senate and became law.

## 8) Medicaid - SB 539 3rd Reading

**Issue** – SB 539 authorized significant cutbacks in Medicaid eligibility and terminates the entire Medicaid program in three years. Key among the changes was authority for radical cutbacks in eligibility for the adult Medicaid program that provides healthcare for working poor, including thousands of parents. The bill moved the adult Medicaid income eligibility from 75% to 23% of federal poverty level. These changes will hurt real, working parents and affect their ability to support their children’s development and educational success. Cuts to social programs and higher education funding have been primary ways that legislative leaders have maintained roughly level or slightly increased funding of K-12 education over the last three years without increasing state tax revenues.

**MNEA position – NO** – MNEA strongly opposed the effort to balance the budget on the backs of Missouri’s poor, elderly and disabled and urged the legislature to enact measures to increase revenues by comprehensive, fair tax reform. The cuts authorized by SB 539 will make it harder for poor, working parents to ensure their children come to school healthy and ready to learn.

**Outcome – Unfavorable** – The House passed SB 539 and the Governor signed the bill into law.



## 2005 MNEA Legislative Report Card - Senate

Member	District	Party Affiliation	1 - Formula - SA 16/SB 287 Requires Full Formula Funding		2 - Workers' Comp - SB 1 3rd Reading		3 - Retirement - HB 443 3rd Reading		4 - Medicaid - SB 539 3rd Reading		5 - ECSE Placement - SB 42 3rd Reading		Points Possible	Points	Vote Score	Bill/Amendment Sponsorships	Behind the Scenes Advocacy	Committee Work	Total Score	Grade
			Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No										
MNEA Position			Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No								
<u>Harry Kennedy</u>	1	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	5	5	100%	3	10	0	100%	A				
<u>Jon Dolan</u>	2	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	5	2	40%	-5	-3	0	32%	F				
<u>Kevin Engler</u>	3	R	-	-	+	+	+	+	5	3	60%	0	5	3	68%	B				
<u>Pat Dougherty</u>	4	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	5	5	100%	10	10	5	100%	A				
<u>Maida Coleman</u>	5	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	5	5	100%	7	7	0	100%	A				
<u>Carl Vogel</u>	6	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	5	2	40%	0	0	0	40%	D				
<u>John Loudon</u>	7	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	5	2	40%	0	0	-3	37%	F				
<u>Matt Bartle</u>	8	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	5	2	40%	-5	0	3	38%	F				
<u>Yvonne Wilson</u>	9	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	5	5	100%	5	10	10	100%	A				
<u>Charles Wheeler</u>	10	D	L	+	+	+	+	+	4	4	100%	5	3	0	100%	A				
<u>Victor Callahan</u>	11	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	5	5	100%	3	10	7	100%	A				
<u>David Klindt</u>	12	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	5	2	40%	3	0	0	43%	D				
<u>Timothy P. Green</u>	13	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	5	5	100%	5	5	5	100%	A				
<u>Rita Heard Days</u>	14	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	5	5	100%	7	7	10	100%	A				
<u>Michael Gibbons</u>	15	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	5	2	40%	5	5	3	53%	C				
<u>Frank Barnitz</u>	16	D	O	O	+	O	O					0	0	0		N/A				
<u>Luann Ridgeway</u>	17	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	5	2	40%	3	5	0	48%	D				
<u>John Cauthorn</u>	18	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	5	2	40%	-5	0	3	38%	F				
<u>Chuck Graham</u>	19	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	5	5	100%	5	10	10	100%	A				
<u>Dan Clemens</u>	20	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	5	2	40%	3	0	0	43%	D				
<u>Bill Stouffer</u>	21	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	5	2	40%	0	0	0	40%	D				
<u>Bill Alter</u>	22	R	O	O	+	O	O					0	0	0		N/A				
<u>Chuck Gross</u>	23	R	-	+	+	-	+	+	5	3	60%	5	3	3	71%	B				
<u>Joan Bray</u>	24	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	5	5	100%	10	7	5	100%	A				
<u>Rob Mayer</u>	25	R	-	-	+	+	+	+	5	3	60%	5	0	0	65%	B				
<u>John Griesheimer</u>	26	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	5	2	40%	5	5	3	53%	C				
<u>Jason Crowell</u>	27	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	5	2	40%	-5	0	0	35%	F				
<u>Delbert Scott</u>	28	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	5	2	40%	0	0	0	40%	D				
<u>Larry Gene Taylor</u>	29	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	5	2	40%	5	3	0	48%	D				
<u>Jack Goodman</u>	29	R	O	O	O	O	O		0	0		0	0	0		N/A				
<u>Norma Champion</u>	30	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	5	2	40%	0	0	0	40%	D				
<u>Chris Koster</u>	31	R	-	+	+	-	+	+	5	3	60%	3	3	0	66%	B				
<u>Gary Nodler</u>	32	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	5	2	40%	-5	3	3	41%	D				
<u>Chuck Purgason</u>	33	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	5	2	40%	-5	-3	0	32%	F				
<u>Charlie Shields</u>	34	R	-	-	+	-	+	+	5	2	40%	0	7	7	54%	C				

## 2005 MNEA Legislative Report Card - House

Member	District Number	Party Affiliation	1 - Formula - HSA 2/HA 2/SB 287 Small Schools Grants	2 - Vouchers - HA 2/HB 639 Requires MAP Testing	3 - Vouchers - HA 3/HB 639 No Intent to Reduce State Aid for Schools	4 - Vouchers - HA 4/HB 639 Must Fully Fund Formula	5 - Merit Pay - HB 539 3rd Reading	6 - Workers' Comp - SB 1 3rd Reading	7 - Retirement - HB 443 3rd Reading	8 - Medicaid - SB 539 3rd Reading	Points Possible	Points	Vote Score	Bill/Amendment Sponsorships	Behind the Scenes Advocacy	Committee Work	Total Score	Grade
MNEA Position			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No								
Munzlinger	001	R	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	3	38%	0	0	0	38%	D
Behnen	002	R	-	-	+	-	-	L	+	-	7	2	29%	0	-5	0	24%	F
Whorton	003	D	-	+	-	+	+	+	P	+	7	5	71%	0	3	0	74%	B
Lager	004	R	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	8	4	50%	-7	3	0	46%	D
Guest	005	R	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	8	4	50%	0	0	0	50%	C
Bringer	006	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	10	10	10	100%	A
Quinn	007	R	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	3	38%	0	0	0	38%	D
Chinn	008	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Shoemyer	009	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	5	10	0	100%	A
Witte	010	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	0	5	0	100%	A
Henke	011	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	3	7	5	100%	A
Parker	012	R	-	L	L	L	L	-	+	+	4	2	50%	0	0	0	50%	C
Rupp	013	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Smith 014	014	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	3	3	0	31%	F
Faith	015	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Bearden	016	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	-10	-10	-10	0%	F
Schneider	017	R	-	+	L	+	-	-	+	+	7	4	57%	0	3	0	60%	C
Dempsey	018	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	3	3	0	31%	F
Davis	019	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	8	1	13%	-10	-5	0	0%	F
Moore	020	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	-3	-3	0	19%	F
Hobbs	021	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Sander	022	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	8	1	13%	3	0	0	16%	F
Harris 023	023	D	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	8	7	88%	3	10	3	100%	A
Robb	024	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	5	-5	-5	20%	F
Baker 025	025	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	5	10	10	100%	A
Aull	026	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	10	10	10	100%	A
Wildberger	027	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	3	5	0	100%	A
Schaaf	028	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	8	1	13%	0	0	0	13%	F
Rucker	029	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	0	0	-3	97%	A
Brown 030	030	R	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	8	4	50%	0	3	0	53%	C
Skaggs	031	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	0	5	0	100%	A
Phillips	032	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Noite	033	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Flook	034	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F

## 2005 MNEA Legislative Report Card - House

Member	District Number	Party Affiliation	1 - Formula - HSA 2/HA 2/SB 287 Small Schools Grants	2 - Vouchers - HA 2/HB 639 Requires MAP Testing	3 - Vouchers - HA 3/HB 639 No Intent to Reduce State Aid for Schools	4 - Vouchers - HA 4/HB 639 Must Fully Fund Formula	5 - Merit Pay - HB 539 3rd Reading	6 - Workers' Comp - SB 1 3rd Reading	7 - Retirement - HB 443 3rd Reading	8 - Medicaid - SB 539 3rd Reading	Points Possible	Points	Vote Score	Bill/Amendment Sponsorships	Behind the Scenes Advocacy	Committee Work	Total Score	Grade
MNEA Position			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No								
Ervin	035	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	3	5	0	33%	F
Nance	036	R	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	8	5	63%	0	0	0	63%	C
Brooks	037	D	+	L	L	L	-	L	P	+	4	2	50%	5	0	0	55%	C
Silvey	038	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Low	039	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	3	7	10	100%	A
Burnett	040	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	3	10	10	100%	A
Curls	041	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	3	7	3	100%	A
Hughes	042	D	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	8	6	75%	0	5	3	83%	B
Bland	043	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	5	10	10	100%	A
Lowe	044	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	0	5	3	100%	A
Jolly	045	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	5	10	10	100%	A
Meiners	046	D	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	8	5	63%	0	0	0	63%	C
Johnson 047	047	R	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	8	4	50%	10	10	10	80%	B
Kraus	048	R	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	8	5	63%	3	3	0	69%	B
Young	049	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	3	5	3	100%	A
Brown 050	050	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	0	3	0	100%	A
Salva	051	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	0	3	0	100%	A
LeVota	052	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	7	10	7	100%	A
Dougherty	053	D	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	+	8	7	88%	0	0	3	91%	A
Dusenberg	054	R	-	-	+	-	-	L	+	-	7	2	29%	0	3	3	35%	F
Pratt	055	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	3	3	-3	28%	F
Yates	056	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	3	0	0	28%	F
El-Amin	057	D	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	8	5	63%	0	5	7	75%	B
Hubbard	058	D	+	-	-	-	L	+	+	+	7	4	57%	-10	-5	-5	37%	D
Oxford	059	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	5	10	0	100%	A
Boykins	060	D	+	L	L	L	-	L	+	+	4	3	75%	3	5	3	86%	A
Johnson 061	061	D	+	+	+	P	+	+	+	+	7	7	100%	10	10	5	100%	A
Wood	062	R	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	8	4	50%	0	3	0	53%	C
Wright-Jones	063	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	0	7	3	100%	A
Storch	064	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	3	5	0	100%	A
Kratky	065	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	0	3	0	100%	A
Vogt	066	D	+	L	+	L	+	+	+	+	6	6	100%	0	0	0	100%	A
Daus	067	D	+	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	7	88%	0	0	0	88%	A
Sater	068	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	L	-	7	1	14%	0	0	0	14%	F

## 2005 MNEA Legislative Report Card - House

Member	District Number	Party Affiliation	1 - Formula - HSA 2/HA 2/SB 287 Small Schools Grants	2 - Vouchers - HA 2/HB 639 Requires MAP Testing	3 - Vouchers - HA 3/HB 639 No Intent to Reduce State Aid for Schools	4 - Vouchers - HA 4/HB 639 Must Fully Fund Formula	5 - Merit Pay - HB 539 3rd Reading	6 - Workers' Comp - SB 1 3rd Reading	7 - Retirement - HB 443 3rd Reading	8 - Medicaid - SB 539 3rd Reading	Points Possible	Points	Vote Score	Bill/Amendment Sponsorships	Behind the Scenes Advocacy	Committee Work	Total Score	Grade
MNEA Position			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No								
Walsh	069	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	L	+	7	7	100%	0	0	0	100%	A
Bowman	070	D	+	L	+	+	+	+	+	+	7	7	100%	5	5	0	100%	A
Haywood	071	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	0	3	3	100%	A
Chappelle-Nadal	072	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	3	10	5	100%	A
Donnelly	073	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	10	10	5	100%	A
George	074	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	L	L	6	6	100%	5	7	7	100%	A
Darrough	075	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	L	+	7	7	100%	3	7	3	100%	A
Spreng	076	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	0	3	0	100%	A
Corcoran	077	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	5	10	10	100%	A
Zweifel	078	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	3	10	3	100%	A
Liese	079	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	0	5	0	100%	A
Hoskins	080	D	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+	8	5	63%	-10	-7	-10	36%	D
Walton	081	D	+	+	+	L	+	+	+	+	7	7	100%	0	5	0	100%	A
Page	082	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	0	3	0	100%	A
Fraser	083	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	5	10	7	100%	A
Ice	084	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	-5	0	0	20%	F
Lembke	085	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	3	3	0	31%	F
Cunningham 086	086	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	-10	-10	-10	0%	F
Muschany	087	R	-	-	+	-	L	-	+	-	7	2	29%	-5	-3	-3	18%	F
StOnge	088	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Jackson	089	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Johnson 090	090	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	L	+	7	7	100%	5	10	3	100%	A
Fares	091	R	-	+	P	P	-	-	+	-	6	2	33%	7	5	7	52%	C
Portwood	092	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Stefanick	093	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	-5	-5	-5	10%	F
Byrd	094	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	3	0	0	28%	F
Avery	095	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	8	5	0	38%	D
Yaeger	096	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	L	+	7	7	100%	0	0	0	100%	A
Bivins	097	R	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	3	38%	5	5	0	48%	D
Nieves	098	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	-3	0	22%	F
Sutherland	099	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	5	5	5	40%	D
Schoemehl	100	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	5	10	5	100%	A
Meadows	101	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	L	+	7	7	100%	3	10	3	100%	A
Roorda	102	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	0	3	0	100%	A

## 2005 MNEA Legislative Report Card - House

Member	District Number	Party Affiliation	1 - Formula - HSA 2/HA 2/SB 287 Small Schools Grants	2 - Vouchers - HA 2/HB 639 Requires MAP Testing	3 - Vouchers - HA 3/HB 639 No Intent to Reduce State Aid for Schools	4 - Vouchers - HA 4/HB 639 Must Fully Fund Formula	5 - Merit Pay - HB 539 3rd Reading	6 - Workers' Comp - SB 1 3rd Reading	7 - Retirement - HB 443 3rd Reading	8 - Medicaid - SB 539 3rd Reading	Points Possible	Points	Vote Score	Bill/Amendment Sponsorships	Behind the Scenes Advocacy	Committee Work	Total Score	Grade
MNEA Position			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No								
Casey	103	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	0	3	0	100%	A
Wagner	104	D	+	+	+	+	+	L	+	+	7	7	100%	0	3	0	100%	A
Selby	105	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	L	+	7	7	100%	0	5	0	100%	A
Tilley	106	R	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	5	0	0	30%	F
Robinson	107	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	0	0	0	100%	A
Villa	108	D	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	8	5	63%	0	3	0	66%	B
Threlkeld	109	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Harris 110	110	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	3	5	0	100%	A
Schlottach	111	R	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	8	4	50%	0	0	0	50%	C
Loehner	112	R	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	8	4	50%	0	0	0	50%	C
Bruns	113	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Deeken	114	R	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	8	4	50%	0	3	10	63%	C
Schad	115	R	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	8	4	50%	0	0	3	53%	C
Self	116	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Jones 117	117	R	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	8	4	50%	0	0	0	50%	C
Smith 118	118	R	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	3	38%	0	0	0	38%	D
Wilson 119	119	R	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	-3	0	0	22%	F
Cooper 120	120	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	-5	-10	-10	0%	F
Pearce	121	R	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	8	4	50%	3	3	0	56%	C
McGhee	122	R	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	8	4	50%	0	0	0	50%	C
Baker 123	123	R	-	+	+	+	P	-	+	-	8	5	63%	5	10	7	85%	B
Rector	124	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Fisher	125	R	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	3	38%	0	0	0	38%	D
Emery	126	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Hunter	127	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	8	1	13%	-10	-10	-10	0%	F
Stevenson	128	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	L	L	6	0	0%	0	-5	0	0%	F
Richard	129	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	8	1	13%	0	0	0	13%	F
Wilson 130	130	R	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	8	4	50%	0	0	3	53%	C
Ruestman	131	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	8	1	13%	0	0	0	13%	F
Goodman	132	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Parson	133	R	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	8	4	50%	0	0	0	50%	C
Viebrock	134	R	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	8	4	50%	0	3	0	53%	C
Denison	135	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	5	3	0	33%	F
Marsh	136	R	-	L	L	L	L	-	+	L	3	1	33%	3	0	0	36%	D

## 2005 MNEA Legislative Report Card - House

Member	District Number	Party Affiliation	1 - Formula - HSA 2/HA 2/SB 287 Small Schools Grants	2 - Vouchers - HA 2/HB 639 Requires MAP Testing	3 - Vouchers - HA 3/HB 639 No Intent to Reduce State Aid for Schools	4 - Vouchers - HA 4/HB 639 Must Fully Fund Formula	5 - Merit Pay - HB 539 3rd Reading	6 - Workers' Comp - SB 1 3rd Reading	7 - Retirement - HB 443 3rd Reading	8 - Medicaid - SB 539 3rd Reading	Points Possible	Points	Vote Score	Bill/Amendment Sponsorships	Behind the Scenes Advocacy	Committee Work	Total Score	Grade
MNEA Position			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No								
Wright 137	137	R	-	L	-	L	-	-	+	-	6	1	17%	0	0	0	17%	F
Lampe	138	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	5	10	10	100%	A
Roark	139	R	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	8	1	13%	-5	-5	-5	0%	F
Dixon	140	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	-3	-3	0	19%	F
Wasson	141	R	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	3	38%	0	0	0	38%	D
Weter	142	R	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	8	4	50%	0	0	0	50%	C
Wallace	143	R	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	8	4	50%	5	10	10	75%	B
Kelly	144	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Cunningham 145	145	R	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	8	3	38%	0	0	0	38%	D
Pollock	146	R	-	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	8	3	38%	0	0	0	38%	D
Wells	147	R	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	3	38%	0	0	0	38%	D
Day	148	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
May	149	R	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Barnitz	150	D	O	L	L	L	+	+	+	+	4	4	100%	0	3	0	100%	A
Franz	151	R	-	+	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	3	38%	0	0	0	38%	D
Kuessner	152	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	8	8	100%	3	3	0	100%	A
Dethrow	153	R	-	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Kingery	154	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	3	7	10	45%	D
Cooper 155	155	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Jetton	156	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	-5	0	20%	F
Lipke	157	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	5	0	0	30%	F
Cooper 158	158	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Wright 159	159	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Myers	160	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	8	2	25%	0	0	0	25%	F
Black	161	R	-	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	8	3	38%	0	3	0	41%	D
Swinger	162	D	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	L	7	7	100%	5	5	7	100%	A
Bean	163	R	-	L	L	L	L	L	+	+	3	2	67%	-5	0	0	62%	N/A