



**Fighting for the Schools
Our Students Deserve**

May 22 Bargaining Report

Overview

On Monday, May 22, we met with the SFUSD bargaining team for our 10th session. It has been one week since the District shared its counter to our Economic Package. We have heard our colleagues' resounding "NO" to their 5% proposal, and we echo it.

At every step of this process, our big bargaining team made it clear that we are committed to putting in the work to ensure we can reach a deal before we go on summer break. We have restated this repeatedly over the last two months. We spent countless hours creating proposals to address many issues our educators, students, and schools face. It is in the District's best interest to consider these proposals because they will absolutely stabilize SFUSD. Despite our best efforts to find a solution, the District is dragging its feet, and their bargaining team is responsible for the lack of progress we've seen to date.

Last night, we exchanged counters, including sending our classified and certificated economic proposals back across the table to them. When we returned our economic proposals to their team, we shared powerful personal stories with them about why these proposals are so crucial to our entire school community. We are hopeful this had a real impact on their bargaining team.

Our next bargaining session is set for Wednesday, May 24, at 3 pm. If there is any chance of reaching a deal before we leave on break, this would be the day to get it done. We remain committed to doing everything possible to make that happen, but we need the district bargaining team to do the same.

Proposals

You can read a summary of each proposal passed last night below.

The District started with emergency class coverage. The District accepted that no middle or HS teacher would be forced to provide emergency coverage without the member's and immediate supervisor's agreement. The District also recognized UESF's initial counter that would provide relief teachers compensation for coverage when they must take additional students into their class to support coverage issues. The current counter also specifically

codifies the union's and District's understanding that classified members would not be asked to cover a class in place of an absent teacher, which is in alignment with the law.

The District's second counter was on reassignments for Support Services members (SSW, SDN, SLP, etc.). The District submitted a counter accepting most of the language UESF proposed with some changes. Specific items include when involuntarily transferred, unit members will receive one day off to move to the new site and get situated before starting the new assignment. There is still disagreement on requests for voluntary transfer and the terms by which the District can initiate an involuntary transfer.

For their third counter on Leaves, the District submitted a counter that includes the use of hours (7) and days (1) language, which is what UESF bargaining team members wanted. There was progress made in the District's counter, regarding a rejected proposal that would have required doctors notes for absences on certain days of the week. The District is asking the union also to be responsible for letting our members know when they have been accepted to the sick leave bank, even though UESF contends that the District should be responsible as the District manages the accrual and amendments to employee sick time allocations.

With the fourth counter on Class Sizes, the District countered with a "goal" of 11 students to 1 educators ratio all TK classes. Similarly, the District countered UESF's proposed limit of 25 students, with a "goal of 28" students for Grade 4-5 combo classes. The District rejected limits that UESF proposed for Middle and High School classes that would have addressed the needs of our focal student populations, including those with IEPs. UESF argued this proposed guidance for scheduling students that considers class size limits and ratios, at High Potential Schools, would best support the whole-child approach to ensuring equitable access to education for all students.

Lastly, the District had a fifth counter proposal rejecting, for a second time, that unit members living within the district would have priority for their children to be able to attend the school where the staff member *is working* OR to ensure a unit member would be guaranteed an Interdistrict Transfer for those living outside of the district. UESF was surprised to see the District reject this proposal again, as it could only positively impact the District's current student enrollment. We emphasized that creating this benefit would help in attracting and retaining educators. However, the District insists that giving educators' children preference would violate Board Policy 5101, although they failed to cite what particular part of the Policy would apply. Instead, the District proposed creating a committee with UESF to lobby the Board to make the changes we seek, instead of bargaining the contract.

UESF shared counters to our economic packages. Three classified educators shared their personal experiences about how the District's 5% proposal was disrespectful. UESF re-submitted the original offer of an increase to \$30 (or an 8% increase) as the base for the first year, with an 8% increase for all classified staff in the second year of the contract. In the last counter, the District rejected any mention of longevity for classified staff. UESF bargaining team members decided to continue to fight for longevity pay for classified staff, as 60% of current paraeducators have 5 or more years with SFUSD, and many well beyond the last

salary step. Three classified members spoke to the truth and experiences of classified staff regarding their service to our students and how the current compensation is tragic. Our classified staff is on the front line supporting and educating our students across the District, and they deserve a fair and just wage that reflects their commitment to our students.

UESF then followed with a counter of the certificated economic package. UESF had originally asked for a \$12,000 increase for every step of the certificated pay schedule in the first year and an 8% increase across the Board in the second year. The District had countered with a single increase of 5%-- in spite of their often-expressed goal of attracting and retaining educators in SFUSD. UESF responded to this disrespectful offer by sending the original proposal back to the District so they could "try again" with something more reasonable and fair instead of their less serious offer. Early, middle, and veteran career teachers spoke directly to the District and testified how the District's offer was disrespectful to the realities of living in one of the most expensive cities in the U.S.

UESF followed the economic package counters with another attempt for a new article 40 that would address the issues that our school social workers (SSW) and nurses (SDN) experience currently. The District had previously rejected, in its entirety, any language that would serve to offer dignity to our SSWs and SDNs. The work that our SSWs and SDNs provide for our students is specific, and their knowledge and background is essential for the safety and growth of our students. UESF maintains that the District must reconsider UESF's proposal in order to ensure that the work of our SSWs and SDNs can continue to be robust and thorough.

The last counter-proposal that UESF offered covered both certificated and classified members' access to professional development (PD) for all. UESF argued that allowing members to visit colleagues and their classrooms, schools, or programs to learn from peers is essential. Additionally, UESF asked for appropriate compensation for Induction mentors, as this work is substantial but also critical to ensuring qualified educators are retained. UESF asked that induction members receive \$4,500 per inductee per year and accepted the District's stipend for New Member Support mentors (\$1,400 per mentee per year). For "job-alike" meeting, UESF countered with three days a year for full-day training and monthly meetings, instead of the district's proposed single day.

Timeline

Wednesday, May 24th	Thursday, May 25th	Friday, June 2nd
Bargaining 3pm	Strike Readiness for Site Leaders Training	End of Year Social RSVP

Next Steps

We will be back at the table again on Wednesday, for as long as it takes to get a deal done this week. But given the District's current positions, counters, and rejections, we are also

preparing for what we hope is an avoidable strike in the Fall if we can't reach an agreement before we go on summer break. On Thursday, May 25, from 5:30-7:30 pm at O'Connell high school, we are holding a "Strike Readiness for Site Leaders Training." This training will equip our site and work area leaders with the necessary skills and knowledge to be ready for a potential strike. Check in with your UBC and ensure someone from your site or work area is signed up to come!

For More Information

Talk to your union building representative or to your site's bargaining team member.

Or email Organizing@uesf.org or ask-uesf@uesf.org

Together We Win!