



**Fighting for the Schools
Our Students Deserve**

May 24 Bargaining Report

Overview

On Wednesday, May 24, we met with the SFUSD bargaining team for a 12th session. We did exchange a number of proposals, although we have been unable to reach a deal that would stabilize our schools for the Fall. Unfortunately, the district's bargaining team began to move more quickly just this week, too near to the end of the year. We are still too far apart on meaningful and equitable compensation, community schools, special education caseloads, priority school placement and protections from poor management decisions.

Given the fact that the District indicated its readiness to move closer together so late in the 22-23 school year, we need to prepare to keep up the escalating pressure on the district to make an agreement that provides for the schools our students deserve. UESF's bargaining team has put in hours of effort to bring reasonable and targeted proposals that improves wages and working conditions, contribute fully staffing our schools, support our students and provide protections from mistakes caused by poor management decisions. Tonight, site leaders will be in an initial training for strike readiness. We recognize that while we will do everything possible to reach an agreement, we have to be ready to take collective action if necessary. The training tonight will equip our site leaders with the necessary skills and knowledge to prepare for any necessary escalating actions in the Fall. So far, we have over 70 schools signed up to come!

Our power lies in organizing of educators, along with students, families and community members all year at our school sites. Expanding that work together is exactly what we need to win the schools our students deserve. We have proven that we are stronger at the negotiations table with our big bargaining team and at our school sites, where hundreds of you have spent the last few months organizing and picketing.

Proposals

We started bargaining with a response to their counter on our community schools proposal. UESF continues to insist on language to give schools the tools to implement the community school model that has been implemented in other parts of the City and the state. Nick Chandler, a school social worker and community school coordinator at BVHM, spoke

passionately and impactfully about the importance of aligning our work, our policy, and practice with the actual voiced needs of our students and families. UESF Secretary Leslie Hu, a nationally recognized expert on community schools and one of the country's longest-serving community school advocates and coordinators, noted the importance of the voice of SFUSD's homegrown experts' advice to shape this work. Both articulated that the tangible results of the practices they helped shape at their schools have been transformative for our most underserved and marginalized students in all the metrics SFUSD district management claims to care about. UESF is fighting for our students and families, and we invite district management to join us in this work, not just pay it lip service.

Our next counter was about sub-coverage and creating our substitute core. We agreed to lower the number of assignments a substitute teacher must take (10 per year) to keep their active status. The rationale was that keeping a large sub-pool costs nothing, but continually onboarding new substitute recruits is expensive in both time and money. Additionally, to incentivize current sub paras to join the core para substitute pool, we proposed that if a sub para becomes a core para, they will receive the \$1 increase in pay retroactive to hours they worked as a sub para from the start of the current semester.

The District started with their counter to our site-based meetings proposal. We had proposed to increase the number of meetings to 8 hours per month by including faculty meetings into the count. However, the District responded by accepting the additional two hours of meeting time and expecting us to attend two other faculty meetings every month!

We reached an agreement on language regarding emergency sub-class coverage. We agreed that middle and high school members could not be forced to provide emergency coverage. In addition, relief teachers will now be compensated for receiving additional students when an emergency sub-coverage plan has been activated.

The District then countered our caseload cap proposal. The District rejected the hard cap limit. Instead, they want to create a subjective measure of "a workload that requires extra support," and only then would they possibly provide extra support or possible recompense. This is a way for the District to avoid additional hiring and to create a condition where additional labor can be extracted from our specialists if they are in a significantly impacted school. The District acknowledged that there is an ever-increasing demand for special education support. There needs to be firm cut-offs to ensure that we stop similarly rising rates of provider burnout.

The District finally countered our proposal on protecting school social workers (SSWs) and school district nurses (SDNs). We proposed protecting SSWs' and SDNs' from being asked to perform duties outside their role, such as supervision and emergency class coverage. However, the District continues to reject these basic protections. Instead, they proposed to merely ask site administrators to "prioritize" the functions of SSWs and SDNs over other duties.

The District bargaining team ended its counter-proposal offerings with both economic packages.

Classified: The District did not move on its offer of a \$29/hour minimum or 5% increase, whichever is higher (down from the \$30/hour or 8% we proposed). They did make some minimal movement on longevity increases. They accepted our longevity increase pay structure, but drastically reduced what we asked for. We proposed pay increases at 5, 10, 15, and 20 years of 5%, 10%, 15%, and 20%, respectively. They countered with 1%, 2%, 3%, and 4%. Finally, they accepted our compromise on floating holidays of 6 per year, up from the current 4. The District's proposal only offered one year of compensation.

Certificated: The District continued only to offer increases for one year. They held to extend the 2024-2025 year by one day. Additionally, they proposed offering a \$1,000 per year stipend for staff in hard-to-staff roles through 2026 while proposing that they designate SSW and SDN positions as hard-to-fill positions so that they would qualify for this stipend instead of offering additional certification bonuses. As for a pay increase, the District proposed a one-year \$5,500 increase for every salary square. This new proposal is not substantially different than what the District last proposed, and it is still very far from the fair compensation package we proposed over six weeks ago.

Timeline

Thursday, May 25th	Friday, June 2nd	TBD
Strike Readiness for Site Leaders Training	End of Year Social RSVP	No Bargaining Dates Currently Scheduled

Next Steps

As we head into summer, we are open to continuing to meet with the District to negotiate small things, but we will not negotiate anything significant like our economic proposals or reach a tentative agreement when our membership is on break. We will resume normal negotiations when we are all back at our school sites in the Fall and can organize together to win a contract that we all deserve.

It might be a few weeks before we have another bargaining report for you, but the moment we have anything to report, we will be sure to update you all. We hope you all have a wonderful summer, and we look forward to continuing to organize with you all for the schools our students deserve in the Fall!

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!