



**Fighting for the Schools  
Our Students Deserve**

# August 28 Bargaining Report

## Overview

We kicked off bargaining this semester with a bang on Monday! At noon, we held a [press conference](#) with parents, labor, and community allies, where we released a white paper detailing decades of financial mismanagement at SFUSD. [You can read the “Payday Loans and Pumpkin Patches: A History of Fiscal Mismanagement in SFUSD” report here.](#)

At 5 pm, our big bargaining team sat down with the District management team for the first session of the 23-24 school year. This is the first time in person since May; Over the summer, we bargained via Zoom. We put into practice the truth that our power is our numbers as the Contract Action Team (CAT) joined our large bargaining team in observing the process. We packed the bargaining room. Every seat was full! We came with this show of strength to highlight the seriousness with which we are taking this contract campaign because we know that how important a fair contract is to the stability of our schools.

As usual, our big bargaining team came prepared for the meeting. Sunset educator Lisa Truong testified to the unnecessary stress her family experienced when denied an interdistrict transfer and an appeal to have her child placed at her school. We then presented counters on Special Education Caseloads, Community Schools, Staffing, SDN & SSW Role Protections, Prep Time, the Classified Economic Package, and the Certificated Economic Package.

Initially, the district management team countered our PD for all Proposals and Site-Based Meeting Proposals. UESF had proposed a cap of 8 hours on all site based meetings, including faculty meetings. They attempted to add an additional two hours of meeting time to the proposal and unlimited faculty meetings for TK-5 and no language for secondary. Our team took issue with the suggested extra meeting time and expressed our frustration. After a caucus, they withdrew the site-based meeting proposal and stated they will continue working on it.

For the classified package we reasserted the need for a 2-year deal with a \$30 floor or 8 percent increase in year 1 and an 8 percent in year 2. We are happy to say that the district had previously agreed to our framework for longevity with increases at 5,10,15 and 20 years. We are now negotiating the exact percentage. For the certificated package our team reasserted 12k on every square for year 1 and reduced the package at the exact amount that the district increased theirs in May, proposing a 7.5% increase in year 2. To quote Cassondra, “pathways to a deal are wide open”, if only the district commits to funding the schools our students deserve.

# Proposals

## UESF Counters

<p>Priority School Assignment</p>	<p>The first proposal we passed back our Priority School Assignment proposal. This is designed to alleviate the very real stress of trying to navigate different start and end times when having to drop your students off at sites different from the one you work at. The district has claimed that our educators can rectify this via the appeals process, to refute this, we invited a unit member to testify about her burden this has had on her. Her child had not only been denied placement at her school, but was denied placement after appeal. In fact, she was honest that the only reason she has been able to make things work at all is that she has a number of family members who have thus far been able to pitch in. This is not a universal privilege. For a district that is concerned about retention of staff and falling enrollment of students it feels ridiculous that our district would not take seriously helping our educator parents, who often are forced to live outside of SF for myriad reasons including our low pay.</p>
<p>Special Education Caseloads</p>	<p>The second proposal that we passed back was to address special education caseloads. Additionally, we sent a request for information to the district so we could accurately understand what caseloads look like across the district in May. We STILL have not received an answer. No one was willing to make a concrete commitment about a timeline for getting information for us. At the high school level, SPED teachers are unfairly designated both RS and SDC impossibly being tasked with fulfilling the requirements of both roles. Lack of sufficient staffing across the board are making it impossible for RSD staff at other grade levels to meet mandated minutes of service. One educator who offered testimony reported being told by an administrator to place all of his special education students in one room to meet the minutes. Not only is this is against the law it is unethical. These violations leave us vulnerable to millions of dollars in lawsuits, yearly. We cannot meet our stated mission of equitable education for all if we overburden our special education professionals; this is in essence denying our most vulnerable students their rights under IDEA.</p>
<p>Community Schools</p>	<p>The third proposal we passed back was to fight for the integrity of our community schools. The district has been stripping essential language from our proposal including denial of a community school coordinator and steering committee. Mandates that San Francisco Board of Education has already acknowledged as integral to the establishment of effective community schools and were part of the funding process for the community school initiative. Collaborative shared decision making at the community school is central to its ability to transform a local school in both tangible and intangible ways. We are citing language already agreed upon by the state of California. We are simply calling upon the district to come into alignment with accepted best practices and California education code.</p>
<p>Staffing</p>	<p>The fourth proposal we passed back was to the district's proposal about staffing.</p>

	We crossed out language about program need as the language is ambiguous. If the district is allowed to reassign people simply because they claim it's needed it will only further the current levels of disruption.
SDN & SSW Protections	The fifth proposal we passed back was about role protections for SDN and SSWs. Our current vacancy rate for SDNs is 23%. The time for seriousness in addressing issues of stipends for additional additional training and protecting these essential roles' ability to focus on their legally required duties, is now.
Prep Time	The six proposal we passed back was about Preparatory Time. This proposal is to protect time for our educators have protected time to plan, meet, and accomplish other required tasks in order to successfully do their job as block schedules get rolled out across our district. We are also asking the our elementary educators also are given more prep time as the current standard of 20 minutes is insufficient. We countered the district's assertion that 20 minutes was sufficient with 25 minutes.
Classified Economic Package	Seventh we passed back our classified economic package. We refused the districts offer of \$29 dollars and increase of 5% and reasserted our ask for \$30 dollars basement with 8% increase or whichever is greater for TWO years, not the district's proposed one year. We did come closer to the district on longevity countering their offer of 1%, 2%, 3%, and 4% at 5 years, 10 years, 15 years, and 20 years of service, respectively with 3%, 7%, 12%, 18%. We also clarified that we were not seeking to flatten our steps, but to allow for increases across the all steps when we raise the floor to \$30 for classified staff.
Certificated Economic Package	The final proposal we passed back was the certificated economic package. We stood firm on the \$12K on every square for certificated staff. We did come down .5% on our second year ask. Cassondra asserted clearly the importance of stability. We will not accept a one year proposal.

### District Counters

PD For All	The district passed back our PD for all proposal tying provision of mentorship, induction coaching, and release to attend two days a year to attend day long PDs to availability of funding. This renders our proposal moot as changes in budgetary priorities could negate this language and these programs at anytime.
Site Meetings	They passed back a second proposal, but when Cassondra named their counter as unacceptable, they withdrew it. That is the power of the union in practice. Imagine if we apply the same clarity and show up as strongly to our commitment to strike vote.

# Timeline

Monday, Sept 18	Monday, Sept 18	Monday, Oct 2
<b>In Person Bargaining</b> 5-8 PM @ 555 Franklin St	<b>Informational Picketing</b> 4-8 PM @ 555 Franklin St <a href="#">RSVP Here</a>	<b>In Person Bargaining</b> 5-8 PM @ 555 Franklin St

## Next Steps

The District offered two dates for bargaining over the next two months (September 18 & October 2) when we asked if we could resume our weekly bargaining sessions. UESF has additionally proposed a Sept 11 date. We know that the stability of our schools is dependent upon a deal that meets the needs of our educators, students, and families. Any lack of urgency on the part of the district will not deter us from organizing ourselves for a fair contract. We will continue to push for more than two bargaining dates, but in the meantime, we need everyone at their school and work sites to work with your site UBCs to turn out to the bargaining picket at 555 Franklin St on September 18 from 4-8 pm. [You can RSVP here.](#)

## For More Information

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

Or email [Organizing@uesf.org](mailto:Organizing@uesf.org) or [ask-uesf@uesf.org](mailto:ask-uesf@uesf.org)

**Together We Win!**