

# UESF Assembly Meeting

Wednesday, May 17, 2000

McAteer High School

## MINUTES

President Mitchell called the meeting to order at 4:05.

### *Minutes*

#### **1. Approval of Minutes.....**

**MSC** to accept the minutes as presented.

### *Reports*

#### **1. President's Report.....Kent Mitchell**

1) New superintendent-strengths: First she was in Seattle. Deputy superintendent there, then she went to D.C. She had to report to 6 or 7 bosses, plus Congress. They were faced with a \$60 million deficit. She worked at the problem by cutting administrative costs. She may have left because of a collapse of the governing structure.

This time the selection process was different from other recent searches. The Board used the Calif. School Board Association. They made a search and had 72 candidates and then they winnowed it down to 7. Her name was not released because it was not clear if she would come to S.F. The search team tried to keep everything quiet to avoid a bidding war. The leak to the Examiner may result in the D.C. folks offering her more money.

Henry Der could be good. He has skills working with the legislature. The other candidate is the superintendent of the Berkeley local. His experience is with small districts. Pres. Mitchell will be traveling to DC and he will attempt to meet with her when he is there.

2) Financial status of the district: FICMAT and Deloitte and Touche report very bad. The district does not know what it has. Systems are very bad. Leadership on the school board very bad. We need to make sure that the board gets an information system, attendance system and financial system that make sense.

Sacramento: pressure appears to be yielding good results. Too soon to know since the budget is not complete. Government is willing to offer money to reduce teachers' taxes. We need to get an organizational position on the proposal. The money that is coming will probably be in packages-e.g. targeted to special things. One that seems likely is the move to final year compensation for calculating retirement. We have to take the PARS early retirement off the table because the retirement based upon the raise would make it unattractive for people. We will have to re-think the entire proposal.

If we don't have a school board that keeps focused on putting that money in salaries, then we lose a lot. We must keep pressure on the Board.

When we created the initial proposal we put it out there so that we could follow the demonstration on May 8 with a demonstration on May 9. Now it is appropriate that we change the proposal (see attached) We got Executive Board approval for the amendment.

## May 17, 2000 Assembly Meeting Minutes

We need to continue the pressure on the school board. There is a petition in the distribution that we need to circulate, and we need to have a presence at the school board meetings from now on. It is extremely important that we, in this room, not fall victim to the mindset that the board might fall victim to. If they think that there is extra money they might spend it on all sorts of programs. We can't let ourselves forget that the Board members need to be held accountable for what they have done. For example, when they bought 333 Grant. It was an illegal act.

Question: On the "salaries first petition," don't we want to put in 25%?

Pres. Mitchell: We have a school board that needs to be reminded. It is not necessary. We must show our resolve on Tuesday when there is a Board of Education Meeting. Let's make our point together.

Discussion on the petition to take place later in the meeting.

### **a) Initiating the Standards Based Evaluation Pilot**

There will be a pilot next year and the principals will be approaching the UBC's. When we deal with standards for evaluation we want to know clearly what is expected. For sites to participate we need to have the UBCs signing off.

We need to know what teachers need to know at the site in order to make a decision as to whether to participate in the pilot.

### **2. Vice President's Report:..... Rudi Faltus**

Area reps will do distribution because it is not yet ready for the Assembly members to take to their respective schools.

Report of the May 8 activity: Approximately 800 people participated. There were 562 on the list. There were 172 on the train. We had four buses with 45 on each. The rest were in car pools. Area reps, the Cope committee, staff, building reps worked on it.

The May 9 Board rally: Steve Shapiro organized it and we estimate 800-900 participants. We need to keep up the momentum.

Internal structure. Most of our schools have an elected UBC. We will have UBC development training. The kick-off will be at the Leadership Training Workshop next fall.

### **3. Treasurer's Report ..... Lily Hickman**

Lily Hickman reviewed the expenses and income.

### **Action**

#### **Old Business**

#### **New Business**

### **1. Revised Reopener Proposals ..... Kent Mitchell**

Business items: Resolution reflected in proposal to District. The national discussion shows that there is an awakening. What is lacking is the money to make it happen. We are looking for a 25% increase in the salary structure.

## May 17, 2000 Assembly Meeting Minutes

The money that comes from the state to the school district is called the COLA. It is set in the state budget negotiations. The dollar amount is \$1.8million above what was proposed in Jan. The actual percentage is up in the air. Also, SFUSD is a declining enrollment district so we have an "adjusted" COLA. At this point in time in order to get the attention of the Board 25% is a good number. They need to know that whatever they get we are entitled to it.

Member '**proposal for an additional amendment:** That the union will accept no less than 25%.

Brother Monley-Spoke in favor of the amendment. As an executive board member he said that he felt that it had been a mistake not to go out to the membership when we decided what to ask for. He feels that as a union we need to ask for at least 25%.

Sister Hickman-If it says at least 25% and they don't give it to us and we reach an impasse, then mediation, then do we have to go to strike?

President Mitchell explained that we are in the third year of the contract. The bargaining could go on for a long time. We could contemplate a strike for July 2001.

Sister Hickman- Isn't it true that if we do go on strike, we have to go through the process or the district does not pick up costs? President Mitchell said "Yes, that is true."

Brother Fesler: Term "not less than" means we do not have anything to talk to the district about. We are putting the negotiating team in a rigid position. No matter what you ask for you have to see what is available. We don't yet know what is available. It is self-defeating to say "at least."

Brother Borcher spoke against the amendment because it could cause negotiations to go on and on and give the Board a chance to stall and not give us any raise.

Galileo teacher spoke about the need to help new teachers who are so underpaid.

Another member commented that we need to follow the funds as they come into the district.

Sister Hene Kelly said that we want to do everything right to get the most we can for our members. We have to be ready to strike. We must be able to argue within this room and then join together outside of this room.

Sister Clare Merced spoke In favor of the amendment. She said that the district always hides the money.

**Amendment:** SFUSD teachers will receive no less than 25% pay increase for the 2000-2001 school year, to be paid by the new monies coming from the state.

**Motion failed.**

Sister Kelly- The amendment should read 30%. It will get us in the ballpark of 25%.

Brother Ken Tray spoke in favor of 30%. If we have an impasse we won't get anything all year. We need the flexibility and we should go for as much as we can.

Sister Pamela Routh- As a member of the negotiating team representing the substitutes I learned that you have to know the process.

**MSC to change the amendment to from 25% to 30%.**

## **May 17, 2000 Assembly Meeting Minutes**

Main motion: (Golden rod or Lavender-)

### **Approval of the main motion.**

**Emergency Resolution..... Bob Fesler**

Resolution submitted for consideration as an "item urgently requiring action" under Assembly rules:

Whereas Governor Davis has proposed that public school teachers be exempted from state income taxes; and

Whereas singling out any occupation or profession, however noble or deserving, for dramatically preferential tax treatment cannot help but be politically divisive and intensely controversial as a public policy issue; and

Whereas what California teachers and schools really need, rather than a tax subsidy, is a level of state funding that will permit decently competitive salaries that will attract and retain the teachers that children need; now therefore be it

Resolved that UESF oppose Governor Davis' proposal that public school teachers be exempted from California income tax; and

Be it further resolved that UESF urge the Governor and the Legislature to use the reported \$500 million cost of the proposed exemption as a specifically identified addition to the unrestricted general fund state education budget; and

Be it finally resolved that the intent of this resolution be communicated to Governor Davis, Senator Burton, Assembly members Midge and Shelley, and to our state affiliates.

### **MSC**

Brother Miller made a motion that the petitions be changed to read 30%.

### **MSC**

Revised copy will be sent to the schools in the distribution in a different color. The original had v2. The new one will be v3.

### ***Good of the Order***

Request was made for the union to collect correct addresses so that the union can contact members during the summer.

It was clarified that re-openers are brought to the membership for approval.

There were suggestions regarding unity of the union. There were suggestions to improve communication.

There were 33 sites represented.

### ***Adjournment***

Motion to adjourn 6:35.

# **May 17, 2000 Assembly Meeting Minutes**

## **MSC**

Minutes submitted by Linda Plack