

**United Educators of San Francisco**  
**655 14<sup>th</sup> St**  
**San Francisco, California 64114**  
August 16, 1999

*Data Collection:* Bill Harju, Interviewer  
*Data Source:* Kent Mitchell, President  
Rudi Faltus, Vice President

**A. Demographics**

*Number of Schools:* 141

*Children's Centers:* 25

*Elementary* 68

*Middle* 17

*High School* 17

*Other:* 14 alternative schools

*Total number of employees by classification:*

*Certified:*

4,400 certified non-supervisory employees in the UESF bargaining unit. In addition, UESF represents 500 day to day substitute teachers. Worthy of note, approximately half of the SFUSD teaching staff have seniority dates since 1993.

*Paraprofessionals:* 1500

*Classified:* 1900

*Management/supervisory:* 300

*Current enrollment by level:* (63,925)

*Elementary* 29,250

*Middle/Junior High:* 12,984

*High School:* 18,820

*Other:* County Programs - 2871

*Current enrollment by race/ethnicity*

*Caucasian:* 12.1%

*Hispanic:* 21.3%

*Black/African American:* 16.0%

Asian: 49.9%

Native American: 0.7%

Second Language programs: 19,292 (31.6%)

Average Class Size by level:

Primary: 20

Upper: 32.1

Middle/Junior High: 33.1

High School: 34.1

School District Budget

Total expenditures: \$500,000,000

Expenditures per student: 6,000

## **B. Significant Background Information:**

. *Union Structure/Roles*

*Officers (Names, longevity)*

President: Kent Mitchell (2 years)  
Vice President: Rudi Faltus (2 years)  
Vice President, ESP: Peggy Gash (15 years)  
Vice President, Substitutes: Robert Fesler (3 years)  
Secretary: Dennis Kelly (9 years)  
Treasurer: Lilly Gee Hickman (new)  
Sergeant at Arms: Tom Edminster (2 years)

*Executive Body*

UESF has an Executive Board of 40 members composed of the officers and board members elected at large among several constituencies as follows:  
Four high school members  
Three middle school members  
Five elementary members  
One Special Education  
One Children's Center  
One Counselor  
One Bilingual  
Two Substitutes  
Four members at large - certificated  
Three Paraprofessional members, one each from Elementary, Middle and High School levels.  
Two Paraprofessionals from Children's Centers.  
One Paraprofessional from Bilingual.  
One Paraprofessional from Special Education  
Three Paraprofessionals elected at large.  
One retired who serves as chairperson of the Retired Division.

The Executive Board is the administrative body of UESF, and meets on the first Wednesday of each month.

*Representative Body*

The Assembly is the policy making body of the UESF. The Assembly is composed of one representative for each fifteen member, and meets monthly, September - June. Typical attendance at Assembly meetings is 40 to 50 representatives. If all members were present, the assembly would number approximately 350. UESF is working to enhance the status of Assembly members in the hopes of increasing involvement and attendance.

*Committees Union:*

UESF has the following standing union committees:

1. Executive Committee - Seven officers and Retired Division Chair. Advises President.
2. Election Committee
3. Budget Committee
4. Grievance Committee
5. Committee on Political Education (COPE)
6. Personnel Committee - Works with the president on Job Descriptions and Evaluation of UESF Staff.

*Committees Joint:*

Grade Level Committees - The Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article XXVI, Section 26.3 (See Attachment 1) establishes subject matter-grade level committees to meet with appropriate administrators in the central office to deal with educational issues. These committees, which are composed of executive board members from the level (elementary, middle, HS), and building representatives from the grade level, meet on a monthly basis during the school year with the appropriate associate superintendent. The role of these committees is to deal with educational issues within the grade level. Examples of issues handled by these committees include: 1) Special Education inclusion issues; 2) Implementation of California's class size reduction program at the primary level; 3) The issue of 8th grade students moving to the high school level with four or more failures in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade.

Restructuring Council/Labor Management Community Committee: The expired Collective Bargaining Agreement contained a "Restructuring Council" charged with oversight of school improvement efforts within the district. The intent of the Council was to serve as a shared decisionmaking body within the district, that represented all district stakeholders. The Superintendent, Wildemaar Rojas, who departed the district for the Superintendency in Dallas, Texas on July 1, 1999, did not provide recognition to the Council, and thus it was not an effective structure. In the current negotiations (summer, 1999), and as part of a major district grant, the UESF and the District are engaged in discussions around the creation of a "Labor Management/Community Committee" which would replace the Restructuring Council. This new structure, which will again include representation of all major stakeholders, will attempt to devise a collaborative approach to increase student achievement, to improve the performance of low performing schools, and to devise an alternative to the District's procedure around school reconstitution.

### *Permanent Union Staff (Names, tenure)*

1. Steve Shapiro - Staff relations with a set of schools - similar to UniServ. Handles grievances through arbitration. 10 years.
2. Mary Anne Ahtye - Staff relations with a set of schools - similar to UniServ. 13 years
3. Ron Jackson - Staff relations with a set of schools - similar to UniServ. Also charged with Community Relations and Community outreach.

In addition, the Vice President, the Vice President ESP and the President of UESF are full time released.

### *Term limits*

UESF has no term limits for officers or executive board members.

### *Union Partnerships*

Ujima and UESF Partnership A partnership between UESF and an African American Community Organization designed to identify and implement goals and strategies for the improvement of education among San Francisco's African American students. (Attachment 5)

UESF has no formal partnerships with business or academia although there is an intern program jointly sponsored by the District, UESF and San Francisco State.

### *Principal means of communication with members:*

San Francisco Educator, A monthly professionally printed newspaper. (Attachment 3)

Bulletin/Update - Twice monthly flyers which are updates on current issues (Attachment 4)

Website ([www.uesf.org](http://www.uesf.org)) UESF maintains a website, however a formal process for keeping the site up to date is yet to be developed.

E-Mail UESF maintains a list of e-mail addresses for approximately 3,000 of it's members, and has conducted occasional e-mail broadcasts to these addresses.

### *Membership Engagement*

UESF conducts two or three events annually to bring members together. These include annual parties as well as events with speakers on current topics.

Area Representatives UESF has divided the city into 9 geographic areas and has designated 9 individuals to serve as liaison to the members in these areas. These "Area Representatives" are paid a stipend approximately \$4000 per year, are released from school 2 days per month, and are expected to spend an average of five hours per week on UESF business. The charge to the Area Representative includes:

1. Distribution of materials to area schools twice per month.
2. Work with Union Building Committees at the sites to strengthen and make more effective UESF building organizations.
3. Provide two-way communication between UESF and the sites.
4. Look at and evaluate the capacity of each site, in terms of union structure, using an evaluation tool established by the union.
5. Identify new leaders - particularly teachers who represent the large number of UESF staff who have been hired since 1993.

*Significant recent budget developments (cutbacks, infusions) if any:*

Since 1996, the budgeting strategy of the prior administration was to spend down to the "nub," take every spare penny and put it into ongoing expenses. As a result, the district is "broke," has budgeted nothing for a raise and, in fact, has been required to cut back up to 100 positions - through attrition. During the prior superintendent's last year, \$8 million was taken from the general fund to purchase a building in downtown San Francisco to convert to a school, and recoup the funds from the state. The purchase was a mistake, the state would not participate, and the district is now attempting to sell the building. (333 Grant St.). The district budget and fiscal processes are now being audited by state.

*In order to understand this district, what is it necessary to know/understand?*

The current fiscal situation, coupled with the fact that the collective bargaining agreement expired in July 1998, with negotiations now ongoing, has created a difficult situation for the Union and the new interim superintendent. The former Superintendent, Waldemar Rojas, left the district on July 1, and an interim Superintendent, Linda Davis, has been appointed while the School Board attempts to determine how to fill the superintendency on a more permanent basis. Further, Rojas took two of the top district employees in the Budget and Finance department with him to Dallas - thus no one in the central office has a good handle on the finances, while the state is in auditing the books.

*Labor-management relationship:*

Currently, the UESF has a good relationship with the interim superintendent. In the past, UESF worked very seriously with the former superintendent on three or four initiatives. Late in Rojas tenure, UESF realized that the district had no commitment, thus the relationship became much more adversarial in Rojas' last year.

In the November 1998 school board election, UESF supported three candidates for election, two of whom were successful. One of the successful candidates defeated the former school board President who had been the Superintendent's strongest supporter. This election has increased UESF influence on the district, and has helped in improving the relationship with the district.

*Measured outcomes - test scores, college acceptance rates (1997-98 & 1998-99)*

Scores, on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS), improved slightly district-wide from 1996-97 to 1997-98. District scores on the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT9) ranged from a low percentile of 38 in Grade 10, to a high of 51 in Grade 2 in Reading; and from a low of 49.7 in Grade 4 to a high of 58.2 in Grade 9 in Math. (Attachment 11)

*Current Superintendency:*

*Name:* Linda Davis

*Background:*

Came to San Francisco with a previous superintendent (Ray Cortines) approximately 1986 - as a deputy. She remained deputy under Rojas, in charge of the instructional program. Davis is very collaborative, and had some difficulty working with Rojas who used a more top-down style of management.

*Tenure:*

Interim superintendent since July 1, 1999. School Board has yet to decide whether to conduct a national search, or whether to make Davis permanent.

*Management team:*

There is a superintendent's cabinet composed of several associate superintendents - approximately 12-14. The composition of the cabinet in the future is still unclear.

*Other employee unions (Name, approximate unit membership, relationship to teachers)*

*Secretarial/clerical:* SEIU Local 790 -

*Paraprofessionals:* UESF

*Maintenance/Bus drivers:* Transportation Union - AFL-CIO affiliated

*Food services:* SEIU Local 790

*Principals:* United Administrators of San Francisco - American Federation of School Administrators - AFL-CIO

*Status of contract:*

*Expiration of current agreement:* The Contract expired on July 1, 1998 - Negotiations are continuing.

*Agency fee:* Yes

*Binding arbitration:* Yes. UESF files approximately 10 arbitrations annually.

*Strikes:* Last strike was in 1979 - lasted six weeks.

*Unfair labor practices:* A ULP regarding the establishment of an Edison Charter School in the district is currently on file, but has been placed on the back burner.

*Significant litigation:* None.

*Approximate number of grievances per year:* UESF files approximately 85 grievances per year.

*Union role in community:*

*Political endorsements*

Typically, the UESF COPE organization endorsed only in School Board Races, and could support labor council endorsements in other races. Recently, UESF Staff Member Ron Jackson has been involved in a campaign to reinvigorate COPE, to increase fundraising to establish coalitions with other unions and community organizations, and to support candidates for mayor and city/county council and legislature.

## C. Education Reform

*Union posture:*

*Pro/anti reform:*

Reform is a major part of the agenda for UESF. Quality of teaching is a significant aspect of the Mission Statement of UESF and President Mitchell cites the three pillars of reform as school quality, teacher quality, and curricular & instructional quality. UESF believes that teachers should be engaged in all of these efforts, while the Rojas administration did not, causing a significant conflict between the parties.

*Membership attitudes*

Member's attitudes are all over the map. Experienced teachers in the system have a very difficult time trusting the district leadership. From the beginning of their careers, the district makes teachers feel that they are simply cogs in a wheel, and not an integral part of the system. This attitude by district leadership has led to a significant amount of legitimate cynicism. UESF has been working to change that through attempting to create a democratic atmosphere at the sites where the voice of the teaching staff has significant meaning.

*Financial commitment* Unknown

*Reform elements in contract:* (See Attachment 1 - Collective Bargaining Agreement)

1. Article XVIII - Professional Development - Includes a joint committee to oversee content and scheduling of Professional Development
2. Article XXI - Restructuring - The article includes several concepts regarding how the parties will approach the restructuring of schools as well as the establishment of and charge to the Restructuring Council.
3. Article XXV - Union Building Committee - Establishes a Union Building Committee (UBC) that meets monthly with the site administrator and deals with issues relating to administration of the contract. The article also contains language regarding establishment of Shared Decisionmaking Councils, election of members to serve, and the role of the UBC in schools with shared decisionmaking councils.
4. Article XXVI - Union-District Meetings, Section 26.3 - Subject matter and grade level consultation: Establishes the grade level committees referenced above under Joint Committees.

*Organization/structure for reform:*

*Central coordinating structure:*

The central coordinating structure for reform in the past had been the Restructuring Council which is now defunct. The Labor Management Community Committee (LMCC) currently under negotiations appears to be the new structure. The LMCC will include all of the major unions, the administration and community representation. A key to the success of LMCC has been the early involvement of the United Administrators, who had seats on the old Restructuring Council, but were never active. As a result of the Ford Foundation grant, UESF and the United Administrators are in the process of working out a more formal and less adversarial relationship.

*District office structure:*

The District has a huge Professional Development department, called Curriculum Improvement and Professional Development (CIPD), a huge bureaucracy, with significant numbers of teachers on special assignment. From the union's perspective, the CIPD has little to do with what goes on

in the classroom. Also, the superintendent's extended cabinet under Rojas was designed to bring all departments together to focus on school improvement, with participation by UESF and other unions. The process, however, has been very unclear and appears to have been set up to create confusion rather than to clarify and focus.

*Union structure:*

It is primarily the responsibility of the executive board to deal with education reform issues. The Grade level committees sometimes filter reform issues, and sometimes bring issues to the Representative Assembly for policy.

*Responsibility (within union - leaders? Staff?)* See above.

*Organization around standards*

The District has developed standards, based upon the State adopted standards. The process began 2-3 years ago, and it is now theoretically true that the district has curriculum standards in English-Language Arts; Math, Social Studies, Science, Visual and Performing Arts and Physical Education. The standards are content standards, not performance standards. Teachers have been invited to participate; though there has been no formal union involvement.

*Implementation:*

The CIPD department believes that the standards have been disseminated to the schools, and are being used in the classroom. In most cases, however, this is not accurate. Rarely have teachers seen the standards, though in some schools, there has been work done with the standards based upon the leadership of the principal. It appears that the district confuses content and curriculum standards with performance standards, and assessment measures are not related to the standards.

*Role of union:*

There has been no formal role for the union.

*Training/Staff Development*

There has been some staff development around the district content standards, designed by the district and administered district-wide. The training was delivered over two released days, and has not resulted in systematic implementation.

*Professional Development*

*Program description & Operation*

The CIPD department theoretically supports schools in meeting their staff development needs. The CIPD collects a significant amount of data from schools, develops three ring binders that report on the data regarding school quality. The CIPD people are targeting specific schools that are low performing, and are working with those schools in a content area focus.

*Relationship to union:*

There is a joint committee in the contract charged with various responsibilities in the area of Staff Development, however, the joint committee was never established. There has been some involvement of the union in selecting Mentor Teachers under the California Mentor Teacher program.

## *Low performing Schools*

### *Program description: (Attachments 6, 8, 9)*

SFUSD, in 1983, began a reconstitution program under the Federal District Court Consent Decree. The idea was to reconstitute schools which were segregated by making them Magnet Schools. The process was begun by closing schools, with teachers transferred to other schools in the district. New Principals were selected, and a new staff was recruited and assigned. The result of the initial reconstitution was that schools did improve. The irony, however, was that due to the fact that no school was permitted to have more than 45% of one ethnic group, neighborhood students in the African American Community were shut out of their neighborhood schools.

During the later 80's, a few other schools were reconstituted without receiving much publicity. In 1992-93 school year, Waldemar Rojas became the Superintendent. Rojas concept was that reconstitution provided a drastic incentive to improve. As a result, three schools were reconstituted - all from the southeast section of town, and each year thereafter, three schools would be reconstituted. The program was supervised by the Federal District Court, and the UESF had little or no voice in the process.

By 1996-97, it was becoming clear that reconstitution was not creating school improvement since such schools became anathema to current district staff and few teachers would apply for the vacant positions. As a result, significant numbers of new teachers and non-credentialed teachers would fill the positions in reconstituted schools. Accordingly, the parties met and agreed on the development of a new school accountability process. The parties have been working on an accountability process for two years.

The new process involves measuring schools based upon a number of criteria, resulting in the identification of a list of low performing schools. The list was to remain private, however, CIPD department members took the data out to the schools and, without explaining why, began pushing the schools to revise programs, enter into extra planning, etc. As a result, there exists suspicion and paranoia about the new program in the sites affected.

The new process is to be implemented in the 1999-2000 school year.

### *Relationship to union:*

The union has been involved in joint discussions regarding a new process, and is actively seeking an alternative to reconstitution.

### *Implementation issues:*

#### *Personnel - Transfers*

When schools were being "reconstituted," teachers forced out were given priority transfer rights to other schools over voluntary transfers.

*Written documents:* (See Attachments 6, 8, 9)

#### *Evaluation of program:*

Through their joint experience, the parties have determined that reconstitution is a disruptive process, and does not effectively contribute to student achievement. As a result, they have developed a new process of accountability as an alternative to reconstitution which will be implemented in the upcoming 1999-2000 school year.

The documents being generated as a result of two years of planning includes a formal evaluation process which takes place after a specified time period.

*Incentives for school improvement - measures to raise student achievement or teacher quality*

None currently. New state legislation around accountability could provide funding for such initiative in the future.

*Peer review:*

*Program description: (Attachments 7, 10)*

The parties are currently in negotiations over a peer review program. The District position is to begin peer review with experienced teachers. UESF prefers to begin with new teachers. Little progress was made until the State Legislature adopted and the Governor signed legislation which provides that parties negotiate a peer review system, and absent agreement, certain funds are withheld from the district. The programs under discussion are similar to those in existence in Poway, CA; Toledo, Ohio and other locations.

*School based management/decisionmaking related to school improvement*

*Program structure:*

Early efforts at "restructuring" centered on site based decisionmaking. The school site council, established by law in California, is a key to the school restructuring process. The Council will become key to implementation of the new school site accountability process. A duly elected school site council will be charged with developing a plan based upon data related to the criteria used to measure quality schools. The plan then will be implemented, monitored, revised by the site council.

*Role of site teams:*

To develop and implement a school improvement plan, and to monitor, review, and modify the plan as necessary.

*Site budgets:*

Utilization of site funds is an integral part of the school improvement plan which is within the purview of the school site council.

*Contract/rule waivers:*

There is a provision for waiving the contract, board of education policy and procedure and state board of education regulations. Waivers were to go through the Restructuring Council and a replacement provision will be included in the new contract.

*Other major reform efforts (Description, scope, relationship to union)*

Edison Project: San Francisco has a single Edison Project school that was put in place over the objection of the Union. The School Board voted 5-2 to approve the school, prior to the last school board election. 1998-99 was the first year of operation for the Edison school. The first year test scores showed improvement, however, generally, schools in the district showed improvement.

Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program - a Career development program for paraprofessionals. The program, a cooperative program between the UESF, the district and San Francisco State works with paraprofessionals in an effort to help Paraprofessionals become teachers. The program has an advisory council of district, union and university members. The program is funded by providing four-hour paraprofessionals with an extra two hour per day stipend for participating in the program. The program, thus, covers books and tuition costs. Participants must have sixty units or a non-education BA to participate, and must agree to serve up to three years in the district based on the number of years funding is provided. The program focuses on bilingual, special education and math and science. The program has been in place since the 1987-88 school year. Approximately 120 teachers have successfully completed the program.

Attachments:

1. 1995-98 Collective Bargaining Agreement
2. UESF Constitution and Bylaws
3. SF Educator
4. "UESF Bulletin"
5. Ujima & UESF Partnership
6. Trust Agreement - Teacher & School Accountability (Draft - 1/19/99)
7. Peer Support and Review Program (Draft - 1/19/99)
8. Proposed SFUSD School Accountability Process Pursuant to May, 1997 Tentative Agreement
9. Outline of a Tentative Agreement to Reduce the Need for Reconstitution
10. SFUSD Peer Support and Review Program Guidelines - January 19, 1999
11. SFUSD CTBS & SAT9 Data