

Bargaining Summary as of 10/15/2019

PRIORITY ISSUES

Proposal Area (Article No.)	CTU Proposals as of 10.1.19	CPS Response as of 10.1.19	CPS Response as of 10.15.19	Assessment
Contract Duration	3 years.	5 years.	CPS said that a 5-year contract is their final offer.	No movement Agreeing to a 5-year contract means being locked into terms until after the mayor is up for reelection.
Staffing Social Workers, Case Managers, Nurses, Teacher Assistants, Counselors, Librarians, Psychologists OTs, PTs, Restorative Justice Coordinators (Article 9, 15, 20, 21)	Contract language providing increased staffing targets, pipeline programs, and enforcement of increased staffing.	Promise not to privatize clinicians and will phase out contract nurses, otherwise not willing to address in contract.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Still agreeing to phase out contract nurses. • CPS proposed to spend \$2 million for nurse specific pipeline (LPNs to HSNs, and HSNs to CSNs) over a 5-year contract. • CPS proposed an MOU providing \$400,000 annually to recruit new nurses, social workers, and case managers and meeting with CTU on progress. • CPS verbally suggested creating a citywide Joint Committee empowered to add 1 full-time employee at 20% of schools with greatest student needs. • CPS verbally said they will hire additional 200 social workers and 250 nurses over a 5-year contract, allocation of goals for case managers (.5 CM=50-119 IEPs, full-time=120-239, 1.5=240 & above, including pre-k IEPs) and are open to targeting positions in schools with most need. 	<p><u>Movement</u></p> <p>AND:</p> <p>CTU bargaining team is fighting for central funding of base staffing positions, specific allocations based on student need (case managers & ELPTs), and phase in of additional staff toward goals IN WRITING IN THE CONTRACT.</p>
Class Size (Article 28)	Enforceable class size limits, reduce class sizes, esp. in early childhood, increased staffing of TAs.	Expand language that currently provides a TA for K-2 classes over 31; expand to K-3.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPS proposed to spend \$1 million to reduce class size overages in grades 4-12. • CPS proposed to expand language that currently provides a Teacher Assistant for K-2 classes over 32 to K-3. • CPS proposed to spend more \$ (without giving an amount) on providing additional Teacher Assistants. • CPS verbally proposed spending money (without giving an amount) to reduce class sizes citywide at 20% of schools with greatest need and to create a large Joint Committee with power to make enforceable oversight (using the money) to reduce class sizes otherwise. 	<p><u>Movement</u></p> <p>AND:</p> <p>CTU bargaining team is fighting for reduced class size caps (not current caps) and clearer enforcement mechanisms.</p>

Proposal Area (Article No.)	CTU Proposals as of 10.1.19	CPS Response as of 10.1.19	CPS Response as of 10.15.19	Assessment
Preparation Time (Article 4, 5, and 6)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Add 30-minute morning self-directed prep to Elementary Day. Otherwise seek to increase prep time. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> CPS proposed for Elementary to reduce self-directed preps to 3/ week and for High School, they proposed no change to current prep time. No response. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CPS dropped their demand to take away ES self-directed time on the condition that CTU drop all of its prep time demands. CPS says will not agree to 30-minute morning elementary prep. CPS verbally agreed to give CTU class size data from the 10th day at regular intervals. 	<p><u>Movement</u></p> <p>BUT...</p> <p>We're only back to the current contract status quo. CPS seems to have strategically rolled back of their original proposal to make us accept not getting additional prep time.</p>
Pay (Article 36, Appendix A)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> COLA raise per year of the contract's proposed duration: 5%, 5%, 5%. Increase steps for veteran teachers. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> COLA raise per year of the contract's proposed duration: 3%, 3%, 3%, 3.5%, 3.5%. No response. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CPS said that this is their final offer in a 5-year contract. CPS agreed to list member steps, lanes, and anniversary dates on paychecks. 	<p>No movement</p> <p>CTU Bargaining Team is fighting for movement on veteran teacher steps. 9% over 3-years is not acceptable.</p>
PSRP Pay (Appendix A)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increase PSRP base pay above poverty rate by 30% for lowest grades. Add lanes for educational experience. Increase value of step schedule by 4%. Average 1st year increase across all PSRPs, 22%. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increase PSRP base pay an additional 1.5% in year 1 for lowest grades. Create Associate's lane immediately and Bachelor lane in 2021. Increase step schedule by 4% (to equalize steps across all grades). Increase nursing-related PSRP grades by one salary grade. Average 1st year increase across all PSRPs: 8% 	<p>CTU presented a counter proposal asking for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increase PSRP base pay by 21% for lowest grades Keep lane proposal. Move PSRPs up the step schedule faster. Average 1st year increase across all PSRPs: 18% <p>CPS has <u>not</u> responded to CTU counterproposal.</p>	<p><u>Movement</u></p> <p>This is an important offer from CPS to increase pay and create lanes for educational experience, but 1.5% is not enough for our lowest paid members. The CTU bargaining team is standing firm on our counter proposal.</p>
Health Care (Appendix B & E)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce cost of PPO by .8% of salary and freeze premiums at 0%. Reduce co-pays for Physical, Mental Health Therapy in particular. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No changes in benefits but raise premiums by .25% in year 4 and .5% in year 5. No response. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> CPS said this is their final offer in a 5-year contract. CPS agreed to, effective January 1, 2020: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminate co-insurance on outpatient mental health on PPO, same \$25 co-pay. Reduce HMO mental health co-pay from \$30 to \$15. Reduce PPO and HMO physical therapy co-pay from \$45 to \$30. LMCC will work to ensure insurance is equitable for LGBTQIAA+ members. 	<p><u>Movement</u></p> <p>CTU bargaining team feels the movement on co-pays is significant. Challenge is that this reduction is connected to a 5-year contract. The CTU bargaining team does not want to see any premium increases since the .8% PPO increase from January 2019 is still in effect. The Labor Board gave CTU right to continue to pursue the case against the .8% PPO premium increase before an arbitrator. CTU holds firm on its demand to roll-back the .8% increase on PPO.</p>

Proposal Area (Article No.)	CTU Proposals as of 10.1.19	CPS Response as of 10.1.19	CPS Response as of 10.15.19	Assessment
Benefit Time (Article 25, 26, 37)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allow banking of benefit time. 2. Convert benefit time to PTO. 3. Increase # of benefit days. 4. Increase # of holidays. 5. Provide same leaves for teachers and PSRPs. 6. Allow bereavement days to be taken non-consecutively. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No response. 2. No response. 3. No response. 4. No response. 5. No response. 6. No response. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No response. 2. CTU proposed to change the allocation of personal and sick days from 3 PB and 10 SB to 5 PB and 8 SB. CTU proposed that unused PB days roll over into the sick bank and this would allow greater flexibility of use. CPS has not responded. 3. No response. 4. No response. 5. No response. 6. Tentative Agreement. 	<p>No movement.</p> <p>The bereavement leave <u>is</u> important, but CPS has not responded on anything else related to benefit time.</p>
SPED (Article 21)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Protect IEP team decisions from undo pressure. 2. Increase SPED prep time and reduce workload to focus on IEPs. 3. Improve co-teaching and collaboration time. 4. Provide a continuum of services for students. 5. Provide resources to SPED teachers and classrooms. 6. Put into contract that SPED positions would continue to be centrally funded. 7. Equitable distribution of IEP writing among SPED teachers. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No response. 2. No response. 3. Agree to discuss in Joint Committee, schedule joint planning time where administratively possible, and provide access to student roster/data to SPED teachers. 4. No response. 5. No response. 6. No response. 7. No response. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CPS proposed that decisions on IEPs should be “demonstrated by data” and “made solely by the IEP team” according to law. 2. CPS proposed that they would provide \$45 stipends to SPED teachers for each IEP completed, but refused other enforceable workload relief. 3. CPS proposed that SPED co-teachers, “where possible” should not have more than 3 course preps, or 2 if possible. 4. No response. 5. CPS proposed that principals will identify existing SBB money in their school’s budget for resources and the Joint Committee will provide guidance. 6. CPS proposed putting this in the contract and having Joint Committee input on allocation of SPED teacher positions. 7. CPS proposed “to the extent possible,” principals “shall distribute...IEP writing equally.” 	<p><u>Movement</u></p> <p>BUT...</p> <p>The CTU bargaining team is still fighting for further reduced SPED teacher workloads around IEPs. CPS backed off of eliminating reference to the protection of the 70/30 ratio in the state school code from our contract.</p>
REACH Evaluation (Article 39)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tenured teachers with Proficient or Excellent rating skip a full cycle. 2. Mandate use of key documents (e.g. Addenda, SPED documents). 3. Clinician PAT protection from non-renewal being equivalent to termination. 4. Eliminate use of VAM score in elementary ratings. 5. Expand tenured appeals to all Developing ratings. 6. No observations of Kindergarten teachers during KIDS assessment window. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No response 2. CPS proposed that evaluators “may” reference documents, but it’s not required. 3. No response 4. No response 5. Keep current contract language where tenured appeals for 250 or below rating only. 6. CPS proposed that evaluators will try not to observe at that time. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No response 2. Same 3. CPS proposed that PAT1 clinicians with 250 or below rating may be non-renewed and PAT1 clinicians with 251-284 rating will be renewed. And the status quo for PAT2 clinicians. 4. No response. 5. No change. 6. No change. 	<p><u>Movement</u></p> <p>BUT...</p> <p>No movement on the most significant proposals, such as tenured teachers with high ratings being able to skip a cycle, which would provide workload and stress relief for educators and principals.</p>

Proposal Area (Article No.)	CTU Proposals as of 10.1.19	CPS Response as of 10.1.19	CPS Response as of 10.15.19	Assessment
Student Based Budgeting (Article 36)	Contract language to protect veteran teachers from being priced out of jobs and which ensures the district funds Special Ed and other district positions centrally.	No response.	No written response. CPS has said <u>verbally</u> that they might be willing to explore changes.	No movement.
SQRP	Remove use of standardized tests from labeling and sorting schools. Provide resources to schools a la the state evidence-based model.	No response.	No written response. CPS has said <u>verbally</u> that they want to study changes that could be made and might be willing to explore changes.	No movement.
School Closing Moratorium (Side Letter)	Extend moratorium on school closings for duration of the contract.	No response.	No change.	No movement.
Charter Moratorium (Side Letter)	Extend moratorium on charter expansion for the duration of the contract.	No response.	CPS agreed.	<u>Movement</u>
Assessment/Testing (Article 44)	Limit testing to federal, state, and REACH required tests.	Take away current right of members to vote on additional assessments. Make testing entirely principal prerogative.	No change. CPS says they are firm on wanting to eliminate school assessment votes.	No movement.
Grading (Article 44)	Teacher autonomy.	Delete language about task force. Allow principals to put out grading practices each year based on jointly developed Guidance Document.	CPS proposed language consistent with the current status quo—teachers grade as long as it’s within the joint Guidance Document language.	<u>Movement</u>
Counseling Duties (Article 20)	Protect Counselor’s time to provide service to students based on ASCA guidance and 80/20 guideline.	No response.	CPS proposed that principals “shall assign duties” to counselors consistent with ASCA guidance and the CPS REACH Counselor Framework.	<u>Movement</u> The CTU Bargaining Team’s powerful presentation caused this shift.
Housing & STLS Support (Article 46)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide full-time STLS (such as School Community Reps=SCR) to support students. 2. Create home purchase assistance programs for members. 3. Advocate for city initiatives to generate affordable housing for our students families. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No response. 2. No response. 3. No response. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Effective immediately, CPS agreed to fund a full-time SCR at every school with 90+ STLS students, and provide \$1,000 per semester stipends to STLS liaisons in schools: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. 1 stipend at schools with 25-29 STLS students b. 2 stipends=30-59 STLS students c. 3 stipends=60-89 STLS students 2. No response. 3. No response. 	<u>Movement</u> CPS’s response to our STLS proposal shows that CTU was right to advocate for contract language addressing housing needs and the CTU Bargaining Team will continue fighting for more.
Sanctuary Schools (Article 46)	Tentative Agreement.	Agreed to CTU’s language.	No Change.	No movement, but this is a win for our students!

Proposal Area (Article No.)	CTU Proposals as of 10.1.19	CPS Response as of 10.1.19	CPS Response as of 10.15.19	Assessment
Sustainable Community Schools (Article 12)	Continue to fund initial 20 schools and expand to 75 over the duration of the contract.	Discontinue program for existing 20 schools.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CTU countered scaling back our proposal to phase in only up to 50 schools over the duration of the contract. CPS proposed that the existing joint Task Force use the results a study already in the works to determine IF the program continues at all. 	<u>No movement.</u> This was a win in our last contract and was fought for with our community allies. CPS is only back to the status quo of what they've told the joint Task Force. They are avoiding a commitment to this community partnership and putting it back in perpetual limbo which it has been for the last two years.
Substitute Teachers (Article 27)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Guarantee duty-free lunch. Provide PD on SPED, ELL, Tech on 2 PD days. Substitute teachers follow teacher's schedule (get preps). Hire additional Cadre. Provide option to purchase health insurance. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Tentative Agreement. Tentative Agreement. CPS rejects the concept of this entirely. No response. No response. 	<p>No changes to 1-5 AND:</p> <p>CPS proposed working with CTU to establish a substitute evaluation aka "performance improvement process" and abiding by the Substitute Teacher Handbook.</p>	<u>Movement</u> BUT... The CTU Bargaining Team is still fighting for substitutes to have some prep time and access to health insurance.
PSRP Issues (Article 9)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a group of Teacher Assistant substitutes. Protect clerk duties. Delineate probationary period. Create a Joint Committee. Fund Grow Your Own program to help PSRPs become teachers. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No response. No response. Tentative Agreement. No response. CPS proposed to "increase its financial commitment" to diverse teacher pipeline programs for PSRPs and parents. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (See Early Childhood). CPS proposed that they "shall clearly delineate the duties of the school clerk" and "consult" with the CTU about changes. CTU countered that clerks be only staff to perform duties around "Kronos, attendance management, internal accounts, registration, enrollment, and data entry" and not give clerk duties to miscellaneous employees. Tentative Agreement. No change. No change. 	<u>Movement</u> The change on clerk duties from CPS is significant and CTU Bargaining Team is continuing to fight for more protections in writing.
Clinician Issues (Article 20)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Designated private space to work. 45-minute lunch apart from travel time. Increase Clinician Stipend/ Increment. Recognition of national certifications. Honor clinician preferences for school assignments. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No response. Tentative Agreement. CPS has responded by expanding existing stipend to CSN's, OT's, and PT's. No response. No response. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> CPS agreed and we have a Tentative Agreement that "principals shall provide clinicians...space...that is confidential and private" and a weekly schedule of its availability. Tentative Agreement. CPS proposed increased stipends. CPS proposed adding our recommended certifications. CPS proposed that they will take preferences "into consideration." 	<u>Movement</u> The private work space language is better than current and will take active work (surveys and grievance filing) by clinician members and committees to ensure enforcement and other changes will provide further protections.

Proposal Area (Article No.)	CTU Proposals as of 10.1.19	CPS Response as of 10.1.19	CPS Response as of 10.15.19	Assessment
Bilingual Education (Article 44, 46)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increase staffing of EL Program Teachers and protect their work. Expand pipeline of bilingual teachers. Provide additional PD and resources. Protect bilingual educators from being pulled to translate. Create a Joint Committee. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No response. No response. No response. Willing to consider internal certification for doing interpreting work for IEP meetings. No response. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> CPS verbally said they are open to increasing the ratio of program coordinators to EL students and allowing EL teachers to refuse taking on EL program coordination responsibilities. CPS verbally said they are open to the idea of making program coordination a separate position. CPS verbally said they already have a pipeline and haven't memorialized the commitment or expansion of pipeline in writing. No response. CPS proposed to create an internal certification and provide a stipend for bilingual employees to do translation for IEP meetings. CPS agreed to a standing Bilingual Committee. 	<p><u>Movement</u></p> <p>CPS seems to better understand the difference between EL teaching and the EL program coordination responsibilities and we need this in writing.</p>
Early Childhood Education (Proposed Article 17)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Enforceable 10 students to 1 teacher ratio. Protect Teacher Assistants from being pulled from EC classrooms. Reduce workload by not requiring K report cards at same time as KIDS. Expand and protect nap time. Parent application and enrollment at school sites. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> CPS agreed. Reject. No response No response. No response. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> CPS proposed to put into contract and CTU proposed that CPS create a substitute Teacher Assistant pool to work in EC classrooms and we have a Tentative Agreement on this. CPS proposed that "TAs shall be given their contractual breaks covered to maintain the 10:1 ratio." No change. CPS agreed and we have Tentative Agreement that children in full-day pre-K programs "shall be allowed to nap." No change. 	<p><u>Movement</u></p> <p>The CTU Bargaining Team pushed CPS to memorialize the 10:1 ratio from school code in writing.</p>
Deferred Pay (Article 36)	Allow members to choose to have CPS pay over 12-months or 10-months.	Work with banks to help educators who use direct deposit set up themselves.	No change.	No movement.
Calendar (Article 19)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No furloughs. Increased PD days. Appropriate calendar for alternative schools. Two more paid holidays. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No response. No response. No response. No response. 	No change.	No movement.
CTE (Article 18)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Expand and protect CTE programs in high schools. Create CTE Network to ensure knowledgeable oversight of programs. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No response. No response. 	No change.	No movement.

Proposal Area (Article No.)	CTU Proposals as of 10.1.19	CPS Response as of 10.1.19	CPS Response as of 10.15.19	Assessment
Sports and Coaching (Article 13, Appendix A)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increase coaching stipends, add lanes for experience, create more parity in pay and hours between sports. Increase resources for programs at schools—e.g. transportation, equipment, etc. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No response. No response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CTU provided an updated and more specific proposal including proposed amounts and hours and that CPS provide an updated, accessible list of all sports programs available across the district. CPS provided data requested by the bargaining team, but has not responded to the CTU counter proposal. 	No movement.
NBCT (Article 44)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increase funding and stipends for NBCT program. Add advanced credentials for clinicians. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> CPS proposed to increase stipends, but not total program funds. CPS agreed to add Advanced Related Service Provider (clinician) Credentials to NBCT credentials. 	No change.	No movement.
School Climate (Article 30)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Hire restorative justice (RJ) coordinators. Annual RJ training for all staff including security guards. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No response. No response. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> CPS says they are not willing to commit to staff. CPS agreed to work with CTU to develop curriculum and training. 	<u>Movement</u> The CTU bargaining team is still fighting for some number of staff to be hired at schools with highest rates of disproportionate discipline of students of color and a specific dollar amount to be provided by CPS for training to be targeted to highest need schools.
Supply Money (Article 7-6)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increase from \$250 to \$500. Provide money up front or dramatically simplify reimbursement process. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Keep at current \$250. CPS proposed that they will assume purchases are reasonable and will not be denied. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No change. CPS proposed to add that they work with vendors so purchases can be made directly online and be delivered to educator and not need to be reimbursed. 	<u>Movement</u> CPS agreed to make it easier to receive supplies but has not budged on the \$250 amount.
Kronos/Swiping (Article 36)	Only require swiping in, not out.	No response.	No change.	No movement.
Accreted Members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Youth Intervention Specialists Family Engagement Coordinator Comprehensive Service Coordinator Attendance Coordinator College and Career Specialists 	CTU did not change any of our proposals from the 9/26/19 meeting. The Board had all comprehensive proposals for establishing terms for these groups.	CPS <u>verbally</u> agreed to many of the non-economics. Still has not made any written salary counter proposal for these groups since bringing issues to the main table.	CPS stated that they were working on getting us a proposal soon.	No movement.

Proposal Area (Article No.)	CTU Proposals as of 10.1.19	CPS Response as of 10.1.19	CPS Response as of 10.15.19	Assessment
Transfer Period (Article 35-4)	CTU did not propose changes to the transfer periods.	CPS had verbally said they wanted to eliminate the midyear transfer window.	CPS proposed to eliminate the midyear transfer window.	<u>Negative movement</u> CTU bargaining team said <u>verbally</u> that we might be willing to shorten the midyear transfer window if the summer one is extended and CPS improves conditions in schools via other contract proposals.