

**A note from the CTU Bargaining Team, which includes officers, staff, attorneys, and 40+ rank-and-file members**

After more than a week on strike, there has been movement on several of our key bargaining demands. We received class size and staffing proposals from CPS in writing. We have won several agreements on working conditions that will positively impact sections of our membership and our students. Our contract only settles, however, if CPS commits the necessary resources to invest in our schools, our students, and our members. We have told CPS that there needs to be a breakthrough on deep investment in enforceable adequate class size, enforcement of increased staffing, increased pay for PSRPs and experienced educators, and elementary school prep time. We know that your efforts on your picket lines and in the streets have made a big difference, and we believe if we stick together, we are going to win a just and fair contract for our students, our schools, and our members.



**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	Status as of 10.25.19	Status as of 10.29.19
Contract Duration	3 years.	5 years.	CPS said that a 5-year contract is their final offer.	<b>No movement.</b>  Agreeing to a 5-year contract means being locked into terms until after the mayor is up for reelection.	<b>No movement.</b>  Would we be open to a 5-year contract in if we lock-in big wins on our top priorities?	<b>No movement.</b>  CPS and the mayor are dug in. Whether we can agree to a 5-year contract will depend on our assessment of the wins in the contract.  Additionally, would we accept a 5-year contract if it addresses our priorities AND the mayor stops blocking the passage of an Elected Representative School Board and getting back our bargaining rights (rescinding section 4.5)?

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	Status as of 10.25.19	Status as of 10.29.19
<b>Staffing Social Workers, Case Managers, Nurses, Teacher Assistants, Counselors, Librarians, Psychologists OTs, PTs, Restorative Justice Coordinators, Speech-Language Pathologists and Audiologists</b> (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"> <li>• Still agreeing to phase out contract nurses.</li> <li>• CPS proposed to spend \$2 million for nurse specific pipeline (LPNs to HSNs, and HSNs to CSNs) over a 5-year contract.</li> <li>• CPS proposed an MOU providing \$400,000 annually to recruit new nurses, social workers, and case managers and meeting with CTU on progress.</li> <li>• CPS verbally suggested creating a citywide Joint Committee empowered to add 1 full-time employee at 20% of schools with greatest student needs.</li> <li>• 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 &amp; above, including pre-k IEPs) and are open to targeting positions in schools with most need.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Movement</b></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 &amp; ELPTs), and phase in of additional staff toward goals IN WRITING IN THE CONTRACT.</p>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p><b>Tentative agreement</b> on phase out of privatized nurses.</p> <p>CPS proposed in writing that “provided there are a sufficient number of qualified candidates,” they will agree to staff “by 7/30/2023 the following additional positions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 209 additional social workers</li> <li>• 250 additional nurses (includes HSNs, LPNs, and CSNs)</li> <li>• Allocate case managers as follows for the number of students with IEPs (including pre-K, but not including 504s and speech-only):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» .5 position for 50-119 students</li> <li>» 1 position for 120-239 students</li> <li>» 2 positions for 240 or more students</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A joint CTU-CPS Committee would identify 100 schools with highest needs. CPS to provide 25 additional positions a year in 100 of the highest needs schools—LSC would pick what the position is to address SEL, RJ, counseling, library or other instruction. Schools would not be required to pick a Counselor, Librarian or RJ Coordinator.</li> <li>• Starting in SY 19-20, CPS would staff 1 English Learner Program Teacher positions at each school with 150 English Learners students or more and double the ELPT stipend for schools with fewer than 20 EL students to \$1,000.</li> </ul> <p>AND...</p> <p>We <u>have</u> and continue to provide counter proposals especially to specify counselors, librarians and RJ coordinators, and to increase the allocation of case managers and ELPT positions AND create an enforcement mechanism to ensure positions are filled.</p>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We still have a Tentative Agreement on privatized nurses.</li> <li>• CPS still proposed a \$2 million pipeline for developing nurses.</li> <li>• CPS proposed that “by no later than 7/30/2023, the BOARD will assign one full-time social worker and nurse to each school in the District.”</li> <li>• CPS still proposed same social worker and nurse numbers.</li> <li>• CPS proposed to allocate case managers as follows for the number of students with IEPs (including pre-K, but including 504s and speech-onlys at a ratio of 10:1 regular IEPs):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» .5 position for 50-104 students with IEPs</li> <li>» 1 position for 105-174 students</li> <li>» 1.5 positions for 175-239 students</li> <li>» 2 positions for 240-299 students</li> <li>» 2.5 positions for 300+</li> </ul> </li> <li>• CPS agreed to CTU proposal to reduce caseloads and not reduce current staffing numbers of school psychologists OTs, PTs, SLPs, and Audiologists for the duration of the contract.</li> <li>• CPS agreed to CTU proposal to increase the MOU to \$500,000 annually to recruit new nurses, social workers, case managers and agreed to add school psychologists OTs, PTs, SLPs, and Audiologists.</li> <li>• CPS still proposed a joint CTU-CPS Committee to identify now 120 schools with highest needs. For those schools, CPS would provide an additional position each at the rate of 30 schools per year starting in SY 2020-2021. The LSC and principal would pick what the position is to address SEL, RJ, counseling, library or other instruction. Schools would not be required to pick a Counselor, Librarian or RJ Coordinator. School could also choose to take the dollar equivalent of an FTE and use the funds to address same issues in other ways.</li> <li>• CPS proposed that, starting in 2019-2020, CPS would staff:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» .5 ELPT position for schools with 20-150 EL students</li> <li>» 1 ELPT position at each school with 150 EL students</li> <li>» Stipend roles are voluntary with under 19 EL students and stipends remain for EL program coordination work as follows:                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» \$1,000 for 1-49 EL students</li> <li>» \$1,500 for 50-99</li> <li>» \$2,000 for 100-199</li> <li>» \$2,500 for 200-249</li> <li>» \$3,000 for 250+</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>If no teacher volunteers to take on ELPT work, it shall be assigned to an administrator, “if possible.”</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	Status as of 10.25.19	Status as of 10.29.19
<b>Class Size</b> (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"> <li>• CPS proposed to spend \$1 million to reduce class size overages in grades 4-12.</li> <li>• CPS proposed to expand language that currently provides a Teacher Assistant for K-2 classes over 32 to K-3.</li> <li>• CPS proposed to spend more \$ (without giving an amount) on providing additional Teacher Assistants.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>AND:</p> <p>CTU bargaining team is fighting for reduced class size caps (not current caps) and clearer enforcement mechanisms.</p>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPS continues to reject any enforceable hard class size caps.</li> <li>• CTU and CPS agree that having a class size Joint Council with decision making authority will be part of a final agreement. Said Council will have the ability to allocate funds for various remedies from a bucket to alleviate class size overages.</li> <li>• CPS maintains that they would only address class sizes over 32 in K-3 classrooms in Tier 1 elementary schools.</li> <li>• CPS' current dollar amount would only address 15% of the class size overages in the district according to current class size limits and would not expand the number of classrooms helped over time.</li> </ul> <p>The CTU Bargaining Team continues to propose counters which would create enforceable caps, expand the initial relief to more schools and increase the relief to more grades and/or schools over time.</p>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>After 10.24.19, CPS increased their dollar offer for class size relief from \$16 million to \$25 million. TODAY, CPS proposed to put an additional \$10 million into the pot, raising the total to \$35 million.</p> <p>TODAY, CPS proposed that they would put \$10 million additional dollars into the pot, but said that offer only stood if we dropped all other outstanding demands (meaning veteran pay and prep time). The CTU thinks that this additional money is needed to be able to address both priority and non-priority schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPS and CTU still agree to a class size Joint Council with decision making power to delivering enforceable relief in a timely manner.</li> <li>• CPS still proposed that part of the money would go to adding Teacher Assistants in K-3 classrooms with 32 or more students in the second semester of SY 19-20.</li> <li>• Starting in SY 2020-2021, the Joint Council could spend dollars to reduce class sizes in school identified by class size "triggers":             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>» K=32+ students</li> <li>» 1-3=32+</li> <li>» 4-8=35+</li> <li>» 9-12=32/35/38+.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• CPS Priority Schools (those with 60% or more students who live in tier 1 communities) would get preference for remedies and the Joint Council could lower their class sizes below the current contract limits (K=28, 1-3=28, 4-8=31, 9-12=25/28/32/38).</li> </ul>
<b>Preparation Time</b> (Article 4, 5, and 6)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Add 30-minute morning self-directed prep to Elementary Day.</li> <li>2. Otherwise seek to increase prep time.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CPS proposed for Elementary to reduce self-directed preps to 3/week and for High School, they proposed no change to current prep time.</li> <li>2. No response.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• CPS verbally agreed to give CTU class size data from the 10th day at regular intervals.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Movement</b></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>	<b>No movement.</b>	<b>No movement.</b>
<b>Pay</b> (Article 36, Appendix A)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. COLA raise per year of the contract's proposed duration: 5%, 5%, 5%.</li> <li>2. Increase steps for veteran teachers.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. COLA raise per year of the contract's proposed duration: 3%, 3%, 3%, 3.5%, 3.5%.</li> <li>2. No response.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CPS said that this is their final offer in a 5-year contract.</li> <li>• CPS agreed to list member steps, lanes, and anniversary dates on paychecks.</li> </ul>	<p><b>No movement</b></p> <p>CTU Bargaining Team is fighting for movement on veteran teacher steps. 9% over 3-years is not acceptable.</p>	<b>No movement.</b>	<p><b>Movement.</b></p> <p>The CTU Bargaining Team has been laser focused on PSRP and veteran educator increases. TODAY, CPS finally proposed to put \$5 million annually into veteran pay.</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	Status as of 10.25.19	Status as of 10.29.19
<b>PSRP Pay</b> (Appendix A)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase PSRP base pay above poverty rate by 30% for lowest grades.</li> <li>Add lanes for educational experience.</li> <li>Increase value of step schedule by 4%.</li> <li>Average 1st year increase across all PSRPs, 22%.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase PSRP base pay an additional 1.5% in year 1 for lowest grades.</li> <li>Create Associate's lane immediately and Bachelor lane in 2021.</li> <li>Increase step schedule by 4% (to equalize steps across all grades).</li> <li>Increase nursing-related PSRP grades by one salary grade. Average 1st year increase across all PSRPs: 8%</li> </ol>	<p>CTU presented a counter proposal asking for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase PSRP base pay by 21% for lowest grades</li> <li>Keep lane proposal.</li> <li>Move PSRPs up the step schedule faster.</li> <li>Average 1st year increase across all PSRPs: 18%</li> </ol> <p>CPS has <u>not</u> responded to CTU counterproposal.</p>	<p><b><u>Movement</u></b></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>	<p><b>No movement.</b></p> <p>The CTU Bargaining Team sees this as a top priority, and it is connected to our SEIU 73 siblings who are also looking to lift their members out of poverty, even though they work full-time in CPS schools.</p>	<p><b><u>Movement</u></b></p> <p>CPS had already agreed to create an immediate lane for Associates degree and the phase-in lanes for Bachelors degrees. CPS finally responded to CTU's proposal, which we countered, and then received another response from CPS. It puts significantly more money into PSRP pay schedules but does not fast-track the step schedule.</p> <p>CPS proposed to (in addition to the overall COLAs for members):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add a 9% pay increase to the base pay of the GA1, GA2, GB1, GB2, GA3, G03, GB3 pay schedules.</li> <li>Add a 5% pay increase to the base pay of G04 and G05 pay schedules.</li> <li>HSNs and LPNs will receive 8% and 10% increases to their base pay, plus pipeline support to move into higher paying nurse positions.</li> </ul>
<b>Health Care</b> (Appendix B & E)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce cost of PPO by .8% of salary and freeze premiums at 0%.</li> <li>Reduce co-pays for Physical, Mental Health Therapy in particular.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes in benefits but raise premiums by .25% in year 4 and .5% in year 5.</li> <li>No response.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CPS said this is their final offer in a 5-year contract.</li> <li>CPS agreed to, effective January 1, 2020:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eliminate co-insurance on outpatient mental health on PPO, same \$25 co-pay.</li> <li>Reduce HMO mental health co-pay from \$30 to \$15.</li> <li>Reduce PPO and HMO physical therapy co-pay from \$45 to \$30.</li> <li>LMCC will work to ensure insurance is equitable for LGBTQIAA+ members.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p><b><u>Movement</u></b></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>	<p><b>No movement.</b></p>	<p><b><u>Movement</u></b></p> <p>No changes to the existing offer from 10.25.19. CTU Bargaining Team's sense is that this is a decent offer. CPS has also signaled a willingness to positively address the .8% PPO increase as a part of settlement.</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	Status as of 10.25.19	Status as of 10.29.19
<b>Benefit Time</b> (Article 25, 26, 37)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Allow banking of benefit time.</li> <li>2. Convert benefit time to PTO.</li> <li>3. Increase # of benefit days.</li> <li>4. Increase # of holidays.</li> <li>5. Provide same leaves for teachers and PSRPs.</li> <li>6. Allow bereavement days to be taken non-consecutively.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No response.</li> <li>2. No response.</li> <li>3. No response.</li> <li>4. No response.</li> <li>5. No response.</li> <li>6. No response.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No response.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>3. No response.</li> <li>4. No response.</li> <li>5. No response.</li> <li>6. Tentative Agreement.</li> </ol>	<p><b>No movement.</b></p> <p>The bereavement leave <u>is</u> important, but CPS has not responded on anything else related to benefit time.</p>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>CPS is willing to lift the cap on the CTU bank of days from 40 to 244. These days are eligible for use and for pension credit, but not payout upon resignation or retirement. This is a step forward AND the CTU Bargaining Team is trying to get CPS to agree to a PB day usage policy which would end the regular push-back on PB days.</p>	<p><b>No movement.</b></p> <p>The CTU Bargaining Team agrees that the expansion of the CTU bank is positive. CPS continues to be unwilling to meaningfully address issues with PB usage.</p>
<b>SPED</b> (Article 21)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Protect IEP team decisions from undo pressure.</li> <li>2. Increase SPED prep time and reduce workload to focus on IEPs.</li> <li>3. Improve co-teaching and collaboration time.</li> <li>4. Provide a continuum of services for students.</li> <li>5. Provide resources to SPED teachers and classrooms.</li> <li>6. Put into contract that SPED positions would continue to be centrally funded.</li> <li>7. Equitable distribution of IEP writing among SPED teachers.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No response.</li> <li>2. No response.</li> <li>3. Agree to discuss in Joint Committee, schedule joint planning time where administratively possible, and provide access to student roster/data to SPED teachers.</li> <li>4. No response.</li> <li>5. No response.</li> <li>6. No response.</li> <li>7. No response.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CPS proposed that decisions on IEPs should be “demonstrated by data” and “made solely by the IEP team” according to law.</li> <li>2. CPS proposed that they would provide \$45 stipends to SPED teachers for each IEP completed, but refused other enforceable workload relief.</li> <li>3. CPS proposed that SPED co-teachers, “where possible” should not have more than 3 course preps, or 2 if possible.</li> <li>4. No response.</li> <li>5. CPS proposed that principals will identify existing SBB money in their school’s budget for resources and the Joint Committee will provide guidance.</li> <li>6. CPS proposed putting this in the contract and having Joint Committee input on allocation of SPED teacher positions.</li> <li>7. CPS proposed “to the extent possible,” principals “shall distribute...IEP writing equally.”</li> </ol>	<p><b>Movement</b></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>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Tentative Agreement.</b></li> <li>2. The CTU BT is still discussing and countering on this issue.</li> <li>3. <b>Tentative Agreement.</b></li> <li>4. <b>Tentative Agreement.</b></li> <li>5. <b>Tentative Agreement.</b></li> <li>6. <b>Tentative Agreement.</b></li> <li>7. Is a part of the back and forth on IEP workload, CPS’ stipend offer, and prep time.</li> </ol>	<p><b>No movement.</b></p> <p>The outstanding issues are connected to the fight for additional prep time.</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	Status as of 10.25.19	Status as of 10.29.19
<b>REACH Evaluation</b> (Article 39)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tenured teachers with Proficient or Excellent rating skip a full cycle.</li> <li>Mandate use of key documents (e.g. Addenda, SPED documents).</li> <li>Clinician PAT protection from non-renewal being equivalent to termination.</li> <li>Eliminate use of VAM score in elementary ratings.</li> <li>Expand tenured appeals to all Developing ratings.</li> <li>No observations of Kindergarten teachers during KIDS assessment window.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response</li> <li>CPS proposed that evaluators “may” reference documents, but it’s not required.</li> <li>No response</li> <li>No response</li> <li>Keep current contract language where tenured appeals for 250 or below rating only.</li> <li>CPS proposed that evaluators will try not to observe at that time.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response</li> <li>Same</li> <li>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.</li> <li>No response.</li> <li>No change.</li> <li>No change.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Movement</b></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>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CPS rejected CTU proposals for a “gap year” or 3-year cycle for tenured educators with Proficient or Excellent rating.</li> <li>CPS proposed that when “CPS Addenda exist, no evidence shall contradict such Addendum,” which makes this grievable. This is a win.</li> <li>CPS proposed that PAT clinicians in year 1 and 2 cannot be non-renewed if they receive a 251-284 Developing rating and they would receive support. Same rules would apply to 250 or lower and in years 3 and 4.</li> <li>CPS continues to reject.</li> <li>CPS rejected appeal expansion. Under current contract, tenured educators with a 251-284 Developing may appeal if they are laid off out of seniority order.</li> <li>CPS proposed that evaluators “avoid” doing observations during KIDS.</li> <li>CPS proposed that observations shall not occur the day of student attendance before or after Thanksgiving, Winter, and Spring breaks.</li> </ol>	<b>No movement.</b>
<b>Student Based Budgeting</b> (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.	<b>No movement.</b>	<b>No movement.</b>	<b>No movement.</b>
<b>SQRP</b>	Remove use of standardized tests from labeling and sorting schools. Provide resources to schools, like the state evidence-based model does.	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.	<b>No movement.</b>	<b>No movement.</b>	<b>No movement.</b>
<b>School Closing Moratorium</b> (Side Letter)	Extend moratorium on school closings for duration of the contract.	No response.	No change.	<b>No movement.</b>	<b>No movement.</b>	<b>No movement.</b>

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	Status as of 10.25.19	Status as of 10.29.19
<b>Charter Moratorium</b> (Side Letter)	Extend moratorium on charter expansion for the duration of the contract.	No response.	CPS agreed.	<b>Movement</b>	<b>Tentative Agreement</b>	<b>Tentative Agreement</b>
<b>Assessment/Testing</b> (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.	<b>No movement.</b>	<b>No movement.</b>  CTU proposed that joint guidelines be created to help make the vote process go more smoothly. CPS rejected and maintains that they want the elimination of votes.	<b>No movement.</b>
<b>Grading</b> (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.	<b>Movement</b>	<b>No movement.</b>  During the strike, we've exchanged proposals to clarify the current language and have not come to an agreement.	<b>No movement.</b>
<b>Counseling Duties</b> (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.	<b>Movement</b>  The CTU Bargaining Team's powerful presentation caused this shift.	<b>Tentative Agreement</b>	<b>Tentative Agreement</b>
<b>Housing &amp; STLS Support</b> (Article 46)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide full-time STLS (such as School Community Reps=SCR) to support students.</li> <li>Create home purchase assistance programs for members.</li> <li>Advocate for city initiatives to generate affordable housing for our students families.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response.</li> <li>No response.</li> <li>No response.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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"> <li>1 stipend at schools with 25-29 STLS students</li> <li>2 stipends=30-59 STLS students</li> <li>3 stipends=60-89 STLS students</li> </ol> </li> <li>No response.</li> <li>No response.</li> </ol>	<b>Movement</b>  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.	<b>Movement</b>  On #1, we have <b>Tentative Agreement</b> . Effective immediately, CPS agreed to fund: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 full-time SCR at every school with 80-139 STLS students,</li> <li>2 full-time SCRs at schools with 140+ STLS students</li> </ul> And provide \$1,000 per semester stipends to STLS liaisons in schools: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 stipend at schools with 20-25 STLS students</li> <li>2 stipends=26-40 STLS students</li> <li>3 stipends=41-79 STLS students.</li> </ol> And CPS will meet with CTU to evaluate the effectiveness of services to STLS students.	<b>Tentative Agreement</b>  At this point, the STLS language is precedent setting and win. The CTU Bargaining Team has been focused on other protections for students (class size and staffing) and for members (veteran pay and PSRP pay) as opposed to additional wins on housing. We think this win sets the stage for additional work on housing issues.
<b>Sanctuary Schools</b> (Article 46)	Tentative Agreement.	Agreed to CTU's language.	No Change.	<b>No movement, but this is a win for our students!</b>	<b>Still a win!</b>	<b>Tentative Agreement</b>  The CTU Bargaining Team clarified that CPS is willing to meet with CTU, as requested, over sanctuary and related issues (including curriculum).

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	Status as of 10.25.19	Status as of 10.29.19
<b>Sustainable Community Schools</b> (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"> <li>CTU countered scaling back our proposal to phase in only up to 50 schools over the duration of the contract.</li> <li>CPS proposed that the existing joint Task Force use the results of a study already in the works to determine IF the program continues at all.</li> </ul>	<p><b>No movement.</b></p> <p>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.</p>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>CPS proposed to continue to provide \$10 million per year during the duration of the agreement, but the Task Force would use a jointly commissioned study to determine if the money would be shared between more than 20 schools. CTU countered that the Task Force should also determine if any of the 20 schools would change. This is a win.</p>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>This is now a <b>Tentative Agreement!</b></p>
<b>Substitute Teachers</b> (Article 27)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guarantee duty-free lunch.</li> <li>Provide PD on SPED, ELL, Tech on 2 PD days.</li> <li>Substitute teachers follow teacher's schedule (get preps).</li> <li>Hire additional Cadre.</li> <li>Provide option to purchase health insurance.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tentative Agreement.</li> <li>Tentative Agreement.</li> <li>CPS rejects the concept of this entirely.</li> <li>No response.</li> <li>No response.</li> </ol>	<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>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>BUT...</p> <p>The CTU Bargaining Team is still fighting for substitutes to have some prep time and access to health insurance.</p>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>On #4 and 5, CPS proposed to reduce the minimum requirement to be a Cadre working at least 3 school days a week "on average" so that an additional 225 day-to-day substitutes will qualify to become Cadre and therefore receive health insurance.</p>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>The reduction of criteria for becoming a Cadre (and therefore providing additional substitute teachers access to a position with health insurance) is now a <b>Tentative Agreement</b>. CPS continues to reject guaranteeing a substitute teacher the prep periods of the teacher whose schedule they are following. CPS maintains wanting the flexibility of substitute schedules.</p>
<b>PSRP Issues</b> (Article 9)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop a group of Teacher Assistant substitutes.</li> <li>Protect clerk duties.</li> <li>Delineate probationary period.</li> <li>Create a Joint Committee.</li> <li>Fund Grow Your Own program to help PSRPs become teachers.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response.</li> <li>No response.</li> <li>Tentative Agreement.</li> <li>No response.</li> <li>CPS proposed to "increase its financial commitment" to diverse teacher pipeline programs for PSRPs and parents.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(See Early Childhood).</li> <li>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 the only staff to perform duties around "Kronos, attendance management, internal accounts, registration, enrollment, and data entry" and not give clerk duties to miscellaneous employees.</li> <li>Tentative Agreement.</li> <li>No change.</li> <li>No change.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>The change on clerk duties from CPS is significant and CTU Bargaining Team is continuing to fight for more protections in writing.</p>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>BUT not much...</p> <p>On #2, CTU countered that CPS shall return timekeeping, internal accounts, attendance management, registration, enrollment and data entry work to School Clerks, School Clerk Assistants and Substitute School Clerks. So far, CPS rejects and continues to reject other proposals to stop duties from being given to miscellaneous employees. AND... CPS agreed that they "shall not reclassify any TA to a SECA who does not perform diapering and feeding."</p> <p><b>Tentative Agreement</b> on CPS expanding commitment to financially helping PSRPs become teachers.</p>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>CPS agreed to work with CTU to, by SY 2020-2021, return timekeeping duties to School Clerks, School Clerk Assistants and Substitute School Clerks.</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	Status as of 10.25.19	Status as of 10.29.19
<b>Clinician Issues</b> (Article 20)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Designated private space to work.</li> <li>2. 45-minute lunch apart from travel time.</li> <li>3. Increase Clinician Stipend/Increment.</li> <li>4. Recognition of national certifications.</li> <li>5. Honor clinician preferences for school assignments.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No response.</li> <li>2. Tentative Agreement.</li> <li>3. CPS has responded by expanding existing stipend to CSNs, OTs, and PTs.</li> <li>4. No response.</li> <li>5. No response.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 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.</li> <li>2. Tentative Agreement.</li> <li>3. CPS proposed increased stipends.</li> <li>4. CPS proposed adding our recommended certifications.</li> <li>5. CPS proposed that they will take preferences "into consideration."</li> </ol>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>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.</p>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>All of these items are now <b>Tentative Agreements!</b></p>	<p><b>Still wins!</b></p>
<b>Bilingual Education</b> (Article 44, 46)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase staffing of EL Program Teachers and protect their work.</li> <li>2. Expand pipeline of bilingual teachers.</li> <li>3. Provide additional PD and resources.</li> <li>4. Protect bilingual educators from being pulled to translate.</li> <li>5. Create a Joint Committee.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No response.</li> <li>2. No response.</li> <li>3. No response.</li> <li>4. Willing to consider internal certification for doing interpreting work for IEP meetings.</li> <li>5. No response.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 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.</li> <li>2. CPS verbally said they already have a pipeline and haven't memorialized the commitment or expansion of pipeline in writing.</li> <li>3. No response.</li> <li>4. CPS proposed to create an internal certification and provide a stipend for bilingual employees to do translation for IEP meetings.</li> <li>5. CPS agreed to a standing Bilingual Committee.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Movement</b></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>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. See ELPT ratios CPS is maintaining in the Staffing section of this document.</li> <li>On #2 and 3, CTU and CPS have exchanged numerous counter proposals back and forth and are still countering.</li> <li>4. CPS agreed to a proposal to pay a \$500/semester stipend to educators who are asked to do oral language interpretation.</li> <li>5. <b>Tentative Agreement.</b></li> </ol>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>See ELPT ratios in the Staffing section above.</p> <p><b>Tentative Agreement</b> on ELPTs shall have at least 50% of their time protected on non-teaching program coordination work. For an ELPT at a school with 250+ EL students, 100% of their time shall be spent on non-teaching program coordination work. The main focus on the proposal has become these changes to protect EL program coordination work.</p> <p>Still have <b>Tentative Agreement</b> on a Bilingual Committee.</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	Status as of 10.25.19	Status as of 10.29.19
<b>Early Childhood Education</b> (Proposed Article 17)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Enforceable 10 students to 1 teacher ratio.</li> <li>2. Protect Teacher Assistants from being pulled from EC classrooms.</li> <li>3. Reduce workload by not requiring K report cards at same time as KIDS.</li> <li>4. Expand and protect nap time.</li> <li>5. Parent application and enrollment at school sites.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CPS agreed.</li> <li>2. Reject.</li> <li>3. No response</li> <li>4. No response.</li> <li>5. No response.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 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.</li> <li>2. CPS proposed that "TAs shall be given their contractual breaks covered to maintain the 10:1 ratio."</li> <li>3. No change.</li> <li>4. CPS agreed and we have Tentative Agreement that children in full-day pre-K programs "shall be allowed to nap."</li> <li>5. No change.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>The CTU Bargaining Team pushed CPS to memorialize the 10:1 ratio from school code in writing.</p>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Tentative Agreement.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Tentative Agreement.</b></li> <li>3. CPS continues to reject.</li> <li>4. <b>Tentative Agreement.</b></li> <li>5. CPS continues to reject.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Tentative Agreement.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Tentative Agreement.</b></li> <li>3. <b>Tentative Agreement</b> to give two principal-directed preps to teachers during 1st quarter or any other when KIDS assessment is given in order to complete report cards.</li> <li>4. <b>Tentative Agreement.</b></li> <li>5. CPS continues to reject.</li> </ol>
<b>Deferred Pay</b> (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.	<b>No movement.</b>	<b>No movement.</b>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>CPS proposed to work with CTU to identify a bank or institution to easily replicate deferred pay payments to members via CPS's direct deposit system.</p>
<b>Calendar</b> (Article 19)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No furloughs.</li> <li>2. Increased PD days.</li> <li>3. Appropriate calendar for alternative schools.</li> <li>4. Two more paid holidays.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No response.</li> <li>2. No response.</li> <li>3. No response.</li> <li>4. No response.</li> </ol>	No change.	<b>No movement.</b>	<b>No movement.</b>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>CPS agreed to adjust the school calendar for members in alternative schools in jail facilities (York &amp; Jefferson).</p>
<b>CTE</b> (Article 18)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Expand and protect CTE programs in high schools.</li> <li>2. Create CTE Network to ensure knowledgeable oversight of programs.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No response.</li> <li>2. No response.</li> </ol>	No change.	<b>No movement.</b>	<p><b>No movement.</b></p> <p>CPS continues to reject these proposals.</p>	<p><b>No movement.</b></p> <p>CPS has accepted some changes to training and PD, but continues to reject the most substantial proposals.</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	Status as of 10.25.19	Status as of 10.29.19
<b>Sports and Coaching</b> (Article 13, Appendix A)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase coaching stipends, add lanes for experience, create more parity in pay and hours between sports.</li> <li>Increase resources for programs at schools—e.g. transportation, equipment, etc.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response.</li> <li>No response.</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>CPS provided data requested by the bargaining team, but has not responded to the CTU counter proposal.</li> </ul>	<b>No movement.</b>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>CPS proposed creating a joint committee to study and make recommendations on issues including increasing coaching stipends, transportation and officiating for conference games, equipment, number of coaches, practice and playing facilities, access to a public list of sports and extracurricular activities offered. They say they are going to come back with a dollar amount of resources to actually address some of these issues, but CTU is still waiting for that response.</p>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>CPS proposed to create a joint committee and provide <b>\$5 million annually</b> to fund changes to sports programs and coaches pay. Sports is an issue that has not been discussed in decades so this is a win.</p>
<b>NBCT</b> (Article 44)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase funding and stipends for NBCT program.</li> <li>Add advanced credentials for clinicians.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CPS proposed to increase stipends, but not total program funds.</li> <li>CPS agreed to add Advanced Related Service Provider (clinician) Credentials to NBCT credentials.</li> </ol>	No change.	<b>No movement.</b>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> <li><b>Tentative Agreement.</b></li> </ol>	<p><b>Movement.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Tentative Agreement</b> on increasing the stipends.</li> <li>CPS continues to reject additional funds for the NBCT program overall.</li> </ol>
<b>School Climate</b> (Article 30)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hire restorative justice (RJ) coordinators.</li> <li>Annual RJ training for all staff including security guards.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No response.</li> <li>No response.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CPS says they are not willing to commit to staff.</li> <li>CPS agreed to work with CTU to develop curriculum and training.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>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.</p>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>BUT... The movement is only related to possibly hiring an extra staff person in highest needs schools (see the above <b>Staffing</b> section). CPS did accept CTU's proposals to collaborate around RJ training, but would not commit to a dollar amount to fund such training. CTU is still proposing a dollar amount be devoted to RJ training.</p>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>BUT... Again see the Staffing section.</p>
<b>Supply Money</b> (Article 7-6)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase from \$250 to \$500.</li> <li>Provide money up front or dramatically simplify reimbursement process.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep at current \$250.</li> <li>CPS proposed that they will assume purchases are reasonable and will not be denied.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change.</li> <li>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.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Movement</b></p> <p>CPS agreed to make it easier to receive supplies but has not budgeted on the \$250 amount.</p>	<b>No movement.</b>	<b>No movement.</b>
<b>Kronos/Swiping</b> (Article 36)	Only require swiping in, not out.	No response.	No change.	<b>No movement.</b>	<b>No movement.</b>	<b>No movement.</b>

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	Status as of 10.25.19	Status as of 10.29.19
<b>Accreted Members</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Youth Intervention Specialists</li> <li>Family Engagement Coordinator</li> <li>Comprehensive Service Coordinator</li> <li>Attendance Coordinator</li> <li>College and Career Specialists</li> </ul>	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.	<b>No movement.</b>	<b><u>Movement</u></b>  CPS did respond, and we are now close on non-economic issues. However, we are still far apart on salaries and anticipate this only settling once PSRP salaries are settled.	<b>No movement.</b>
<b>Transfer Period</b> (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.	<b><u>Negative movement</u></b>  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.	<b>No movement.</b>  CPS is still unwilling to accept anything less than elimination of the midyear transfer period.	<b>No movement.</b>