

1 [Opposition to Proposition 74]

2

3 **Resolution opposing Proposition 74 on the November 8th special ballot election**

4 WHEREAS, Trustees on local school boards and county boards of education are
5 elected by their communities to recruit, hire and evaluate the teachers who educate the
6 state’s 6 million students; and

7 WHEREAS, The self-described “Put The Kids First Act,” Proposition 74 on the Nov. 8
8 ballot, is deceptively simple and misleading: it claims to help school boards and county offices
9 do their jobs while at the same time undermining their authority; and,

10 WHEREAS, The measure would make it more difficult for school boards and county
11 offices to evaluate and dismiss underperforming teachers, but do nothing to reform the most
12 cumbersome and expensive components of the existing tenure system; and,

13 WHEREAS, Proposition 74 would result in damaging unintended consequences on
14 school boards and county offices by changing probationary periods for teachers and
15 redefining unsatisfactory performance; and

16 WHEREAS, Under current law the probationary period for teachers is two years, with
17 performance evaluations required at least once each year for probationary teachers and at
18 least once every two years for teachers with permanent status; and

19 WHEREAS, Proposition 74 would extend teachers’ probationary periods to five years,
20 thus requiring local boards and county offices to perform two additional performance
21 evaluations during a teacher’s first five years, resulting in an additional 35,000 evaluations
22 each year statewide; and

23 WHEREAS, Proposition 74 would redefine “unsatisfactory performance” as it relates to
24 the dismissal of permanent or tenured teachers: a change that could require boards and
25 county offices to abandon their own locally adopted definitions; and

1 WHEREAS, The initiative would also specifically link the definition of unsatisfactory
2 performance to a process that must be negotiated with teachers through collective
3 bargaining, dramatically raising the stakes for these evaluations; and

4 WHEREAS, This change could result in protracted negotiations over evaluation
5 procedures, with impasses likely in many cases and an increase in grievances over
6 evaluation procedures; and

7 WHEREAS, The statewide costs of this expansion of the scope of collective bargaining
8 and the additional evaluations required by the measure could run into the millions of dollars
9 annually – costs for which districts and county offices would not be reimbursed; now
10 therefore, be it

11 RESOLVED, That the San Francisco Board of Supervisors strongly opposes
12 Proposition 74 on the Nov. 8 special election ballot.

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25