

Students Need Stability–SB 916 Creates Uncertainty Please <u>VOTE NO</u>

Students and families rely on predictable school schedules and programming. In order to meet those expectations, districts need stable funding and budget certainty. SB 916 would lead to the opposite and creates a lose-lose proposition:

- 1. SB 916 B adds pressure to the bargaining process by making it less consequential and more likely for unions to strike, putting pressure on public employers such as school districts to settle in order to avoid a strike. If striking teachers are eligible for UI benefits, the district is more likely to settle a contract it can't afford and this would necessitate cuts.
- 2. If a district does not agree to settle a contract they cannot afford, and educators *do* go on strike, students will lose out on learning time. Under SB 916 B, a strike would also increase district expenses. Schools would need to both reimburse the Unemployment Compensation Trust Fund and spend significant staff time trying to recover those costs.

While the bill includes language to address the cost of schools reimbursing the Trust, the process is still damaging to a district and its ability to serve students.

The time involved in recovering UI costs would create a budgeting challenge for a district on the back-end of a strike. It could take months for districts to recover their costs related to UI benefits during a strike. When a district is figuring out how to pay for a new contract, that is not the time to add uncertainty over cash-flow.

SB 916 B could lead to layoffs of teachers and other public school employees.

During the time a district is working to recover the cost of UI benefits, a district would need to account for the fact that those dollars are not available. That means having less money in the budget to cover classroom expenses in real-time. For a district with a very tight budget, it could result in staff layoffs or furlough days to ensure the district doesn't spend more than it will actually recover.

SB 916 B exposes other employers to risk, not just the employer that is bargaining.

Given the way that unemployment insurance works, if an educator has recently moved from one school district to another in the past 15 months, the prior employer could be charged if that educator goes on strike in the new district. There is no language in SB 916 B that holds employers harmless from the cost of someone else's strike.

School districts across Oregon are already cutting their budgets. Many schools will have fewer staff in 2025-26 and some students may have e fewer days of instruction if SB 916 B passes. This is not the time to risk further strain on budgets.



1

District	2025-2026 Cuts	25-26 Staff Reductions	Cost For 1 Week of UI Benefits
Beaverton	\$2.4 million	2.25 FTE	\$2.2M licensed \$1M classified
Bend-La Pine	\$3 million	22 FTE	\$837,500 licensed \$482,000 classified
Centennial	\$4.5 million	7 FTE	\$400,000 licensed \$215,000 classified
Gresham-Barlow	\$8 million	40 FTE	\$1.07M licensed \$385,000 classified
Hillsboro	\$20 million	77 FTE	\$1.07M licensed \$596,500 classified
PPS	\$40 million	270 FTE	\$2.9M licensed \$1.5M classified
Redmond	\$2.1 million	11.14 FTE	\$343,000 licensed \$205,000 classified
Reynolds	\$25 million	160 FTE	\$665,000 licensed \$346,000 classified