



Date: February 11, 2026

To: Labor and Workforce Development

From: Emily McLain, Oregon Education Association

Subject: HB 4011

### Restoring Bargaining Rights for Educators Supports Students

Chair Grayber, Vice Chairs Munoz and Sharf,

My name is Emily McLain here on behalf of the Oregon Education Association. I am glad to be here with OEA members and elected leaders who you have already heard from today.

The Oregon Education Association represents over 42,000 educators across the state of Oregon. The membership of our union spans every aspect of education. We represent educators in from pre-kindergarten, K-12 and Community colleges. These members have diverse roles from licensed teachers and specialists, classified/education support professionals (ESPs), community college faculty, bus drivers, school nurses, to counselors and more. In short, our members are the ones who ensure students arrive to school safely, are fed, supported in crisis, teach in front of classrooms, and work in difficult conditions to support students and our communities every day.

You've heard history and background on mandatory and permissive topics, and reasons this legislation makes both legal and practical sense. The aim of this bill is to simply change the dynamic that one party of a bargain can currently shut down a conversation on a foundational topic of an educators working conditions.

Since 2021 we now have 5 years of real world experience that you've heard about educators making the difficult decision that they are facing untenable circumstances to support students and that is why they have pressed forward such creative solutions like in Albany that is a model of a modest investment within the budget made a big difference.

I would be remiss if I did not mention the impact of federal actions that beg the question

Answer to questions:

Strikes and settlements

- According to Robert Young we have roughly settled 70 contracts per year since the Portland Strike
- According to Evan, we have only had one strike in Albany and have had roughly 3 strike votes since then as well

Argument that this definition is too broad substantial effect of on the job safety.

- As you heard from Liz Joffe who can answer more on this. The definition used in this -1 amendment is already in place.
  - From Liz: Under ORS 243.650(7)(g), “safety issues that have a direct and substantial effect on the on-the-job safety of public employees” is a mandatory subject for non-school employees. Yet school districts can refuse to discuss standards and procedures for student discipline that have a direct and substantial effect on the on-the-job safety of school employees.

### **Legislator’s questions:**

SB 1572 question from Sharf

Rieke – with more cuts how are you navigating this with the language. How can you navigate the cuts relative to class size agreements?

### **Opposition**

Forest grove school board member – Kristy Kottkey. Financial and systemic harm. 1 million dollars cost. SB 1555. Penalty payments. We would possibly have to eliminate program. Its already permissive. “Instructional quality – targeted feedback. It matters in K-2 grades. 1 million – coaching, mentorship, etc.

Stacey Michaelson – in opposition. Class size does matter. Research shows impact is not universally equal. Early grades and for economically disadvantaged students. That’s why you did the title one change. The original statute was silent on class size. 1994 mandatory. Then in 1995 the legislature said it was not a mandatory.