



The Battle for
Worker Freedom:

**HOW GOVERNMENT
UNIONS FUND
POLITICS
ACROSS THE
COUNTRY**

2nd Edition

DAVID OSBORNE

SENIOR DIRECTOR OF LABOR POLICY

DECEMBER 2025

Authors

David R. Osborne SENIOR DIRECTOR OF LABOR POLICY

David Osborne is the Senior Director of Labor Policy with the Commonwealth Foundation. An attorney with a solid history advocating for public employees, Osborne was the CEO of Americans for Fair Treatment (AFFT), a nonprofit that supports, educates, and empowers public employees to exercise their First Amendment rights. Before that, the president and general counsel of the Fairness Center, a nonprofit public-interest law firm providing free legal representation to those hurt by public sector union officials. Osborne has testified before the Pennsylvania House Labor and Industry Committee against unfair government union labor practices and his work has featured in *The Wall Street Journal*, *FoxNews.com*, *Philadelphia Inquirer*, *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, *National Review*, *Law & Liberty*, *The Hill*, and *RealClearPennsylvania*, among others.

Editor

Elizabeth Stelle VICE PRESIDENT OF POLICY

Elizabeth Stelle is the Vice President of Policy at the Commonwealth Foundation. A graduate of Grove City College, Stelle has researched and written on government reform, health care, welfare, energy, and government transparency. Her work has featured in the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, *Patriot-News*, and *Philadelphia Inquirer*, and she has appeared on a variety of radio and television programs throughout the commonwealth.

Guarantee Of Quality Scholarship

The Board of Directors and Staff of the Commonwealth Foundation are dedicated to providing quality and dependable research on public policy issues in the Keystone State. To this end, the Commonwealth Foundation guarantees that all statements of fact in our publications are verifiable and information attributed to other sources accurately represented.

Committed to providing Pennsylvanians with reliable information, the Commonwealth Foundation welcomes critical review of its work. If the accuracy of our research is questioned and brought to the Foundation's attention with supporting evidence in writing, the Foundation will respond.

If an error exists, the Commonwealth Foundation will issue an errata sheet that will accompany all subsequent distributions of the publication, which constitutes the complete and final remedy under this guarantee.

For additional information or questions, email the Commonwealth Foundation at info@commonwealthfoundation.org or call 717.671.1901.

Key Findings

- During the 2023–24 election cycle, the four biggest public sector unions—the National Education Association (NEA), American Federation of Teachers (AFT), Service Employees International Union (SEIU), and American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)—combined spent over \$915 million in partisan elections and advancing progressive ideology.
- The NEA, AFT, SEIU, and AFSCME collectively spent \$750 million on federal elections and national progressive politics, and their state-level affiliates combined to spend another \$160 million on state races and ideological causes.
- Of the money spent on national politics by the NEA, AFT, SEIU, and AFSCME, **86 percent (nearly \$650 million) came from member dues**. Meanwhile, unions’ federal PAC dollars accounted for 14 percent of political spending, with just 2 percent of overall union political spending going directly to candidates.
 - Government unions’ heavy use of membership dues money for politics—more than what they collectively spent on representational activities—underlines a disturbing trend: the growing, overt reliance by union officials to spend member dues rather than political action committee funds on their political and ideological agendas.
 - Together, the NEA, AFT, SEIU, and AFSCME spent \$488 million of members’ dues driving Democratic politics, economic redistribution, critical race theory, defunding the police, promoting abortion, and opposing school choice.
- The NEA, AFT, SEIU, and AFSCME sent over \$107 million directly to candidates for federal, state, and local office, with 95.8 percent going to Democrats and just 4.2 percent to Republicans.
 - Over the 2023–24 federal election cycle, national PACs operated by the NEA, AFT, SEIU, and AFSCME collectively contributed over \$106 million to candidates for office, party committees, and political committees. President Joe Biden’s campaign, replaced by Vice President Kamala Harris’s bid for the White House in 2024, received almost \$5 million in support from just these four unions.
 - Public sector unions affiliated with the NEA, AFT, SEIU, or AFSCME invested politically in every state, yet, in just five—Illinois, California, Washington, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania—the spending accounted for nearly two-thirds (\$105 million) of overall state-level union PAC outlays.
 - Illinois’ public sector union officials, at \$29.9 million, spent the lion’s share, totaling more than what government unions spent in the bottom 41 states combined.
 - In 2023, Chicago Mayor Brandon Johnson, alone, received over \$5.5 million from the NEA, AFT, SEIU, AFSCME, and their affiliates.

“Unions show no sign of abandoning politics anytime soon. They routinely endorse candidates, fund campaigns, adopt policy platforms, and even bargain for political goals. Indeed, those activities have become their main focus. They are less like private bargaining agents, more like political action committees.”

-Alexander T. MacDonald

FEDERALIST SOCIETY BLOG, **JULY 2024**

“I have also come to believe that unions’ extension into electoral politics was both necessary to union power in the middle of the 20th century and paradoxically responsible for its decline.”

– Prof. Laura Weinrib

HARVARD LAW SCHOOL LECTURE, **MARCH 2023**

Introduction

On June 10, 2025, Sean Spiller—the president of the New Jersey Education Association (NJEA)—ended his bid for governor of New Jersey. He had not only failed to win the Democratic primary—he had come in **fifth place**. In his concession statement, Spiller explained, “We always knew what we were up against when we launched this campaign—wealthy special interests and insiders who don’t want to give working people a voice in their government.”¹

In one sense, Spiller’s was an expected loss. Months before the election, Democratic voters ranked him **fourth** in favorability, with 14 percent. Many voters (42 percent) said they did not even know who he was. As the primary election approached, **polling** put Spiller in fifth place among party primary voters. All the while, his campaign finance reports **indicated** that he had not hired a single staff member.²

Spiller’s campaign also had a money problem. While political donors made New Jersey’s gubernatorial primary the most expensive in state history, Spiller, **on record**, raised the fewest dollars (\$438,817) and spent the least (\$342,059) of all his Democratic rivals.³ He was the only Democrat running for governor who had not raised enough money for New Jersey’s two-to-one public matching fund program. His failure to meet this threshold put him significantly behind the other five candidates in fundraising. Moreover, Spiller’s failure to qualify for public matching funds meant **not participating** in the gubernatorial primary debates.⁴

1 Hannah Gross, “Teachers Union Stands by Splashing out over \$40M on Spiller’s Bid for Governor,” *NJ Spotlight News*, June 12, 2025, <https://www.njspotlightnews.org/2025/06/nj-largest-teachers-union-stands-by-spending-over-40-million-sean-spiller-governor-bid/>; Insider NJ, “Spiller Concedes Race, Congratulates Congresswoman Sherrill,” June 10, 2025, <https://www.insidernj.com/press-release/spiller-concedes-race-congratulates-congresswoman-sherrill/#:~:text=Below%20is%20a%20statement%20from,why%20%20ran%20for%20Governor.>

2 Matthew Fazelpoor, “Rutgers Poll Shows GOP, Dem Divide in NJ Governor Race,” *NJBIZ*, April 25, 2025, <https://njbiz.com/nj-governor-primary-poll-split/>; Emerson College, “May 2025 New Jersey Poll: Sherrill and Ciattarelli Favorites for Party Nominations,” May 15, 2025, <https://emersoncollegepolling.com/may-2025-new-jersey-poll/>; Dana Difilippo, “This Democrat Is Running for Governor with No Staff — but \$35M in His Corner,” *New Jersey Monitor*, March 10, 2025, <https://newjerseymonitor.com/2025/03/10/this-democrat-is-running-for-governor-with-35m-behind-him-and-no-staff/>.

3 New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission, “Spending on June 10 Primary Election Already Dwarfs Past Elections,” news release, June 6, 2025, https://www.elec.nj.gov/pdffiles/press_releases/pr_2025/pr_06062025b.pdf.

4 David Wildstein, “Spiller Doesn’t Qualify for Matching Funds, Won’t Make Debate Stage,” *New Jersey Globe*, March 24, 2025, <https://newjerseyglobe.com/governor/spiller-doesnt-qualify-for-matching-funds-wont-make-debate-stage/>.

Spiller defended his fundraising, [saying](#), “As a teacher, coach, immigrant, and working dad, this race is about so much more to me than who can collect the most cash and dole out the most favors.”⁵

In truth, Spiller had plenty of money at his disposal—it just was not his money. Instead, the money came from Spiller’s own NJEA. The NJEA funneled at least \$48 million in union money to other organizations—two in particular—to promote Spiller’s candidacy. Working New Jersey received exactly [\\$40 million](#), and another [\\$8 million](#) went to Protecting Our Democracy, a group Spiller once chaired.⁶ Protecting Our Democracy bought pro-Spiller ads and mailers throughout New Jersey starting in [March 2024](#), while Working New Jersey waited until 2025 to unload nearly all of its \$40 million, [including](#) at least \$19.1 million on paid media, \$8.7 million on political consulting, \$5.6 million on direct mail, and \$2 million on billboards and signs.⁷

All told, Spiller had more money spent by outside groups registered with New Jersey’s Election Law Enforcement Commission than all other candidates combined.⁸

Yet, the most concerning aspect of the NJEA’s failed gamble is not the amount of money wagered but the source of the NJEA’s bankroll. Traditionally, public sector unions use connected political action committees (PACs) to support candidates for political office. A union’s PAC collects its funds from union members separately from union dues, and members are under no obligation to contribute. Once collected, unions must keep PAC money segregated from their general operating funds and report regularly on political spending.

Here, the NJEA chose not to rely on its connected PAC (NJEA-PAC), which held just under \$1 million at the beginning of 2025. Instead, the union tapped its general operating fund—which houses member dues deposits—to transfer the whole \$48 million, roughly 20 percent of its total assets, by [last count](#),⁹ to a union-controlled political organization, also known as a “527,”¹⁰ called Garden State Forward, which in turn funneled it to the two super PACs, Working New Jersey and Protecting Our Democracy. According to the Sunlight Policy Center of New Jersey, the NJEA regularly [disguised](#) Garden State Forward’s expenditures as “organizational projects” or “independent expenditure issue advocacy efforts.”¹¹

5 Nikita Biryukov, “Governor Hopeful Sean Spiller Fails to Qualify for Public Matching Funds,” *New Jersey Monitor*, March 25, 2025, <https://newjerseymonitor.com/briefs/governor-hopeful-sean-spiller-fails-to-qualify-for-public-matching-funds/>.

6 Joey Fox, “NJEA Has Funneled \$40 Million into Pro-Spiller PAC,” *New Jersey Globe*, June 2, 2025, <https://newjerseyglobe.com/governor/njea-has-funneled-40-million-into-pro-spiller-pac/>; Matt Friedman, “NJEA Has Sent \$8M to Group Promoting Its President as He Runs for Governor,” *Politico Pro*, June 25, 2025, <https://subscriber.politicopro.com/article/2024/06/njea-has-sent-8m-to-group-promoting-its-president-as-he-runs-for-governor-00164854>.

7 Matt Friedman (@MattFriedmanNJ), “NJEA/Sean Spiller 501c4 now sending these out ...,” X, March 18, 2024, 9:54 a.m., <https://x.com/MattFriedmanNJ/status/1769724128481735158>; Gross, “Teachers Union Stands by Splashing out over \$40M on Spiller’s Bid.”

8 New Jersey Election Law Enforcement Commission, “Spending on June 10 Primary Election Already Dwarfs Past Elections.”

9 ProPublica, “New Jersey Education Association: Full Text of ‘Full Filing’ for Fiscal Year Ending Aug. 2023,” accessed October 10, 2025, <https://projects.propublica.org/nonprofits/organizations/210524390/202411949349300946/full>.

10 Under section 527 of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C. § 527(e)(1–2)), political organizations are, by definition, “organized and operated primarily for the purpose of directly or indirectly accepting contributions or making expenditures, or both, for an ‘exempt function,’” and the “term ‘exempt function’ means the function of influencing or attempting to influence the selection, nomination, election, or appointment of any individual to any Federal, State, or local public office or office in a political organization, or the election of Presidential or Vice-Presidential electors, whether or not such individual electors are selected, nominated, elected, or appointed.” The Federal Election Commission qualifies Super PACs as “independent expenditure-only political committees that may receive unlimited contributions from individuals, corporations, labor unions and other political action committees for the purpose of financing independent expenditures and other independent political activity.” OpenSecrets notes that “unlike traditional PACs, super PACs are prohibited from donating money directly to political candidates, and their spending must not be coordinated with that of the candidates they benefit.” See U.S. Federal Election Commission, “Registering as a Super PAC,” accessed October 10, 2025, <https://www.fec.gov/help-candidates-and-committees/filing-pac-reports/registering-super-pac/>; Open Secrets, “Super PACs,” accessed October 10, 2025, <https://www.opensecrets.org/political-action-committees-pacs/super-pacs/2022>.

11 Sunlight Policy Center, “NJEA VP Beatty Finally Admits NJEA’s Super PAC Exists and Is Funded by Teachers’ Dues But Still Keeps the Truth from Teachers,” July 2, 2024, <https://sunlightpolicy.nj.org/njea-vp-beatty-finally-admits-njeas-super-pac-exists-and-is-funded-by-teachers-dues-but-still-keeps-the-truth-from-teachers/>.

Months later, with the help of the Fairness Center, two NJEA members—both public schoolteachers—filed a [lawsuit](#) against Spiller and the NJEA.¹² According to the [complaint](#), the NJEA actively misrepresented to members that their money could not be used for politics, concealing even the existence of Garden State Forward. Based on membership forms filed with the complaint, the NJEA never informed these teachers of any plans to dump general funds into the 527 or any other organizations engaged in electoral politics.¹³ The case remains pending as of the date of this report’s release.

The NJEA’s choice to fund politics using members’ dues money illustrates a disturbing trend over the past 15 years. The increasing use of members’ money to overtly drive political spending, with or without member consent or approval. Often, as with Spiller’s campaign, the in-and-out transfers of employee funds across multiple organizations avoid a direct connection to the specific union. Even when members find out their union supports a particular candidate, they may have to wait until the end of the union’s fiscal year to see exactly how much of and where their membership dues went.

BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

The Commonwealth Foundation initiated this biennial publication examining public sector union political spending in December 2023, as part of its “Battle for Worker Freedom” research series. The second edition of “How Public Sector Unions Fund Politics across the Nation”—similar to the first—uses publicly available data, including federal and state campaign finance reporting and union LM-2 filings to track membership dues and PAC money spent by government unions to influence political campaigns and public policy in state and federal governments during the most recent available reporting period—2023 through 2024. It also compares these numbers against those quantified for the previous election cycle (i.e., 2021–22).

There are limitations to the analysis performed in this report. Among these, foremost is that evidence of unions’ political spending amounts comes entirely from self-reporting, either by union officials, organizations receiving union contributions, or political candidates. Each self-reporting entity may have an incentive to overreport, underreport, mischaracterize, or mislead regulators as to the true nature of unions’ political spending. Even for those entities that self-report in good faith, there may be organization-specific judgment calls (and differences in fiscal years) that make comparisons across several unions more difficult.

Another limitation is the difficulty of tracking political spending among national and international unions with state and local affiliates, each of which could be simultaneously engaged in federal, state, county, municipal, and school board elections. Federal and state campaign finance filings capture much of this spending, but this report does not attempt to analyze county- or city-level campaign finance data, which may or may not be publicly available.

Finally, political spending does not always lend itself to simple categorization. Data captures contributions to a “Republican” or “Democrat,” but it does not capture ideological distinctions between, say, “conservative” and “liberal,” “traditionalist” and “progressive,” or “capitalist” and “socialist.” Even in races with clear political ramifications, union officials’ involvement may be

12 Nikita Biryukov, “NJ Teachers Union Misused Dues to Fund Chief’s Bid for Governor, Lawsuit Claims,” *New Jersey Monitor*, September 30, 2025, <https://newjerseymonitor.com/2025/09/30/nj-teachers-union-lawsuit/>.

13 Marie Dupont and Ann Marie Pocklembo v. New Jersey Education Association and Sean M. Spiller, as Former President of New Jersey Education Association, (Superior Court of New Jersey, September 30, 2025), <https://www.fairnesscenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/Dupont-Complaint-09.30.25.pdf>; The Fairness Center, “Union’s \$40 Million Dues-Fueled PAC Spending Challenged by NJ Teachers, Think Tank,” accessed October 2, 2025, <https://www.fairnesscenter.org/cases/dupont-pocklembo-v-njea-spiller/>.

nominally nonideological, as with get-out-the-vote campaigns or elections without partisan identifiers. In other words, important political factors, which are undetectable at the reporting level, may motivate union executive decisions. This report attempts to responsibly apply ideological labels to certain organizations where it would aid in understanding the nature of union political spending, yet such application is not always possible.

Union Membership Dues Spending Nationwide

Most union revenue comes in the form of membership dues. It would make good business sense, then, for union leadership to prove the value of membership by directing most union financial resources to providing member support. Yet, this is not the way union officials have chosen to spend their members' money.

For example, the NEA, AFT, SEIU, and AFSCME, according to federal filings, collectively reported total disbursements of over \$2.5 billion over the two-year cycle (i.e., 2023–24) analyzed in this report, yet they spent just \$642 million—or approximately 25 percent of total spending—on “representational activities,” the spending category most closely tied to membership support.

By contrast, these four unions together spent \$845 million—nearly 33 percent of total spending—on general overhead, union administration, and staff benefits, cost categories linked to basic operations.

More concerning, the NEA, AFT, SEIU, and AFSCME spend inordinate amounts of member dues on political activities. **All told, these four unions paid out nearly \$650 million in membership dues money—more than what these unions collectively spent on representational activities—on union officials' political and ideological agendas.** LM-2s filed by the NEA, AFT, SEIU, and AFSCME reveal they spent a combined \$369,520,461 on “political activities and lobbying” in 2023 and 2024, with another \$279,694,429 categorized as “contributions, gifts, and grants,” often going to politically oriented nonprofits and other organizations.¹⁴ And this is just the tip of the iceberg. This number does not include state-level affiliates' election spending—like the NJEA's spending on Spiller's campaign—on independent expenditures or other uncoordinated election activities.

This may come as a surprise to the teachers, state employees, and county workers who are members of these unions. Indeed, union membership enrollment forms **invariably** fail to apprise new members about dues spending on politics.¹⁵ The forms use language that suggests that membership dues are only for union services, while separate PAC collections are the only funds subsidizing union executive politics.¹⁶

14 Office of Labor-Management Standards, LM Reports and Constitutions and Bylaws (Online Public Disclosure Room, Union Reports), U.S. Department of Labor, accessed October 10, 2025, https://olmsapps.dol.gov/olpdr/?_ga=2.136748144.1176562507.1697650749-906770878.1697210649.

15 David Osborne, Labor and Industry Committee, Pennsylvania House of Representatives – Public Hearing on Public Sector Union Reform, November 15, 2021, (Testimony on behalf of Americans for Fair Treatment), https://www.palegis.us/house/committees/committee-archives/archive-file?file=2021_0173_0004_tstmny.pdf.

16 In Pennsylvania, for example, the NEA's enrollment form for PSEA affiliates characterizes membership dues as paid “in consideration for the services provided by” the NEA and its affiliates, whereas members may separately make contributions “to support candidates in state and local elections ... [or] candidates for federal office.” The report appendix includes the PSEA form alongside a collection of representative union enrollment forms.

Indeed, some union officials make misleading claims about prohibitions from using members' dues money for politics, when what they are really referring to are the bans on direct contributions to candidates. Take the Michigan State Employees Association, an AFSCME affiliate, which [states](#):

Are my dues being used to fund political activity?

No. Federal and various state campaign contribution laws prohibit dues dollars being used for political campaign contributions.

If my dues can't be used for political contributions, how do unions contribute to political campaigns?

Unions participate in political campaigns through donations from a political action committee (PAC) fund, funded by VOLUNTARY union member contributions.¹⁷

As the research details, the NEA's, AFT's, SEIU's, and AFSCME's own federally mandated disclosures tell a different story.

MEMBERSHIP DUES SPENDING: FEDERAL ELECTIONS

After publicly decrying the Supreme Court's 2010 ruling in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, those running the country's largest government unions have quietly built a strong network of organizations set up to take advantage of the decision. In the view of these union officials, 18 *Citizens United* allows government unions to engage in elections using membership dues money, not just separately collected PAC funds. Still, they typically do so indirectly—by turning over general treasury funds to an organization they either control or trust to engage in elections.

Annual financial disclosure reports, or L-M2s, with the U.S. Department of Labor's Office of Labor-Management Standards (OLMS) are a requirement for any public sector union also representing at least one private sector bargaining unit. In addition to operational and representational expenditures, unions must disclose each year all election-related use of members' dues money in their respective LM-2 filings.¹⁹ Moreover, unions must also report federal election-related contributions and expenditures with the U.S. Federal Election Commission (FEC).²⁰ This dual reporting requirement allows one to distinguish election-related spending as a subset of political spending using membership dues.

According to FEC data, **the NEA, AFT, SEIU, AFSCME, and their affiliates disbursed over \$135 million in membership dues money to their own election-engaged organizations (527s and independent expenditure only committees) or to other, outside organizations**

17 Michigan State Employees Association, "The FACTS about Union Dues and Political Campaigns," accessed October 10, 2025, <https://msea.org/facts-about-union-dues-and-political-campaigns>.

18 *Citizens United* is a decision generally regarded as permitting corporations and unions to spend unlimited amounts in support of or opposed to a political candidate, provided there is no coordination between the candidate and union. See 558 U.S. 310, 360 (2010). However, *Citizens United* did not address the special case of public sector unions, for which political involvement may suggest quid pro corruption or the appearance of corruption in a way that private sector unions would not. Interestingly, Pennsylvania, Kansas, and Iowa have state statutes prohibiting public sector unions from using general treasury dollars to provide direct or indirect support of political candidates, and none of them have been challenged as unconstitutional in light of *Citizens United*. 43 P.S. § 1101.1701; Kan. Stat. § 75-4333(d); Iowa Code § 20.26.

19 Office of Labor-Management Standards, "Form LM-1 Labor Organization Information Report and Forms LM-2, LM-3, and LM-4 Labor Organization Annual Reports: Instructions for Form LM-2 Labor Organization Annual Report," U.S. Department of Labor, accessed October 1, 2025, <https://www.dol.gov/agencies/olms/reports/forms/lm-1-lm-2-lm-3-lm-4>.

20 The term in federal election law for corporate- or labor-backed PACs is "separate segregated fund" (SSF). Depending on whether it is an election year, the FEC has different SSF filing requirements (see U.S. Federal Election Commission, "Understanding the SSF and Its Connected Organization," accessed October 16, 2025, <https://www.fec.gov/help-candidates-and-committees/registering-ssf/understanding-ssf-and-its-connected-organization/>; U.S. Federal Election Commission, "Filing SSF Reports," accessed October 16, 2025, <https://www.fec.gov/help-candidates-and-committees/filing-ssf-reports/>).

for spending in federal elections in 2023 and 2024.

Among these four unions, the one taking most advantage of Citizens United was SEIU, which reported transferring at least **\$24.3 million** in members' dues to its affiliated 527, the SEIU Political Education and Action Fund,²¹ another **\$2.2 million** to its super PAC (United We Can),²² and \$22.3 million more to outside groups making independent expenditures.²³ The NEA and its affiliates sent **\$27.8 million** in members' dues to its super PAC, the NEA Advocacy Fund, during the 2023–24 election cycle, and another **\$14.4 million** to outside organizations for federal election spending.²⁴ The AFT sent about **\$19.5 million** in dues money to its 527, called AFT Solidarity, and nearly \$11.2 million to other groups involved in federal election spending.²⁵ And AFSCME sent **\$54.4 million** to its 527, the Working Families Fund, and spread more than **\$13.5 million** across multiple organizations via independent expenditures.²⁶

MEMBERSHIP DUES SPENDING: PROGRESSIVE ACTIVISM

Meanwhile, public sector unions are also spending members' dues on progressive causes not directly tied to elections. A look at annual LM-2 financial disclosures filed with OLMS reveals political spending well beyond what turns up in campaign finance reports. **Together, the NEA, AFT, SEIU, and AFSCME spent \$488 million driving Democratic politics, economic redistribution, critical race theory, defunding the police, promoting abortion, and opposing school choice.**

This union money—again, sourced from members' dues payments—shored up a progressive political infrastructure with long-range goals beyond the next election. A review of the [LM-2 reports](#) for 2023 and 2024 reveals that the four largest government unions supported the following organizations,²⁷ among many others:

PARTY POLITICS

- \$18,000,000 to For Our Future Action Fund, a [progressive](#) political committee [co-founded](#) in 2016 by leftist environmentalist Tom Steyer.
- \$6,000,000 to the State Engagement Fund, a 501(c)(4) organization distributing money to progressive organizations and with [ties](#), reported the *Washington Free Beacon*, to the Democracy Alliance (see below) and the Committee on States (see below).

21 Open Secrets, "Service Employees International Union: Top Recipients (2024)," accessed October 1, 2025, <https://www.opensecrets.org/orgs/service-employees-international-union/summary?id=D000000077>. Note: SEIU Political Education and Action Fund's Forms 8872 for the years 2024 and 2023 record slightly more (i.e., \$26,787,771) in contributions from SEIU's general fund over the same period of time (see ProPublica, "Service Employees International Union Political Ed and Action Fund," accessed October 1, 2025, <https://projects.propublica.org/527-explorer/orgs/522263644>).

22 U.S. Federal Election Commission, "Campaign Finance Data: Receipts (United We Can)," accessed October 1, 2025, https://www.fec.gov/data/receipts/?committee_id=C00523621&two_year_transaction_period=2024&data_type=processed. Note: United We Can received additional funding from SEIU's Committee on Political Education (COPE), the union's traditional PAC, not counted here.

23 Open Secrets, "Service Employees International Union: Top Recipients (2024)."

24 U.S. Federal Election Commission, "NEA Advocacy Fund: Financial Summary (2023–2024)," accessed October 1, 2025, <https://www.fec.gov/data/committee/C00489815/?cycle=2024>; Open Secrets, "National Education Association: Top Recipients (2024)," accessed October 1, 2025, <https://www.opensecrets.org/orgs/national-education-assn/summary?id=D000000064>.

25 Open Secrets, "American Federation of Teachers: Top Recipients (2024)," accessed October 1, 2025, <https://www.opensecrets.org/orgs/american-federation-of-teachers/summary?id=D000000083>. Note: Open Secrets records just under \$19.5 million, while AFT Solidarity's Forms 8872 record receiving \$19.59 million from AFT (see ProPublica, "Aft Solidarity 527," accessed October 1, 2025, <https://projects.propublica.org/527-explorer/orgs/273202261/>).

26 ProPublica, "AFSCME Working Families Fund," accessed October 1, 2025, <https://projects.propublica.org/527-explorer/orgs/912064198>; Open Secrets, "American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees: Top Recipients (2024)," accessed October 1, 2025, <https://www.opensecrets.org/orgs/american-fedn-of-state-county-municipal-employees/summary?id=D000000061>.

27 Office of Labor-Management Standards, LM Reports and Constitutions and Bylaws.

- \$3,250,000 to the Strategic Victory Fund, a progressive political committee that focuses on Democratic state-level issues, which its website [defines as](#) “[t]he largest partnership of donors and state-based donor alliances in the nation.”
- \$2,800,000 to Development Now for Chicago, a political committee the Cause IQ platform shows as [formed](#) to bring the 2024 Democratic National Convention to Chicago.
- \$2,734,100 to America Votes, a 501(c)(4) organization that [describes](#) itself as “the coordination hub of the progressive community” and [identified](#) by the *New York Times* in a January 2022 article as a Democratic “dark money” organization responsible for Biden’s victory in 2020.
- \$2,113,333 to Democracy Alliance, a 501(c)(4) organization that “channels money from megadonors, whom the group keeps anonymous, to organizations it believes will advance a progressive agenda,” [wrote](#) the *New York Times* in November 2023, which a year later reported that George Soros was a [founding](#) backer.
- \$2,100,000 to the Center for American Progress, a think tank [described](#) by the *Washington Post* in 2011 as “an incessant advocate for a broad progressive agenda and as such, a sharp thorn in President Obama’s left side,” and its sister 501(c)(4) organization, the Center for American Progress Action Fund.
- \$1,500,000 to Future Forward USA Action, a 501(c)(4) organization, which Open Secrets lists as the [largest](#) supporter of Harris’s 2024 presidential run. The organization is affiliated with Future Forward, the “biggest super PAC in American politics,” [according](#) to the *New York Times*.
- \$1,350,000 to America Works USA, a 501(c)(4) organization [affiliated](#) with the Democratic Governors Association, according to a July report by the Michigan Information and Research Service. The organization [says](#) its mission “is to find unique and creative ways to promote progressive policy, strengthen our democracy, and build powerful infrastructure in states.”
- \$1,250,000 to Citizens Not Politicians, a 501(c)(4) organization, which a 2024 release by the Ohio Senate Majority Caucus warned Eric Holder and Marc Elias [set up](#) to “radically” [redesign](#) Ohio’s congressional rules for drawing legislative districts.
- \$1,250,000 to the Democratic Governors Association, a 527 [supporting](#) Democratic governors across the country.
- \$1,220,000 to the State Power Action Fund, a 501(c)(4) organization [promoting](#) community organizing and state-based progressive causes.

- \$960,000 to the Chicago Teachers Union PAC, the Chicago Teachers Union advocacy organization [claiming](#) on its website to have driven out of office the former Republican governor of Illinois, Bruce Rauner, and Chicago’s “moderate” Democrat mayor, Rahm Emanuel.
- \$850,000 to the Hopewell Fund, a 501(c)(3) organization administered by Arabella Advisors and another group the *New York Times* January 2022 article labeled as a Democratic “dark money” organization responsible for Biden’s victory.
- \$850,000 to the Committee on States, a 501(c)(4) organization “focused on creating successful state-based political networks to advance progressive causes and produce lasting change within individual states,” according to [internal documents](#).
- \$825,000 to the Democratic Attorneys General Association, a political committee [describing](#) itself as “solely dedicated to electing and supporting Democratic state Attorneys General.”
- \$720,000 to Blue Compass Strategies, a political consulting firm [advertising](#) itself as “dedicated to providing the progressive community with top-notch research and analysis to inform their electoral, issue-advocacy and accountability campaigns.”
- \$593,921 to the National Women’s Law Center Action Fund, a 501(c)(4) organization that [says](#) it fights for “gender justice” and “aims to drive progressive change in our policies and laws,” and its 501(c)(3) affiliate, the National Women’s Law Center.
- \$750,000 to Priorities USA Action, a political committee [called](#) “a leading Democratic super PAC” by POLITICO in 2022 and currently focused on bringing more young voters into the Democratic party.
- \$400,000 to the Center for Empowered Politics, a 501(c)(4) organization [mobilizing](#) voters for far-left causes and backed by George Soros, among other liberal interests.
- \$400,000 to the National Redistricting Action Fund, a 501(c)(4) organization and its [affiliate](#), the National Democratic Redistricting Committee, which together push to redraw congressional maps to favor Democrats.
- \$350,000 to Florida Watch, a political committee [calling](#) itself “the progressive community’s in-state hub for message development, digital communications, and research.”
- \$310,800 to the Sixteen Thirty Fund, a 501(c)(4) organization [described](#) in 2021 by the *New York Times* as “among the leading dark money spenders on the left.”
- \$255,000 to the National Immigration Law Center, a 501(c)(3) organization [advancing](#) left-of-center immigration and healthcare policies, and its 501(c)(4) [affiliate](#), the National Immigration Law Center Immigrant Justice Fund.
- \$250,000 to Democracy 21, a 501(c)(4) organization founded and operated by Fred Wertheimer, whom National Public Radio [called](#) “one of the progressive movement’s leading strategists on ethics and campaign finance laws since the 1980s.”
- \$250,000 to the Amazon Labor Union in an apparent effort (the contribution was made by the NEA in July 2022) to boost its unionization attempts.
- \$250,000 to [MoveOn.org](#) Political Action, a political committee that, according to its [website](#), “bundles hundreds of thousands of small donations together to elect progressive candidates.”
- \$215,000 to Roosevelt Forward, a 501(c)(4) organization connected to the Roosevelt Institute, a [self-described](#) “progressive think tank.”

- \$200,000 to the Bill, Hillary, and Chelsea Clinton Foundation, a 501(c)(3) organization that has **long** been the source of controversy.
- \$170,000 to Emerge America, a 527 organization that **says** it “recruits and trains Democratic women to run for office.”
- \$150,000 to Building Back Together, a 501(c)(4) organization, **reported** Axios in 2021, staffed by former Biden campaign aides and longtime Democratic strategists.
- \$150,000 to the Alliance for Youth Action, a 501(c)(4) organization **training** progressive activists involved in LGBTQ issues and automatic voter registration, among other efforts.
- \$140,000 to March for Our Lives Action Fund, a 501(c)(4) organization **advocating** for gun control laws.
- \$125,000 to the Progressive State Leaders Committee, a 501(c)(4) organization that **describes** itself as “advocat[ing] for progressive policies that promote justice, fairness, and equity.” It has close **ties** to the Democratic Attorneys General Association, says Capital Research Center’s Influence Watch.
- \$121,670 to Netroots Foundation, a 501(c)(3) organization that **hosts** an annual training and networking conference for progressive organizers.
- \$100,000 to American Bridge, a political committee that **calls** itself “the largest research, video tracking, and rapid response organization in Democratic and progressive politics.”
- \$100,000 to Accelerate Action, a 501(c)(3) organization **helping** progressive organizations raise non-donation revenue using sponsored content.
- \$100,000 to Blue Green Alliance, an organization that **describes** itself as “unif[ying] labor unions and environmental organizations to fight climate change.”
- \$95,000 to Un-PAC Action, a political committee **providing** activism training to college students.

ECONOMIC REDISTRIBUTION

- \$6,845,758 to United for Justice, an SEIU-related 501(c)(4) organization that **says** on tax documents posted on Cause IQ that it broadly “support[s] measures that enhance the rights and status of workers,” but an article by the Commonwealth Beacon reveals it mainly **focused** on a Massachusetts ballot question concerning rideshare drivers.
- \$4,150,000 to Fair Share Massachusetts, an organization that **successfully** convinced voters to impose a 4 percent tax on personal annual income above \$1 million.
- \$1,275,000 to the Economic Policy Institute, a think tank **chaired** by AFL-CIO President Liz Shuler, with **reported** ties to Marxist, socialist, and “radical” economics.
- \$500,000 to the “No on 2124 Committee,” a **political committee** set up to oppose a ballot measure in Washington state that **would** have made participation in a state-sponsored long-term care insurance program voluntary.
- \$500,000 to “No on 2109,” a Washington state **political committee** formed to **oppose** repeal of state capital gains excise taxes.
- \$500,000 to the Progressive Caucus Action Fund, a 501(c)(4) organization **calling** itself “a driving force for progressive change.”

- \$454,000 to Keep it Local, a North Dakota ballot initiative committee [set up](#) to oppose the elimination of property taxes.
- \$180,000 to the Chinese Progressive Association, a left-wing Asian-American 501(c)(3) organization with [reported](#) ties to the Chinese Communist Party.
- \$100,000 to the Indivisible Project, a 501(c)(4) organization that [says](#) it “drives coordinated campaigns, powering the grassroots Indivisible movement to defeat the rightwing takeover of American government and win an inclusive democracy and bold progressive policies.”

CRITICAL RACE THEORY AND DEFUNDING THE POLICE

- \$935,150 to the NAACP and NAACP Empowerment Programs, a 501(c)(3) organization that [says](#) it is fighting against “voter suppression laws and unfair redistricting,” as well as “COVID-19 misinformation,” “reimagined policing,” and “[h]olding corporations accountable.”
- \$490,000 to Power Switch Action, a 501(c)(3) organization that [describes](#) itself as a “community of leaders, organizers, and strategists forging multi-racial feminist democracy and economies in our cities and towns.”
- \$850,000 to Color of Change, a 501(c)(4) organization [co-founded](#) by Van Jones and [involved](#) in “Defund the Police” campaigns.
- \$870,000 to Red Wine & Blue, a 501(c)(4) organization [aiming](#) to increase voter turnout among liberal suburban women and has [counter-protested](#) in support of critical race theory curricula in schools.
- \$465,145 to the National Action Network, a 501(c)(4) organization that on its 2023 tax return, posted by ProPublica, [reports](#) paying [founder and president](#) Al Sharpton an annual salary of \$648,786.
- \$325,000 to Local Progress Policy Action, a 501(c)(4) organization, which [describes](#) itself as “a movement of local elected officials advancing a racial and economic justice agenda through all levels of local government.”
- \$322,500 to Race Forward, a 501(c)(3) organization with a strategic plan to [institute](#) “racial justice governance,” which “[p]rioritizes the collective over the individual,” among other features, and Race Forward Action, its 501(c)(4) organization.
- \$300,000 to the Black Progressive Action Coalition, a 527 [describing](#) itself as “an independent progressive coalition.”
- \$100,000 to the Sixth Episcopal District African Methodist Episcopal (AME) Church in Atlanta, Georgia. The church was a plaintiff in a federal lawsuit [filed](#) by the ACLU challenging the constitutionality of Georgia’s voting laws based on race.
- \$40,000 to the Rainbow PUSH Coalition, a progressive membership organization [founded](#) by Rev. Jesse Jackson.

PROMOTING ABORTION

- \$256,000 to Floridians Protecting Freedom, a political committee devoted to putting an expansive abortion rights provision in the Florida state constitution.
- \$100,000 to Protect Constitutional Abortion Rights, a 501(c)(4) organization seeking to amend the California state constitution to establish a right to an abortion.

OPPOSING SCHOOL CHOICE

- \$862,000 to Support Our Schools Nebraska, a 501(c)(4) organization that successfully repealed a school choice program enacted by the Nebraska state legislature.
- \$450,000 to the Education Law Center, a 501(c)(3) organization that opposes school choice and other public school innovations.

Federal PAC Spending

In addition to spending members' dues money on electoral politics, government unions separately collect voluntary PAC deductions from members and their families.²⁸ Federal law allows government unions to collect and give these PAC dollars directly to candidates, something they are not supposed to do with members' dues money.

PAC SPENDING: NATIONAL PUBLIC SECTOR UNION CONTRIBUTIONS

Over the 2023–24 federal election cycle, PACs operated by the NEA, AFT, SEIU, and AFSCME collectively contributed \$106,275,349.74 to candidates for federal office, party committees, and political committees. SEIU's Committee on Political Education contributed the most (\$71,337,850.77),²⁹ followed by AFT's AFL-CIO Committee on Public Education (\$15,604,806.67),³⁰ AFSCME's Public Employees Organized to Promote Legislative Equality (\$15,389,805.98),³¹ and the NEA Fund for Children and Public Education (\$3,942,886.32).³²

Of that total, as Figure 1 illustrates, the **NEA, AFT, SEIU, and AFSCME collectively sent \$16,137,727.95 directly to candidates for federal office, with 98.80 percent going to Democrats and just 1.20 percent to Republicans.**

28 PAC donations are ostensibly voluntary, yet many government union membership forms include payroll deduction authorizations for PAC contributions with automatic renewal language.

29 U.S. Federal Election Commission, Campaign Finance Data: "SEIU COPE (Service Employees International Union Committee on Political Education) – Disbursements: Recipient Name, 01/01/2023 to 12/31/2024," accessed October 15, 2025, <https://www.fec.gov/data/committee/C00004036/?cycle=2024&tab=spending>; Open Secrets, "Service Employees International Union: Contributions," accessed October 10, 2025, <https://www.opensecrets.org/orgs/service-employees-international-union/totals?id=D000000077>.


30 U.S. Federal Election Commission, Campaign Finance Data: "American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education – Disbursements: Recipient Name, name 01/01/2023 to 12/31/2024," accessed October 15, 2025, <https://www.fec.gov/data/committee/C00028860/?cycle=2024&tab=spending>; Open Secrets, "American Federation of Teachers: Contributions," accessed October 10, 2025, <https://www.opensecrets.org/orgs/american-federation-of-teachers/totals?id=D000000083>.

31 U.S. Federal Election Commission, Campaign Finance Data: "American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees," accessed October 15, 2025, <https://www.fec.gov/data/committee/C00011114/?cycle=2024&tab=spending>; Open Secrets, "American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees: Contributions," accessed October 10, 2025, <https://www.opensecrets.org/orgs/national-education-assn/totals?id=D000000064>.

32 U.S. Federal Election Commission, Campaign Finance Data: "NEA Advocacy Fund – Disbursements: Recipient Name, 01/01/2023 to 12/31/2024," accessed October 15, 2025, <https://www.fec.gov/data/committee/C00489815/?tab=spending&cycle=2024>; Open Secrets, "National Education Federation: Contributions," accessed October 10, 2025, <https://www.opensecrets.org/orgs/national-education-assn/totals?id=D000000064>.

FIGURE 1: PARTY BREAKDOWN OF FEDERAL CANDIDATES RECEIVING GOVERNMENT UNION PAC MONEY, 2023–24 CYCLE.³³

NEA AFT, SEIU, and AFCMS Federal Candidate Contributions
(\$16,137,727.95)



Unsurprisingly, given the total distribution, the top 25 recipients of PAC union money, as reported by national government unions, were Democrats. The Biden, then Harris, campaign received almost \$5 million,³⁴ and Johnson’s successful bid for mayor of Chicago received over \$2.5 million. The remaining top recipients were largely candidates for the U.S. House or Senate (Figure 2), yet unions also spent big on the Los Angeles school board (\$150,000) and Mississippi gubernatorial (\$50,000) races.

³³ U.S. Federal Election Commission, Campaign Finance Data, *supra* notes 29–32.

³⁴ Includes Future Forward—a single-candidate PAC that shifted from Biden to Harris when she replaced him as the Democratic nominee—as well as the Biden and Harris candidate PACs.

FIGURE 2: TOP RECIPIENTS OF NATIONAL GOVERNMENT UNION PAC MONEY, 2023–24 CYCLE.³⁵


Biden/Harris (for President)	\$4,856,000
Brandon Johnson (for Chicago Mayor)	\$2,518,500
Kahlid Al-Alim/Scott Schmerelson/Karla Griego (for Los Angeles School Board)	\$150,000
Brandon Presley (for Mississippi Governor)	\$50,000
Juan Vargas (for U.S. House CA-52)	\$49,500
Tom Suozzi (for U.S. House NY-03)	\$45,375
Jacky Rosen (for U.S. Senate NV)	\$45,000
Dave Min (for U.S. House CA-47)	\$45,000
Marcy Kaptur (for U.S. House OH-09)	\$40,000
Joe Neguse (for U.S. House CO-02)	\$40,000
Sharice Davids (for U.S. House KS-03)	\$40,000
Sheila Jackson Lee (for U.S. House TX-18)	\$40,000
Emilia Sykes (for U.S. House OH-13)	\$40,000
Mazie Hirono (for U.S. Senate HI)	\$40,000
Mary Peltola (for U.S. House (AK-at large))	\$40,000
Greg Landsman (for U.S. House OH-01)	\$40,000
Eric Sorensen (for U.S. House IL-17)	\$40,000
Steny Hoyer (for U.S. House MD-05)	\$40,000
Kirsten Gillibrand (for U.S. Senate NY)	\$40,000
Kristen McDonald Rivet (for U.S. House MI-08)	\$40,000
Ilhan Omar (for U.S. House MN-05)	\$40,000
Hakeem Jeffries (for U.S. House NY-08)	\$40,000
Tim Kaine (for U.S. Senate VA)	\$40,000
Debbie Wasserman Schultz (for U.S. House FL-25)	\$40,000
Chris Deluzio (for U.S. House PA-17)	\$40,000
+20 other Democrats for U.S. House	\$40,000 each

³⁵ U.S. Federal Election Commission, Campaign Finance Data, *supra* notes 29–32.

State Election PAC Spending

During the 2023–24 election cycle, state campaign finance reports reveal another \$160.9 million in government union PAC spending.³⁶ Most of this spending—nearly \$91 million—went to partisan politics (i.e., parties, party-managed PACs, and partisan candidates for state and local offices), while \$70 million went to nonpartisan PACs and candidates running for nonpartisan offices. Of the amount spent on party politics (Figure 3), 95.4 percent went to Democrats or progressive party candidates, whereas just 4.6 percent went to Republicans.

FIGURE 3: PARTY BREAKDOWN OF STATE-LEVEL CANDIDATES RECEIVING GOVERNMENT UNION PAC MONEY, 2023–24 CYCLE.³⁷
State-level Union PAC Spending by Party (\$90,972,990)




Public sector unions affiliated with the NEA, AFT, SEIU, or AFSCME invested politically in every state (Figure 4), yet they overwhelmingly directed spending to a handful of states: Illinois (\$29.9 million), California (\$25.8 million), Washington (\$18.6 million), Massachusetts (\$17.9 million), and Pennsylvania (\$12.8 million). Spending in these five states accounted for nearly two-thirds (\$105 million) of overall state-level PAC outlays, with more political spending in Illinois than in the bottom 41 states combined.

³⁶ To the reader, this follows campaign finance reports filed by the NEA, AFT, AFSCME, and SEIU, and their affiliated unions with the responsible campaign finance reporting entity in each state.

³⁷ Campaign finance reports filed by the NEA, AFT, AFSCME, and SEIU, and their affiliated unions with the responsible campaign finance reporting entity in each state.

FIGURE 4: POLITICAL SPENDING BY STATE, 2023–24 CYCLE.³⁸



³⁸ Campaign finance reports filed by the NEA, AFT, AFSCME, and SEIU, and their affiliated unions with the responsible campaign finance reporting entity in each state.

Public sector unions' focus on Illinois during the 2023–24 election cycle had much to do with Johnson's 2023 run for the mayor's office. The NEA, AFT, SEIU, and AFSCME combined to give \$5.5 million in direct political contributions to Johnson. Over half of that sum—almost \$2.5 million—came from the Chicago Teachers Union (CTU) and its affiliate, AFT, in advance of CTU's contract negotiation with the city. After Johnson's win—who [reportedly](#) still maintains his CTU membership—CTU secured a four-year deal worth around [\\$1.5 billion](#).³⁹

Union investments in California and Washington are also paying off with recently enacted measures that significantly assist union officials seeking to organize and monetize new workplaces. For example, in 2022 and 2023, Washington and California became the first states to enact legislation allowing legislative-branch employees to unionize.⁴⁰ California also enacted tax incentives to pay union dues,⁴¹ and Washington expanded collective bargaining to include management-level employees and student workers at public universities.⁴²

STATE ELECTION PAC SPENDING: STATE AND LOCAL CANDIDATES

Most state-level union PAC spending goes directly to candidates for state and local offices. These candidates are almost exclusively Democrats. In fact, 95.4 percent of partisan contributions at the state and local levels went to Democratic candidates and Democrat-operated PACs. Among the NEA, AFT, SEIU, and AFSCME, SEIU is most tilted toward the Democratic Party, with 99.2 percent of its partisan contributions going to Democrats. The NEA was the least partisan, with 92.1 percent of its partisan contributions going to Democrats.

Indeed, the top individual recipients of union political spending were all Democrats (Figure 5), with Chicago's Mayor Johnson claiming the top spot.

39 Reema Amin, "The Mayor's on 'Union Leave' from CPS despite Leaving CTU. Does That Undermine Contract Talks?," Chalkbeat, <https://www.chalkbeat.org/chicago/2025/01/08/brandon-johnson-union-leave-status-complicates-ctu-contract-talks/>; Mailee Smith, "Chicago Teachers Union Contract Will Be Costly, but Did Union Get What It Demanded?" Illinois Policy Institute, April 7, 2025, <https://www.illinoispolicy.org/chicago-teachers-union-contract-will-be-costly-but-did-union-get-what-it-demanded/>.

40 Assemblymember Tina Mckinnor et al., Chapter 313, Statutes of 2023 (Assembly Bill 1), California Assembly, 2023–24 Regular Session, October 7, 2023, https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billStatusClient.xhtml?bill_id=202320240AB1; Rep. Marcus Riccelli et al., Chapter 283, Laws of 2022 (House Bill 2124), Washington State Legislature, 2022 Regular Session, March 31, 2022 [effective: June 9, 2022], <https://app.leg.wa.gov/billsummary?BillNumber=2124&Initiative=false&Year=2021>.

41 Assemblymember Phil Ting, Chapter 737 (Assembly Bill 158), California Assembly, 2021–22 Regular Session, September 29, 2022, https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=202120220AB158.

42 Rep. Beth Doglio et al., Chapter 136, Laws of 2023 (Second Substitute House Bill 1122), Washington State Legislature, 2023 Regular Session, April 20, 2023, <https://app.leg.wa.gov/billsummary?BillNumber=1122&Year=2023&Initiative=false>.

FIGURE 5: TOP RECIPIENTS OF STATE GOVERNMENT UNION PAC MONEY, 2023–24 CYCLE.⁴³

	Recipient	Amount	State
1	Brandon Johnson (for Chicago Mayor)	\$5,538,100	IL
2	Emanuel “Chris” Welch (for Illinois House)	\$1,398,900	IL
3	Kathryn Lybarger (for California Senate)	\$1,252,947	CA
4	Don Harmon (for Illinois Senate)	\$1,017,400	IL
5	Michelle Chambers (for California Senate)	\$1,056,400	CA
6	Jennifer McCormick (for Indiana Governor)	\$541,451	IN
7	Joanna McClinton (for Pennsylvania House)	\$411,500	PA
8	Jennifer Konfrst (for Iowa House)	\$410,000	IO
9	Eugene Depasquale (for Pennsylvania Attorney General)	\$408,594	PA
10	Vincent Hughes (for Pennsylvania Senate)	\$405,000	PA
11	Jay Costa (for Pennsylvania Senate)	\$337,500	PA
12	Graciela Guzman (for Illinois Senate)	\$332,785	IL
13	Matt Bradford (for Pennsylvania House)	\$295,000	PA
14	Sara Innamorato (for Allegheny County Executive)	\$270,500	PA
15	Marcus C. Evans Jr. (for Illinois House)	\$245,900	IL
16	Jordan Harris (for Pennsylvania House)	\$243,000	PA
17	Tara Stamps (for Cook County Commissioner)	\$233,687	IL
18	Nabeela Syed (for Illinois House)	\$217,700	IL
19	Nick Pisciotano (for Pennsylvania Senate)	\$202,368	PA

While, overall, union political spending favors Democrats, Republicans receive greater union political spending relative to their Democratic counterparts in a handful of states: Alabama, Missouri, North Dakota and South Dakota. In each of these states, Republicans not only control state government but have overwhelming majorities in both legislative chambers.

STATE ELECTION PAC SPENDING: OTHER PACS AND INTEREST GROUPS

PACs operated by the NEA, AFT, AFSCME, SEIU, and their affiliates directed millions toward other state-level PACs and interest groups during the 2023–24 election cycle. These state-focused political organizations are key allies for public sector union officials: they provide union officials with a means of advancing ideological positions sometimes unrelated to collective bargaining. And yet, because these political organizations are not directly associated with the union, union officials are unlikely to pay a political price when the causes they fund turn out to be controversial among membership.

For example, the single biggest state-level recipient of union political funds in the 2023–24 election cycle was the “No on 2124 Committee,” a Washington-based political action committee set up in opposition to Washington Initiative 2124. The initiative, which ultimately failed, would

⁴³ Campaign finance reports filed by the NEA, AFT, AFSCME, and SEIU, and their affiliated unions with the responsible campaign finance reporting entity in each state.

have allowed individuals to opt out of Washington’s long-term health care program and avoid paying associated payroll taxes. Despite the potential freedom offered to their own members under the initiative, public sector union officials in Washington dumped \$7.8 million into the organization campaigning against it.

As Figure 6 shows, the top twenty groups receiving state-level PAC funds from union officials are all progressive in nature.


FIGURE 6: TOP GROUP RECIPIENTS OF STATE GOVERNMENT UNION PAC MONEY, 2023–24 CYCLE.⁴⁴

	Recipient	Amount	State
1	No on 2124 Committee	\$7,800,000	WA
2	Citizens Not Politicians (supporting creation of a new redistricting commission)	\$3,902,943	OH
3	Minnesota Democratic Party (including House and Senate-specific PACs)	\$3,278,153	MN
4	Opportunity PAC (supporting progressive political candidates)	\$3,165,000	CA
5	California Democratic Party (including House and Senate-specific PACs)	\$3,119,370	CA
6	A Teacher In Every Classroom (supporting legalization of teacher strikes)	\$2,500,000	NV
7	Ohio Democratic Party (including House and Senate-specific PACs)	\$2,084,499	OH
8	Strategic Horizons (influencing school board elections)	\$2,000,000	NV
9	Support Our Schools Nebraska (leading the effort to repeal a Nebraska school choice law)	\$1,801,154	NE
10	Arizona For Abortion Access (supporting a state constitutional amendment to guarantee abortion rights)	\$1,700,000	AZ
11	New York State Democratic Party (including House and Senate-specific PACs)	\$1,443,150	NY
12	One Person One Vote (opposing a measure to increase the threshold needed to pass a constitutional amendment)	\$1,227,640	OH
13	Pennsylvania Fund for Change (supporting progressive political candidates)	\$1,210,000	PA
14	Michigan Democratic Party (including House and Senate-specific PACs)	\$962,625	MI
15	Students Deserve Better (influencing school board elections)	\$760,000	CO
16	Fighting Together for Philadelphia (supporting a Democrat mayoral candidate)	\$750,000	PA
17	Houstonians for Working Families (supporting progressive political candidates)	\$582,358	TX
18	Marylanders for a Safe Future (supporting progressive political candidates)	\$515,100	MD
19	Healthy Montana for I-185 (supporting a measure to expand Medicaid eligibility and raise tobacco taxes)	\$402,166	MT
20	Kentucky Family Values (supporting progressive political candidates)	\$300,000	KY

⁴⁴ Campaign finance reports filed by the NEA, AFT, AFSCME, and SEIU, and their affiliated unions with the responsible campaign finance reporting entity in each state.

Discussion

Union political spending during the 2023–24 election cycle shows union executives’ marked preference for independent expenditures and issue advocacy—using membership dues—and away from traditional PAC spending. In fact, **of the money spent on politics by the NEA, AFT, SEIU, and AFSCME, 86 percent (~\$650 million) came from members’ dues, while 14 percent (~\$106 million) came from union PAC dollars. Even then, the overwhelming majority of all union PAC dollars went to other party and political committees (Figure 7), with just 2 percent of overall spending going directly to candidates.**



Several factors may explain union officials’ willingness to spend big on politics using membership dues money, even despite the potential for member backlash. First, general treasury fund spending—used politically for independent expenditures, issue advocacy, and non-electoral politics—is not subject to the contribution limits that cap PAC outlays in federal elections and many states. For example, federal law limits most union-connected PACs to \$5,000 per federal election to any one candidate committee, with other limitations on sending money to other PACs or party committees. In contrast, there are no federal election law limits on the amount of independent expenditure funds for use in support of or against candidates,⁴⁵ with even fewer controls on how to spend money on non-electoral politics.

Second, and relatedly, general fund dollars offer greater flexibility to union officials, who can choose whether to deploy them for politics—as independent expenditures in a particular election, as support for the broader leftist political infrastructure, or as donations to progressive charities pushing social issues outside of formal politics—or not at all. If a political push turns out to be unnecessary, the union may choose to spend them on internal operations or leave them unspent for another year. Meanwhile, PAC funds must have a segregated accounting, completely separate from union general treasury dollars.

⁴⁵ U.S. Federal Election Commission, “Understanding Independent Expenditures,” accessed October 16, 2025, <https://www.fec.gov/help-candidates-and-committees/candidate-taking-receipts/understanding-independent-expenditures/#:~:text=An%20independent%20expenditure%20is%20an,Advertising%20and%20disclaimers>.

Third, general funds are far easier to raise than PAC dollars. Membership dues and special assessments regularly replenish the general treasury fund—often through automatic deductions from members’ pay under state law or employer agreement—and many members see these obligations as routine or even necessary. With respect to PAC dollars, however, unions must obtain separate, voluntary authorizations from members before collecting their PAC contributions, typically in relatively small dollar amounts. While unions may, like with membership dues, have these funds deducted from members’ paychecks with authorization, unions may not collect more than the already agreed contribution without a new PAC fundraising drive. Such fundraising may require a costly campaign and attract controversy, depending on its purpose, whereas raising membership dues is a simpler process that does not necessarily alert members to any specific need, let alone an intent to subsidize a particular political agenda.

Finally, union members find it harder to hold union executives accountable for political spending using membership dues relative to PAC spending. While public employees can access union LM-2 forms from the Department of Labor’s OLMS, there remains a significant lag between actual spending and the availability of LM-2s. For example, the filing date on one LM-2 from AFT examined for purposes of this report was July 31, 2024, but it covers the union’s fiscal year running from July 1, 2022, through June 30, 2023, meaning that some reported expenses occurred two years prior to filing. The FEC, meanwhile, requires PACs to report at least quarterly during election years with semi-annual filings during non-election years.⁴⁶

Even then, most political spending observable on LM-2s fails to disclose the ultimate beneficiary of the funding. This is particularly obvious when it comes to dues dollars turned over to the union’s super PAC or 527, laundering not strictly necessary for independent expenditures or issue advocacy. On a union’s LM-2, they can see that funds moved from the union’s general treasury to another similarly named organization (like the NEA to the NEA Advocacy Fund), but they will have to do additional digging to discover where the money went from there.

Conclusion

The country’s largest public sector unions drive elections and fund an expansive progressive ecosystem, influencing state and national politics in and out of election years. During the 2023–24 election cycle, the four biggest public sector unions—NEA, AFT, SEIU, AFSCME, and their state-level affiliates—combined to spend over \$915 million in elections and progressive politics.

Yet, much of this spending is possible only because of the lack of accountability and control over what powerful union executives do with members’ dues. Union dues, not the separately collected PAC funds, are the overwhelming power behind—86 percent—of union political spending. Few members are aware that union leaders launder much of their dues through super PACs and 527s to back political projects. Even fewer members can effect change within their union to stop it.

Spiller’s election is just one particularly egregious example of unchecked union political spending—hardly the beginning or end of union political involvement. If union members cannot change union officials’ spending habits, expect many public employees to leave their unions altogether. In the end, it may take regulation from state and federal policymakers. After all, if employees cannot trust union officials to safeguard their interests, today’s union executives may have outlasted their usefulness.

⁴⁶ See U.S. Federal Election Commission, “Filing SSF Reports.”

Appendix: Membership Forms SEIU, AFSCME, PSEA, and Philadelphia Federation of Teachers (PFT)

Membership Application Source (Applicant may leave blank)

<input type="checkbox"/> Housevisit	<input type="checkbox"/> NEO
<input type="checkbox"/> Leader	<input type="checkbox"/> Training
<input type="checkbox"/> Mailing	<input type="checkbox"/> Union Event
<input type="checkbox"/> Member meeting	<input type="checkbox"/> Worksite

PS
Apr
2022

 **Sign me up!** I'm ready to join tens of thousands of Oregonians in SEIU 503 and work for better pay, quality public services, healthcare for all, and a fair shot for everyone to get ahead—not just get by.

_____/_____/_____
 FULL NAME (please print) DATE OF BIRTH (mm/dd/yyyy)

HOME PHONE _____ *CELL _____

HOME EMAIL _____

**By providing my phone number, I understand that the Service Employees International Union (SEIU), its local unions, and affiliates may use automated calling technologies and/or text message me on my cellular phone on a periodic basis. SEIU will never charge for text message alerts. Carrier message and data rates may apply to such alerts. Reply STOP to stop receiving messages; reply HELP for more information. If you would like to opt out of text messages, please check the box.*

HOME ADDRESS: _____
STREET CITY STATE ZIP

MAILING ADDRESS: _____
(IF DIFFERENT FROM HOME ADDRESS) STREET CITY STATE ZIP

EMPLOYER/AGENCY _____ JOB TITLE _____ WORKSITE/DEPARTMENT _____

EMPLOYEE ID _____ HIRE DATE (mm/dd/yyyy) _____ WORK ADDRESS _____ CITY/STATE/ZIP _____

PREFERRED LANGUAGE: English Español русский Tiếng Việt 普通话 Soomaali Other: _____

Membership Authorization

We're Stronger Together. SEIU members are united across race, religion, industry, and geography to improve our jobs and our communities.

Yes, I want to join my fellow employees and become a member of SEIU Local 503! I request and voluntarily accept membership in SEIU Local 503 and its successors or assigns (collectively "Local 503"). This means I will receive the benefits and abide by the obligations of membership set forth in both Local 503's and the Service Employees International Union's Constitutions and Bylaws. I authorize Local 503 to act as my representative in collective bargaining over wages, benefits, and other terms/conditions of employment with my employer, and as my exclusive representative where authorized by law. My membership will be continuous, unless I resign by providing notice to Local 503 via U.S. mail (or other method if permitted by Local 503 policies). I know that union membership is voluntary and not a condition of employment, and that I can decline to join without reprisal.

X Signature _____ Date _____

Dues Deduction/Checkoff Authorization

I request and voluntarily authorize my employer to deduct from my earnings and to pay to Local 503 and its successors and assigns (collectively "Local 503") an amount equal to Local 503's regular dues, and other fees or assessments uniformly applicable to members of Local 503. This dues deduction authorization shall remain in effect unless I revoke it by providing notice to Local 503 via U.S. mail (or other method if permitted by Local 503's policies) within 15 days before or after (1) the annual anniversary date of this agreement or (2) the termination of the applicable collective bargaining agreement between my employer and union ("my window periods"). This authorization will renew automatically from year to year even if I have resigned my membership, unless I revoke it during one of my window periods and as required by Local 503's policies. This authorization is voluntary and is not a condition of my employment, and I can decline to agree to it without reprisal. I understand that all members benefit from everyone's commitments because they help build a strong union that is able to plan for the future.

X Signature _____ Date _____

Contributions or gifts to Local 503 are not tax deductible as charitable contributions.

Scholarship Fund: Check this box if you would like the portion of dues spent on political power to go toward SEIU 503's scholarship fund.

Appendix: Membership Forms (continued)

OPTIONAL DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION (check all that apply):

- | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Female | <input type="checkbox"/> She/Her/Hers | <input type="checkbox"/> LGBTQIA+ | <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic/Latinx | <input type="checkbox"/> Arab American/Middle Eastern/North African |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Male | <input type="checkbox"/> He/Him/His | <input type="checkbox"/> Transgender | <input type="checkbox"/> African/African American | <input type="checkbox"/> Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Binary | <input type="checkbox"/> They/Them/Their | <input type="checkbox"/> Disabled / Person with a disability | <input type="checkbox"/> Asian/Asian American | <input type="checkbox"/> White |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say | <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say | <input type="checkbox"/> Deaf / Hard of Hearing | <input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous/Native American | <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other: | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: | <input type="checkbox"/> Blind / Low Vision | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Active/Veteran US Military | | |

Citizen Action For Political Education (CAPE)

14,000 SEIU members contribute to our member-driven political program, in addition to paying dues. We do this because CAPE is our voice in politics. It's not politics as usual, it's how we're about to have a say in decisions that impact us directly.

Recent CAPE wins

Affordable Housing

A raise means nothing when rent goes up 30 or 40 percent. That's why SEIU members spent years fighting for tenant protections. In 2019, we won, passing the nation's first statewide rent stabilization bill and bringing an end to no-cause evictions.

seiu503.org/cape

Healthcare

Our union fought hard to protect healthcare for 400,000 Oregonians by helping pass Measure 101 in 2018. We then unseated the legislator who tried to cut Medicaid and replaced her with a union nurse!

Paid Sick Leave

No one should lose their job because they get sick. We helped pass a law in 2017 that made paid sick leave mandatory in Oregon.

Wages

In 2016, SEIU members fought for an increase to the minimum wage, because working 40 hours a week means you should be able to keep your head above water.

Voluntary SEIU Local 503 Citizen Action for Political Education (CAPE) Check-off

Yes! I want to hold politicians accountable to working families and I know we can only do that if we stand together. I hereby authorize my employer to withhold the indicated amount per month to forward to SEIU Local 503 ("SEIU") as a contribution to Citizen Action for Political Education ("CAPE"). My signature shows that I agree with the terms below.

- \$30.00 / month \$20.00 / month \$13.00 / month \$10.00 / month Other \$_____ / month

This contribution qualifies for the Oregon Political Tax Credit. Single filers are eligible for a credit up to \$50/year; joint filers up to \$100 per year.

This authorization is made voluntarily based on my specific understanding that: 1) I am not required to sign this form or make voluntary contributions to SEIU CAPE as a condition of my employment or membership in the union; 2) I may refuse to contribute without reprisal; 3) Under law, only union members and executive / administrative staff who are U.S. Citizens or lawful permanent residents are eligible to contribute to CAPE; 4) The contribution amounts on this form are merely suggestions, and I may contribute more or less by this or other means without fear of favor or disadvantage from SEIU or my employer; 5) SEIU CAPE uses the money it receives for political purposes – including, but not limited to, making contributions to and expenditures on behalf of candidates for federal, state, and local offices – and addressing political issues of public importance. This authorization shall remain in effect until revoked by me in writing via U.S. mail to SEIU. 6) Contributions or gifts to SEIU Local 503, OPEU CAPE are not tax deductible as charitable contributions.



Signature _____

Date _____

Appendix: Membership Forms (continued)

AFSCME Council 57

Strong

- ✓ For my job.
- ✓ For my family.
- ✓ For my future.

I'm AFSCME STRONG and I am standing with my coworkers.



AFSCME PEOPLE!

Earn MVP Rewards when you contribute.

I hereby authorize my Employer and associated agencies to deduct, each pay period, the amount certified as a voluntary contribution to be paid to the treasurer of American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees PEOPLE, AFSCME, AFL-CIO, P.O. Box 65334, Washington, DC 20035-5334, to be used for the purpose of supporting pro-worker candidates in federal, state and local elections. My contribution is voluntary, and I understand that it is not required as a condition of membership in any organization, or as a condition of continued employment and is free of reprisal. I understand that any contribution guideline is only a suggestion and I am free to contribute more or less than that amount and will not be favored or disadvantaged due to the amount of my contribution or refusal to contribute and that I may revoke this authorization at any time by giving written notice.

YES, I want to contribute the following amount to AFSCME PEOPLE

\$8.35 (if paid monthly)
 \$4.26 (if paid bi-weekly)
 OTHER _____
 SELECT JACKET SIZE:
 S
 M
 L
 XL
 2XL
 3XL
 4XL
 Jacket received
 (Jacket with contribution of at least \$100 per year)

Signature _____ Date _____

Contributions or gifts to AFSCME PEOPLE are not deductible as charitable contributions for federal income tax purposes. In accordance with federal law, AFSCME PEOPLE will accept contributions only from members of AFSCME and their families. Contributions from other persons will be returned.

ORANGE/CARDINAL

For office use only: _____ Received _____ Submitted To Employer _____

(Please print)

Name _____ Local # _____ AFSCME Council 57

Employee ID _____ Hire Date _____ Last four of SSN # _____

Home Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____

Home Phone _____ Cell Phone* _____

Employer _____

Occupation _____ Dept. _____

Work Address _____

City _____ Zip Code _____

Home Email _____

Yes, sign me up for:

Work Email _____

Text alerts (message & data rates may apply)

Email updates

*By providing my cell phone number, I understand that the Union and its affiliates may use automated calling technology to send or text messages to me on my cell phone on a periodic basis. The Union will never charge for text message alerts; carrier message and data rates may apply to such texts. *

AFSCME Membership

I hereby apply for membership in Local _____ of AFSCME Council 57 (hereafter referred to as the "Union") and I agree to abide by its Constitution and Bylaws. By this application I authorize the Union, and its successor or assign, to act as my exclusive bargaining representative for purposes of collective bargaining with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment with my Employer.

Effective immediately, I hereby voluntarily authorize and direct my Employer to deduct from my paycheck the amount of dues certified by the Union, and as they may be adjusted periodically by the Union. I further authorize my Employer to remit such amount monthly to the Union.

This voluntary authorization and assignment shall be irrevocable, regardless of whether I am or remain a member of the Union, for a period of one year from the date of execution or until the termination date of the memorandum of understanding or collective bargaining agreement (if there is one) between the Employer and the Union, whichever occurs sooner, and for year to year thereafter, unless I give the Employer and the Union written notice of revocation not less than ten (10) days and not more than twenty (20) days before the end of any yearly period; provided however, that any conflicting membership and deduction provisions of the applicable governing body and memorandum of understanding or collective bargaining agreement supersede the provisions of this agreement, and if the applicable memorandum of understanding or collective bargaining agreement specified a different or longer annual revocation period, then only that other period shall apply. The applicable memorandum of understanding or collective bargaining agreement is available for review upon request. This card supersedes any prior check-off authorization card I signed.

I recognize that my authorization of dues deductions, and the continuation of such authorization from one year to the next, is voluntary and not a condition of my employment.

Payments to the Union are not deductible as charitable donations for federal income tax purposes. However, they may be tax deductible as ordinary and necessary business expenses.

Signature _____ Date _____

_____ Confirmed on Employer List

VUE _____
 Entered
 New Member

Enterprise _____
 Status Change

Appendix: Membership Forms (continued)

		PENNSYLVANIA STATE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION PSEA-AFFILIATED LOCAL ASSOCIATION NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION 2024-2025 EA ENROLLMENT FORM			
LOCAL ASSOCIATION NUMBER		LOCAL ASSOCIATION NAME/EDUCATIONAL EMPLOYER		BUILDING NAME	
SSN (LAST 4 DIGITS) OR PSEA ID#		TITLE		MIDDLE INITIAL	
STREET ADDRESS		CITY		STATE ZIP CODE	
EMPLOYMENT LEVEL (✓) PLEASE CHECK ONE <input type="checkbox"/> 01 Preschool <input type="checkbox"/> 02 Kindergarten <input type="checkbox"/> 03 Elementary <input type="checkbox"/> 04 Middle Sch./Jr Hg <input type="checkbox"/> 05 High School <input type="checkbox"/> 06 Community/Junior College/Two-Year Associate Degree <input type="checkbox"/> 07 College <input type="checkbox"/> 08 University <input type="checkbox"/> 09 Other					PPID #
EA EMPLOYMENT CODES: (✓) PLEASE CHECK ONE					
Classroom Teacher (K-12) <input type="checkbox"/> 101 Adult Ed <input type="checkbox"/> 102 Art <input type="checkbox"/> 103 Business Ed <input type="checkbox"/> 104 Coach <input type="checkbox"/> 105 Communications <input type="checkbox"/> 106 Computer Science <input type="checkbox"/> 107 Driver Ed <input type="checkbox"/> 108 English/Language Arts <input type="checkbox"/> 109 World Language & Literature <input type="checkbox"/> 110 Health & Physical Education <input type="checkbox"/> 111 Family & Consumer Sciences <input type="checkbox"/> 112 Library Science <input type="checkbox"/> 113 Mathematics		Career/Technical Studies <input type="checkbox"/> 201 Agriculture <input type="checkbox"/> 202 Business <input type="checkbox"/> 203 Distributive <input type="checkbox"/> 205 Family & Consumer Sciences <input type="checkbox"/> 206 Technology Ed. <input type="checkbox"/> 207 Trade and Industrial <input type="checkbox"/> 208 Other/Voltech <input type="checkbox"/> 209 Nursing Educator <input type="checkbox"/> 210 Physical Therapy Educator <input type="checkbox"/> 211 Occupational Therapy Educator		Higher Ed <input type="checkbox"/> 301 Agriculture <input type="checkbox"/> 302 Architecture <input type="checkbox"/> 303 Biology <input type="checkbox"/> 304 Business <input type="checkbox"/> 305 Communications <input type="checkbox"/> 306 Computer Science <input type="checkbox"/> 307 Education <input type="checkbox"/> 308 Engineering <input type="checkbox"/> 309 English <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Foreign Languages <input type="checkbox"/> 311 Geography <input type="checkbox"/> 313 Family & Consumer Sciences <input type="checkbox"/> 314 Law <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Library <input type="checkbox"/> 316 Mathematics	
<input type="checkbox"/> 317 Military Science <input type="checkbox"/> 318 Philosophy <input type="checkbox"/> 319 Physical Science <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Psychology <input type="checkbox"/> 321 Religion <input type="checkbox"/> 322 Social Science <input type="checkbox"/> 323 No Subject <input type="checkbox"/> 324 Other <input type="checkbox"/> 325 Nursing Educator <input type="checkbox"/> 326 Physical Therapy Educator <input type="checkbox"/> 327 Occupational Therapy Educator <input type="checkbox"/> 330 SCUPA <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Graduate Assistant		Administration/Supervision <input type="checkbox"/> 401 Chief/Assistant Administrator <input type="checkbox"/> 402 Supervisor <input type="checkbox"/> 403 Other Administration <input type="checkbox"/> 404 Principal <input type="checkbox"/> 405 Assistant Principal		Pupil Services <input type="checkbox"/> 501 Counselor <input type="checkbox"/> 502 Dental Hygienist <input type="checkbox"/> 503 H & S Visitor <input type="checkbox"/> 504 Certified School Nurse <input type="checkbox"/> 505 School Psychologist <input type="checkbox"/> 508 RNLPN/Health Room Aide <input type="checkbox"/> 509 School Social Workers <input type="checkbox"/> 506 Occupational Therapist <input type="checkbox"/> 507 Physical Therapist	
DATE OF BIRTH		POLITICAL AFFILIATION		ETHNIC CLASSIFICATION	
MO	DAY	YEAR	<input type="checkbox"/> REPUBLICAN <input type="checkbox"/> INDEPENDENT <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER <input type="checkbox"/> DEMOCRAT <input type="checkbox"/> NONE	PSEA is committed to ensuring the equitable representation of members of ethnic minority groups at all governance levels of the Association. To help achieve this goal, completion of this section is strongly encouraged. Failure to do so, however, will not affect your membership status, rights or benefits in NEA, PSEA, the local or any of their affiliates. Ethnic minority shall mean those persons designated as ethnic minority by the U.S. Bureau of Census. This information will be kept confidential.	
GENDER		AREA CODE		TELEPHONE NUMBER	
<input type="checkbox"/> FEMALE <input type="checkbox"/> MALE <input type="checkbox"/> NON-BINARY		HOME:		<input type="checkbox"/> 01 Native American/Alaska Native <input type="checkbox"/> 02 White <input type="checkbox"/> 03 Black or African American <input type="checkbox"/> 04 Hispanic, Hispanic or Chicano/Latino <input type="checkbox"/> 05 Asian <input type="checkbox"/> 06 Bi-racial <input type="checkbox"/> 07 Multiracial <input type="checkbox"/> 08 Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	
HOME E-MAIL ADDRESS		CELL:		HAVE YOU EVER BEEN A MEMBER OF PSEA/NEA? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
MEMBERSHIP TYPE AND RATES				DUES PAYMENT CALCULATION (SUMMARY)	
Pennsylvania is a unified state. The NEA PSEA and local associations may not be joined separately. Dues cannot be pro-rated.					
(✓) PLEASE CHECK ONE EA MEMBERSHIP (PROFESSIONAL)		PSEA DUES	NEA DUES	TOTAL DUES OBLIGATION	PSEA DUES (from left)
<input type="checkbox"/> 10- Active - Annual - hired or joining in September or October and working greater than 75% up to and including 100% of the normal schedule of an active member		599.00	213.00	812.00	\$ _____
<input type="checkbox"/> 11- Active - 3/4 Year - hired or joining in September or October and working greater than 50% up to and including 75% of the normal schedule of an active annual member OR hired or joining in November or December and working greater than 50% up to and including 100% of the normal schedule of an active annual member		449.25	213.00	662.25	NEA DUES (from left) \$ _____
<input type="checkbox"/> 12- Active - 1/2 Year - hired or joining in January, February, or March OR working greater than 500 hours up to and including 50% of the normal schedule of an active annual member		299.50	119.00	417.50	LOCAL DUES: \$ _____
<input type="checkbox"/> 13- Active - 1/4 Year - hired or joining on April 1 or later OR working less than 500 hours during the school year		149.75	70.75	220.50	REGION ASSESSMENT \$ _____
					PSEA/PACE CONTRIBUTION (from pledge below) \$ _____
					NEA FUND CONTRIBUTION (from pledge below) \$ _____
					TOTAL PAYMENT \$ _____
CONTINUOUS PSEA-PACE AND NEA FUND PLEDGE BY PAYROLL DEDUCTION					
PSEA has established a political action committee (PSEA-PACE) to support candidates in state and local elections. PSEA-PACE collects voluntary contributions from Association members and uses these contributions for political purposes including, but not limited to, making contributions to and expenditures on behalf of friends of public education who are candidates for state and local office. The National Education Association Fund for Children and Public Education (NEA FUND) collects voluntary contributions from Association members and uses those contributions for political purposes, including, but not limited to, making contributions to and expenditures on behalf of friends of public education who are candidates for federal office. Contributions to PSEA-PACE and the NEA Fund are voluntary and members have the right to refuse to contribute without reprisal. A member may contribute more or less than the suggested amount, or not contribute, without affecting his or her membership status, rights, or benefits in NEA, PSEA or any of PSEA's affiliates.			law prohibits The NEA Fund from receiving contributions from persons other than members of the NEA and its affiliates and their immediate families. All contributions from persons other than members of the NEA and its affiliates, and their immediate families, will be returned forthwith.		
Contributions to PSEA-PACE and The NEA Fund are not deductible as charitable contributions for federal or state income tax purposes. Only U.S. citizens or lawful permanent residents may contribute to PSEA-PACE or The NEA Fund. No dues dollars may be given to political candidates.			With full knowledge of this information, I agree that my authorization for political action pledges as indicated by the check marks (✓) below and my authorization for payroll deduction, if available, shall continue in force from year to year unless revoked or modified by me by giving written notice to my local association.		
Federal and state law requires PSEA to use its best efforts to collect the name, mailing address, occupation, and the name of the employer for each individual whose contributions to PSEA-PACE aggregate in excess of \$10 in a calendar year or whose contributions to The NEA Fund aggregate in excess of \$200 in a calendar year. Federal			PSEA-PACE for State Elections (✓) PLEASE CHECK <input type="checkbox"/> \$106 (\$2 per week) <input type="checkbox"/> \$12 (\$1 per week) <input type="checkbox"/> \$104 (\$2 per week) <input type="checkbox"/> \$ _____ OTHER CONTRIBUTION (ENTER AMOUNT)		NEA Fund for Federal Elections (✓) PLEASE CHECK <input type="checkbox"/> \$10 CONTRIBUTION <input type="checkbox"/> \$ _____ OTHER CONTRIBUTION (ENTER AMOUNT)
MEMBERSHIP COMMITMENT AND PAYMENT AUTHORIZATION					
Membership Commitment: Yes, I choose to become a member of _____ local association, PSEA, and NEA. I voluntarily accept unified membership in these associations and agree to abide by the Constitution and Bylaws of all three associations. I understand that my membership will be continuous unless I provide a written, signed notice to my local association or PSEA that I no longer want to be a member.					
Annual Payment Agreement: I hereby agree to pay the yearly dues established by my local association, PSEA, and NEA for my membership category in consideration for the services provided by the three associations. I understand the amounts may be subject to change each year by the governing bodies of the associations. I agree to payment of those yearly amounts on a continuing basis, through payroll deduction or other arrangement, regardless of my membership status. While I may resign my membership at any time, I agree to pay an amount equal to my full yearly dues, unless I assign my membership through written signed notice to my local association or to PSEA received no later than October 1 of each membership year.					
I UNDERSTAND THIS AGREEMENT IS VOLUNTARY AND IS NOT A CONDITION OF EMPLOYMENT AND THAT I HAVE THE LEGAL RIGHT TO REFUSE TO SIGN THIS AGREEMENT WITHOUT SUFFERING ANY REPRISAL.					
By providing my phone number, I understand that the Pennsylvania State Education Association (PSEA), and the local association may use automated calling techniques and/or text message me on my cellular phone on a periodic basis. PSEA and the local association will not charge for text message alerts. Carrier message and data rates may apply. I understand that I am not required to agree to automated calling techniques and/or text messages as a condition of membership. If at any point you no longer wish to receive text messages or calls, please send an email request to optout@psea.org .					
SIGNATURE	DATE	HIRE DATE	LOCAL OFFICER VERIFICATION		



**COMMONWEALTH
FOUNDATION**



commonwealthfoundation.org

717.671.1901

