Workers Alliance member outside Karin poses with a CA Domestic Workers Alliance banner. Stephen at ABA Mid-Winter WOSH panel in San Diego with Secretary of Labor Edens, and Morgan Lewis Partner Worksafe in the News. Legal Access Foundation and California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation launched a pilot program to provide legal services to farmworkers. This pilot was the result of a joint proposal by the California Legislative Worker Safety Caucus and the California State Senate. The Fund for California Domestic Workers (aka CalWORKS) was created to provide temporary support to workers who face financial hardship due to workplace injury or illness. The Fund was created by the California State Legislature in 2018 and is administered by the California Department of Social Services. The Fund provides up to $300 per week for up to 12 weeks to workers who have a workplace injury or illness that prevents them from working and results in a loss of income. The Fund is currently funded through a special allocation of General Fund appropriations. The Fund is administered by the California Department of Social Services and is open to all California workers who meet the eligibility criteria. The Fund is funded through a special allocation of General Fund appropriations. The Fund is administered by the California Department of Social Services and is open to all California workers who meet the eligibility criteria.

The Fight for CalDom in California: Domestic Workers

Sunday section! (Buy the print edition only to read this section), but two notable ones we wanted to share immediately:

The budget portion of this bill designating a hardship fund to help employers comply with Cal/OSHA standards for household domestic service and family daycare homes.

The Advisory Committee to the California Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board voted to add domestic workers to the list of industries covered by Cal/OSHA. The proposed amendment would exclude only publicly funded institutions from occupational health and safety protections. The Advisory Committee also voted to support a bill that would create a rebuttable presumption that a negative action against an employee is retaliatory if it occurs within 90 days of reporting a labor or equal pay violation.

A majority of California workers who report workplace violations do experience retaliation. And so many of us don’t speak up. And when workers are afraid to speak up, wage theft, unequal pay, and workplace hazards are allowed to flourish, making our communities less safe and equitable.

The bill would also allow whistleblowers who experience retaliation to collect a financial award for any economic damages they suffer as a result of the retaliation. The bill would also create a rebuttable presumption that a negative action against an employee is retaliatory if it occurs within 90 days of reporting a labor or equal pay violation. The bill would also create a rebuttable presumption that a negative action against an employee is retaliatory if it occurs within 90 days of reporting a labor or equal pay violation.

Last year, Governor Newsom vetoed a bill that would have required employers to provide workers with paid sick leave. The bill would have allowed workers to earn up to 40 hours of paid sick leave each year, which they could use for their own or a family member’s medical emergency, or for the death of a family member. The bill was opposed by the California Restaurant Association and some other business groups, who argued that it would be too costly for employers. The bill was opposed by the California Restaurant Association and some other business groups, who argued that it would be too costly for employers.
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