

BEFORE THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
OF THE
PLEASANTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Non-Reemployment of
Certificated Employees,

Respondents.

OAH No. 2009030305

PROPOSED DECISION

Administrative Law Judge David L. Benjamin, State of California, Office of Administrative Hearings, heard this matter in Pleasanton, California, on April 27 and 28, and May 18, 2009.

Laurie S. Juengert, Attorney at Law, Fagan Friedman & Fulfrost LLP, represented complainant Pleasanton Unified School District.¹

Dale Brodsky, Attorney at Law, Beeson, Tayer & Bodine, represented the respondents identified on Appendix A, attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

Respondents Cara Banks and Julie Duncan appeared and represented themselves.

There was no appearance by or on behalf of respondents Jill Battilega, Merilee Fisher, Kiera Huntze, Jennifer Johnson-Phillips, Kimberly Kozuch, Mark Macur, Keri McDonald, Kathy Mercer, Phillip Peacock, Lydia Rice, Lesli Schusterman, Sharon Stewart, Philippe Vergon, or Tamara Yanak-Schoonover.

The record was reopened to receive a letter from Ms. Juengert, dated May 19, 2009, reciting new stipulations between complainant and Ms. Brodsky. The May 19, 2009 letter was marked for identification as Exhibit IV and admitted into evidence.

At the request of the administrative law judge, Ms. Juengert submitted a letter dated May 27, 2009, regarding certain procedural and jurisdictional matters. The record was reopened to receive the letter, which was marked for identification as Exhibit V and admitted into evidence.

¹ Kim Kingsley Bogard and Paul Gant, Attorneys at Law, Kingsley Bogard Thompson LLP, represented complainant until May 7, 2009, when the district substituted Ms. Juengert as its counsel.

The record was closed and the matter was deemed submitted on May 27, 2009.

FACTUAL FINDINGS

1. Dr. Bill Faraghan made and filed the accusation in his official capacity as Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources of the Pleasanton Unified School District.
2. Each respondent is a certificated employee of the district.
3. On February 24 and March 5, 2009, the Board of Trustees adopted Resolution No. 2008-09.15 and Resolution No. 2008-09.20, respectively, reducing or eliminating particular kinds of services for the 2009-2010 school year and directing the superintendent or his designee to give appropriate notices to certificated employees whose positions will be affected by the actions.
4. On or before March 15, 2009, Assistant Superintendent Faraghan gave written notice to respondents of the recommendation that their services will not be required for the 2009-2010 school year. The reasons for the recommendation were set forth in these preliminary layoff notices.
5. Respondents filed timely requests for hearing to determine if there is cause for terminating their services for the 2009-2010 school year. An accusation was served on respondents, all of whom are deemed to have filed timely notices of defense. All prehearing jurisdictional requirements have been met.
6. On February 24, the board took action to reduce or eliminate the following particular kinds of services for the 2009-2010 school year:

Service	Grade Level	FTE ²
Academic Support	6-12	1.00
Athletic Director	9-12	0.80
AVID	6-12	2.00
Band and Strings	K-5	1.50
Community Day School	7-12	2.60
Coordinator: Barton Reading Program	K-8	0.50
Counselors	K-12	10.40
EL/ELD	6-12	1.50
Multiple Subject (includes K-5 & Middle School Block)	K-6	78.50
English	6-12	6.00
Health	6-12	1.50
Keyboard/Computers	6-8	0.50
Language	6-12	2.20
Lunch Activities	9-12	0.40

² Full-time equivalent.

Mathematics	6-12	7.50
Music	6-12	0.50
Physical Education	K-12	2.00
Reading Improvement	6-12	0.50
Reading Specialists	K-5	5.00
Science – Biological/Life	K-12	1.50
Science – Chemistry	K-12	0.50
Science – Geoscience	K-12	0.50
Science – Physics	K-12	0.50
Service Learning	6-12	0.50
Social Science	6-12	2.00
Tri-Valley Teacher Induction Program Coaches	K-12	7.00
Visual and Performing Arts	9-12	1.00
World Language – American Sign Language	6-12	0.50
World Language – French	6-12	1.00
World Language – German	6-12	1.00
World Language – Japanese	6-12	0.50
World Language – Latin	6-12	0.50
World Language – Spanish	6-12	1.00
TOTAL PKS REDUCTIONS		147.90 FTE

7. On March 5, the board took action to reduce or eliminate the following particular kinds of services for the 2009-2010 school year:

Service	Grade Level	FTE
Counselors	K-12	4.10
Drama	9-12	0.20
English	7-12	0.50
Foods	9-12	0.40
Mathematics	7-12	0.10
Physical Education	K-12	3.20
Social Science	9-12	1.00
VAPA	K-12	2.70
World Language – French	9-12	0.20
TOTAL PKS REDUCTIONS		12.40

8. In addition to identifying the services to be reduced or eliminated, Resolution No. 2008-09.15 also identified certain “services” to be “skipped.” Those services include “All Special Education,” and “BCLAD/Dual Immersion,” which the resolution defines as “[t]eachers with BCLAD certifications actually using the credential in their classroom assignments.”

9. Since March 5, the district has determined that the total PKS reduction will be 140.78 FTE.

10. The district has partially rescinded layoff notices it issued to five respondents who each held a 1.0 FTE position. The district rescinded 0.4 FTE of the layoff notice it had issued to William Brown; 0.5 FTE of the layoff notice it had issued to Julie Duncan; 0.3 FTE of the layoff notice it had issued to Merilee Fisher; 0.9 FTE of the layoff notice it had issued to Stephanie Maimoni; and 0.4 FTE of the layoff notice it had issued to Keri McDonald.

11. The district has rescinded the layoff notices it issued to Jill Battilega, Phillip Peacock, Lydia Rice, and Lesli Schusterman. They are no longer respondents in this proceeding.

12. The district has rescinded the layoff notices it issued to the respondents on Appendix A with the notation “Rescinded” next to their names. Those persons are no longer respondents in this proceeding.³

Seniority Date Issues

13. The parties stipulated to changing the seniority dates of the following respondents to the dates indicated:

<u>Respondent</u>	<u>New Seniority Date</u>
Cindy Vance	August 25, 2004
Nicole Hoffman	August 25, 2004
Mary Oullette	August 25, 2004
Cindy Baker	August 25, 2004
Jennifer Guerin	August 25, 2004
Kelli Walter	August 25, 2004
Kathleen Hockett	January 29, 2004
Caryl Daly	August 24, 2005
Kerry King	August 30, 1999
Theresa Moore	August 23, 2001
Stephanie Beard	August 28, 1997
Nicole Scanlon-Lodato	March 8, 2007

14. The parties stipulated that Kristen Hammes is a first year probationary teacher (Prob 1) and that her seniority date is August 21, 2008.

15. The parties stipulated that Alex Ondi is a Prob 1 with a seniority date of August 21, 2008.

16. The parties stipulated that Julie Duncan’s seniority date is May 14, 2003.

³ The district has also rescinded certain layoff notices that it issued to employees who are not respondents in this proceeding. Because those employees are not within the jurisdiction of this proceeding, they are not identified in this decision.

17. The parties stipulated to changing the seniority dates and/or classifications of the following respondents as follows:

<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Classification</u>	<u>New Seniority Date</u>
Katherine Crawford	Permanent	August 24, 2006
Heather Fleming	Permanent	August 24, 2006
Carolyn O'Connor	Permanent	August 24, 2006
Luis Ospina	Permanent	August 24, 2006
Delise Williams	Permanent	August 24, 2006
Nicole Benson	Permanent (for .87 FTE)	August 24, 2005
Megan Tracy	Permanent	August 24, 2006

18. Heather Johnson was assigned a seniority date of September 13, 2007. She contends that her seniority date should be August 15, 2007, because she was directed to report for training on August 15 through August 21, 2007, before the semester began on August 23. (Johnson was not given August 23 as her seniority date because the district did not receive her fingerprint clearance until September 13, and could not place her in a classroom before that date.) Johnson testified that she was paid on an hourly basis for attending the pre-semester training.

Seniority is measured from the first date on which an employee renders paid service in a probationary position. (Ed. Code, § 44845.⁴) Even if attendance at the August training was mandatory, the evidence did not establish that the training was part of Johnson's service in a probationary position. Johnson's contract for the 2007-2008 school year was not offered into evidence. It appears that the training was not part of her probationary service, as she was paid an hourly rate for her participation rather than her salary as a probationary employee. Johnson is not entitled to an earlier seniority date.

19. While the general rule is that seniority is measured from the first day of paid probationary service, under certain circumstances a probationary employee can "tack on" a prior year's service as a temporary employee. Section 44918, subdivision (a), provides:

Any employee classified as a . . . temporary employee, who serves during one school year for at least 75 percent of the number of days the regular schools of the district were maintained in that school year and has performed the duties normally required of a certificated employee of the school district, shall be deemed to have served a complete school year as a probationary employee if employed as a probationary employee for the following school year.

⁴ All statutory references are to the Education Code.

20. Andrea Carstensen, Chelsea Pancoast, and Jill Weaver were each employed by the district under temporary contracts for two school years, and then employed as probationary employees for the following third school year. (Carstensen was employed on a temporary contract for the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 school years, Pancoast and Weaver were employed on temporary contracts for the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 school years.) When these respondents were employed as probationary employees at the beginning of their third school year, the district tacked on their prior year's service as temporary employees as required by section 44918: Carstensen was assigned a seniority date of August 24, 2006, and Pancoast and Weaver were assigned seniority dates of August 24, 2007. Their seniority dates are correct.

Carstensen, Pancoast and Weaver assert that, when they came to work for the district for the first time, other teachers with similar backgrounds and credentials were hired as probationary employees, not temporary employees. They argue that the district acted "arbitrarily and capriciously" by employing them on temporary contracts.

So long as it complies with the laws governing the classification of certificated employees, it is within the district's discretion to decide who it will offer a temporary contract and who it will hire as a probationary employee. (*Kavanaugh v. West Sonoma County Union High School Dist.* (2003) 29 Cal.4th 911, 916-917.) The evidence does not establish that the district's classification of Carstensen, Pancoast, and Weaver was incorrect.

21. Janice Clark worked for the district as a substitute teacher from April 2007 to the end of the 2006-2007 school year. She was then employed as a probationary employee for the 2007-2008 school year and assigned a seniority date of August 23, 2007. She contends that she should be granted seniority retroactive to April 2007. Under section 44918, subdivision (d), Clark is not entitled to tack on her work as a day-to-day substitute. Even if Clark was not a day-to-day substitute in 2007, she can tack on that time only if she worked as a substitute for at least 75 percent of the school days during the 2006-2007. (§ 44918, subd. (a).) Since she was not employed until April 2007, she could not have done this. Clark is not entitled to an earlier seniority date.

22. Julie Berglin worked for the district from 1997 until 2005, when she and her family relocated to Arkansas and she resigned. They later returned to California and Berglin was reemployed by the district in 2008. Berglin retained her classification as a permanent employee, but she was given a new seniority date of August 21, 2008. Berglin believes that she should keep her original seniority date.

Section 44848 states that, if an employee resigns and is thereafter reemployed, "[her] date of employment shall be deemed to be the date on which [she] first accepted reemployment . . . or rendered paid service . . . after [her] reemployment." Berglin's seniority date is correct.

23. Sue Mello began work for the school district in 1978. She resigned at the end of the 2005-2006 school year when she adopted two children. Mello later sought

reemployment with the district and was reemployed for the 2007-2008 school year. Like respondent Berglin, Mello retained her classification as a permanent employee but was given a new seniority date of August 23, 2007. As in the case of respondent Berglin, section 44848 establishes that Mello's seniority date is correct. Mello argues that she should have been advised to go on medical leave instead of resigning, which would have allowed her to keep her original seniority date. It was established by uncontradicted evidence, however, that Mello would not have been entitled to use medical leave for the purpose of staying at home with her children.

Tie-Breaking Issues

24. On February 24, 2009, the board adopted Resolution 2008-09.14, which establishes criteria to determine the relative seniority of employees with the same seniority date. The resolution establishes 11 different criteria, including "Program Need (including School and Student needs)," and "Other certification or specialized training that enhances school programs and/or educational needs."⁵ The resolution directs the superintendent to exercise his judgment in applying the criteria. To apply the criteria, the district's administrators identified certain activities that satisfy "program needs" and certain training programs that "enhance school programs and/or educational needs." Points were assigned to teachers who satisfied any of the tie-breaking criteria.

25. At hearing on April 27 and April 28, many respondents sought additional tie-breaking points under the categories of "program need" and "other certification or specialized training," arguing in essence that the categories had been interpreted too narrowly. The parties have since stipulated that the district will withdraw these two categories of tie-breaking criteria and recalculate the relative seniority of employees without these categories.

26. At hearing on April 27 and 28, Tami Smith, Karen Cobb, Teresa Huk and Delila Neves sought additional tie-breaking points based on specialized training that each of them had received. The parties have now stipulated, however, that the district will not use this category to determine relative seniority. Respondents Smith, Cobb, Huk and Neves are not entitled to additional tie-breaking points for specialized training.

Smith testified that her training should gain her an additional point under the category of "NCLB/HOUSSE compliance." She stated that her training on the induction of new teachers "counts toward the district's NCLB compliance." Under this category, however, the district awards a tie-breaking point to teachers who are NCLB compliant in their subject area. The evidence does not establish that Smith's training constitutes NCLB compliance in her subject area.

⁵ Other criteria include breadth of the employee's credential; NCLB/HOUSSE compliance in subject area; academic preparation; advanced degrees; total years teaching; and total years experience with the district.

27. The parties stipulated to change the tie-breaking points of the following respondents:

<u>Respondent</u>	<u>Change</u>
Abby Johnson	+1 for Masters degree
Nancy Brazil	+1 for NCLB compliance
Greg Dankwardt	+1 for NCLB
Patricia Baldwin	+1 for Masters degree
Shari Eastman	5 total points (after stipulated withdrawal of two criteria)
Steve Eastman	6 total points (after stipulated withdrawal of two criteria)
Jacob Berg	+1 for English supplemental authorization
Lauren Andrade	+1 for years of teaching
Kim Phirman	+1 for NCLB compliance
Tim Roach	6 total points (after stipulated withdrawal of two criteria)
Kim Calton	+1 for NCLB
Julie Duncan	+1 for NCLB

Skipping Issues

28. Respondents Alma Avalos, Yanira Guzman and Elias Muniz-Rodriguez hold BCLAD credentials and are currently teaching dual immersion classes, services to be skipped according to Resolution No. 2008-09.15. Nevertheless, they have been identified for layoff. They contend that they should have been skipped in accordance with the resolution.

The district contends that Avalos, Guzman and Muniz-Rodriguez are subject to layoff because their dual immersion classes are being eliminated for the 2009-2010 school year. It was established by uncontradicted evidence that, because it is eliminating its class size reduction program, the district is eliminating four dual immersion classes and will not need four dual immersion teachers. Avalos, Guzman and Muniz-Rodriguez are three of the four most junior employees holding BCLAD credentials and teaching dual immersion classes. The district contends that it has no obligation to skip these respondents unless their services will be needed to teach dual immersion in 2009-2010.

There is, as respondents suggest, some ambiguity in Resolution No. 2008-09.15. On the one hand, it appears to assure employees that certain “services” will be skipped, including BCLAD/Dual immersion. On the other hand, as a result of other reductions, fewer dual immersion courses will be offered during the 2009-2010 school year. The issue is whether Avalos, Guzman and Muniz-Rodriguez may, or must, be skipped even though their services will not be needed to teach dual immersion classes.

Under section 44955, the general principle is that certificated employees must be laid off in inverse order of their seniority. A district may depart from this principle and “skip” junior employees if “the district demonstrates a specific need for personnel to teach a specific course or course of study . . . and that the certificated employee has special training and experience necessary to teach that course or course of study . . . , which others with more

seniority do not possess.” (§ 44955, subd. (d).) The district, therefore, may skip junior teachers with a BCLAD credential who teach dual immersion courses only if the teachers will actually be employed to teach such courses. (*Ibid.*; *Alexander v. Board of Trustees* (1983) 139 Cal.App.3d 567.) It was established that the services of respondents Avalos, Guzman and Muniz-Rodriguez will not be needed to teach dual immersion classes in the 2009-2010 school year. The district did not err in electing not to skip Avalos, Guzman and Muniz-Rodriguez.

29. Christine Fitzsimmons is a special education teacher. Fitzsimmons claims that that she should have been skipped under Resolution No. 2008-09.15, which identifies “special education” as a service to be skipped. The evidence established, however, that Fitzsimmons was issued a layoff notice because she was “bumped” by a more senior employee who holds a special education credential. Under section 44955, subdivision (b), a senior employee whose position is discontinued has the right to transfer to a continuing position which he or she is certificated and competent to fill. (*Lacy v. Richmond Unified School District* (1975) 13 Cal.3d 469.) Under these circumstances, the district was not required to skip Fitzsimmons.

Other Matters

30. Any other assertions put forth by respondents at the hearing and not addressed above are found to be without merit and are rejected.

31. The parties stipulated that respondents classified as Prob 0’s will have all layoff and reemployment rights afforded under sections 44949, 44955, and 44957.

32. The parties stipulated that if dual immersion classes are restored in the 2009-2010 school year, employees holding BCLAD credentials who have been laid off will be reemployed in order of seniority and credentialing.

33. The proposed reductions and discontinuances of particular kinds of services will not reduce district services below legally-mandated levels.

34. No permanent or probationary employee with less seniority is being retained to render a service which any respondent is certificated and competent to provide.

35. The cause for not reemploying respondents relates solely to the welfare of the schools in the district and the district’s pupils.

36. Hearing in this matter was continued from April 28, 2009, to May 18, 2009, at which time the matter was submitted. The effect of the continuance is to extend the date by which copies of the proposed decision must be submitted to the board and to respondents and the date by which final layoff notices must be served. Ordinarily, copies of the proposed decision are required to be submitted to the board and to respondents by May 7 (§ 44949, subd. (c)(3)), and final layoff notices are required to be served by May 15 (§ 44955, subd.

(c)). If the hearing has been continued, these dates are extended for a period of time equal to the continuance (§ 44949, subd. (e)). May 18 is 20 days after April 28, so the proposed decision is due 20 days after May 7 (May 27, 2009) and final layoff notices are due 20 days after May 15 (June 4, 2009).

LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

1. Cause exists to require the district to prepare an updated seniority list that reflects the stipulations and findings set forth in this decision.
2. Cause exists because of the reduction of particular kinds of services pursuant to section 44955 to give notice to William Brown that his services will be reduced from 1.0 to 0.4 FTE for the 2009-2010 school year; to Julie Duncan that her services will be reduced from 1.0 to 0.5 FTE for the 2009-2010 school year; to Merilee Fisher that her services will be reduced from 1.0 to 0.3 FTE for the 2009-2010 school year; to Stephanie Maimoni that her services will be reduced from 1.0 to 0.9 FTE position for the 2009-2010 school year; and to Keri McDonald that her services will be reduced from 1.0 to 0.4 FTE for the 2009-2010 school year. This cause relates solely to the welfare of the schools and the pupils thereof within the meaning of section 44949.
3. Cause exists because of the reduction of particular kinds of services pursuant to section 44955 to give notice to the remaining respondents that their services will not be required for the 2009-2010 school year. This cause relates solely to the welfare of the schools and the pupils thereof within the meaning of section 44949.
4. The total particular kinds of services reduction shall not exceed 140.78 FTE.

ORDER

1. In accordance with Legal Conclusion 1, the district shall update its seniority list in light of the stipulations and findings set forth in this decision.
2. In accordance with Legal Conclusion 2, the district may give notice to William Brown that his services will be reduced by 0.6 FTE for the 2009-2010 school year; to Julie Duncan that her services will be reduced by 0.5 FTE for the 2009-2010 school year; to Merilee Fisher that her services will be reduced by 0.7 FTE for the 2009-2010 school year; to Stephanie Maimoni that her services will be reduced by 0.1 FTE for the 2009-2010 school year; and to Keri McDonald that her services will be reduced by 0.6 FTE for the 2009-2010 school year because of the reduction or discontinuation of particular kinds of services.
3. In accordance with Legal Conclusion 3, the district may give notice to the remaining respondents that their services will not be required for the 2009-2010 school year because of the reduction or discontinuation of particular kinds of services.

4. In accordance with Legal Conclusion 4, the total particular kinds of services reduction shall not exceed 140.78 FTE.

DATED: _____

DAVID L. BENJAMIN
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings

Appendix A

1.	Acevedo, Amber	
2.	Adkins, Donna	
3.	Allison-Jara, Charity	
4.	Anderson, Reine	Rescinded
5.	Andrade, Lauren	Rescinded
6.	Avalos, Alma	
7.	Baker, Cynthia	
8.	Baldwin, Patricia	
9.	Barnett-Dreyfuss, Bree	Rescinded
10.	Battilega, Edward Anthony	
11.	Beard, Stephanie	Rescinded
12.	Benson, Nicole	
13.	Berg, Jacob	
14.	Berglin, Julie	
15.	Blaine, Laura	
16.	Boe, Julie	Rescinded
17.	Bowman, Melissa	
18.	Brazil, Nancy	
19.	Brown, William	
20.	Burak, Amber	
21.	Burton, Heidi K.	
22.	Butler, Denise	Rescinded
23.	Buttafoco, Angela	
24.	Calton, Kim	
25.	Carpenter, Margaret	Rescinded
26.	Carrolan, Lisa A.	
27.	Carroll, Cynthia	Rescinded
28.	Carstensen, Andrea	
29.	Castro, Elizabeth	
30.	Clark, Janice	
31.	Clark, Rosie Martinez	Rescinded
32.	Cobb, Karen	
33.	Comstock, Barbara	
34.	Correia, Elizabeth	
35.	Crawbuck, Mary	
36.	Crawford, Kathryn	
37.	Daly, Caryl	Rescinded
38.	DaSilveira, Jamie	
39.	Dankwardt, Greg	
40.	Delema, Amy	
41.	Detamore, Jeremy	Rescinded
42.	Douwes, Felicias	Rescinded
43.	Eastman, Shari	

44.	Eastman, Steve	
45.	Ebbers, Jennifer	Rescinded
46.	Eisenbies, Jennifer	
47.	Ekstrom, Erik	Rescinded
48.	Elder, Eva	
49.	Erickson, Denicia	Rescinded
50.	Fenton, Patricia	Rescinded
51.	Ferreira, Pamela C.	Rescinded
52.	Feusier, Jessica	
53.	Fields, Caroline	Rescinded
54.	Finney, Elizabeth M.	
55.	Fitzsimmons, Christine	
56.	Fleming, Heather	
57.	Foley, Trisha	
58.	Forbes, Katharine	
59.	Funes, Renee	Rescinded
60.	Gapasin, Saneen	
61.	Garcia, Suzie	Rescinded
62.	Gerstenberg, Tina	Rescinded
63.	Grimes, Kathryn	Rescinded
64.	Guerin, Jennifer	
65.	Gurney, Jennifer	
66.	Guzman, Yanira	
67.	Hammes, Kristen	
68.	Haskell, Kendra	
69.	Heid, Jennifer	
70.	Hernbroth, Tracie	
71.	Hill, Joshua M.	
72.	Hillier, Kasey	Rescinded
73.	Hilton, Kelly	
74.	Hockett, Kathleen	
75.	Hoffman, Nicole	
76.	Huggins, Susan T.	Rescinded
77.	Huk, Teresa	
78.	Johnson, Abby	
79.	Johnson, Anne	
80.	Johnson, Heather	
81.	Kamali, Stephanie	Rescinded
82.	King, Kerry	Rescinded
83.	Kinney, Colleen	
84.	Kobb, Lisa	Rescinded
85.	Konitzer, Rebecca	
86.	Kumar, Joanne	
87.	Kumar, Vidya	
88.	Leavens, Amy	Rescinded

89. Leonardini, Jennifer	
90. Leyva, Diana	Rescinded
91. MacChesney, Christine	Rescinded
92. MacDonald, Cynthia	Rescinded
93. Maimoni, Stephanie	
94. Matek, Shelley	Rescinded
95. May, Donna L.	Rescinded
96. McGrath, Katie	
97. McHone, Dan	
98. McLaughlin, Rebecca	Rescinded
99. Melby, Drew	
100. Mello, Susan	
101. Mendoza, Amanda	Rescinded
102. Meunier, Joseph	
103. Miller, Brent J.	Rescinded
104. Mitchell, Kelly	
105. Montgomery, Erica	
106. Moore, Theresa	Rescinded
107. Muniz-Rodriguez, Elias	
108. Nava, Celeste	Rescinded
109. Neves, Dalila	
110. Nichols, Kathleen	Rescinded
111. Nissen, Katherine	
112. Norem, Carol	Rescinded
113. Nunemacher, Jodee	Rescinded
114. O'Connor, Caroline	
115. Ondi, Alex	
116. O'Shea, Jennifer	
117. Ospina, Luis Miguel	Rescinded
118. Ouelette, Mary L.	
119. Pagtakhan, Erin	
120. Pancoast, Chelsea	
121. Parrish, Nathan	
122. Patock, Elizabeth M.	Rescinded
123. Perez, Leah	Rescinded
124. Perkins, Michelle O.	
125. Phirman, Kimberly	Rescinded
126. Pierce, Stephanie	
127. Polon, Ronald	
128. Posson, Jessica	Rescinded
129. Ramirez, Rene Alex	Rescinded
130. Ravina, Jason	Rescinded
131. Roach, Timothy	
132. Sadler, Lennis	Rescinded
133. Scanlon-Lodato, Nicole	

134. Sherratt, Joy	
135. Schneider, Kathleen	Rescinded
136. Schoenfeld, Robert	Rescinded
137. Schussel, Melissa	Rescinded
138. Scott, Jennifer	Rescinded
139. Scotto, Nancy K.	Rescinded
140. Serrano, Angela	
141. Sharps, Erin	Rescinded
142. Shelley, Stacy	Rescinded
143. Sherratt, Joy	
144. Silva, Rachel	Rescinded
145. Smith, Tami	
146. Spiker, Kerstin	
147. Springer, Marianne	
148. Sweet, Amy	
149. Takhar, Sunita	Rescinded
150. Taw, Lisa	
151. Templeman, Lindsey	
152. Thayer, Matt	
153. Tracy, Megan	
154. Treffkorn, Christine	
155. Triebwasser, Natalie	
156. Vance, Cynthia R.	
157. Vanderzee, Eric B.	
158. Vernon, Renee	
159. Walter, Kelli	
160. Weaver, Constance	
161. Weaver, Jill	
162. Weaver, Sam	Rescinded
163. White, Cynthia	
164. Wilcox, Melanie	
165. Williams, Delise	Rescinded
166. Willis, Lisa	Rescinded
167. Wise, Mary C.	Rescinded
168. Wong, Liana	
169. Wu, Linda	
170. Yeffa, Katherine	