

BEFORE THE
BOARD OF EDUCATION
SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

OAH No. 2011020737

Respondents listed in Appendixes A, B, and C.

PROPOSED DECISION

Donald P. Cole, Administrative Law Judge, Office of Administrative Hearings, State of California, heard this matter in San Diego, California, on April 18 and 19, 2011.

Mark R. Bresee, Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo, Attorneys at Law, represented the San Diego Unified School District.

Fern M. Steiner, Tosdal, Smith, Steiner & Wax, Attorneys at Law, represented all respondents except those listed below.

Dr. Jeannie Steeg, Director, San Diego City Schools Administrators Association, represented respondents Patricia MacIntyre, Dr. Patrick Holland, and Laura Alluin.

Respondent Leslie Jimenez represented herself and was present throughout the hearing.

The matter was submitted on April 29, 2011.¹

FACTUAL FINDINGS

1. William Kowba, Superintendent, San Diego Unified School District, made and filed the accusation dated March 31, 2011.

¹ At the conclusion of the hearing, the parties' request to submit post-hearing briefs in lieu of closing argument was granted. Briefs were timely filed by the district, by the respondents represented by Ms. Steiner, and by the respondents represented by Dr. Steeg. These briefs were marked for identification and received for non-evidentiary purposes as Exhibits 16, H, and I, respectively.

2. Respondents² are certificated district employees.

3. On March 10, 2011, in accordance with Education Code sections 44949 and 44955, Sandra Huezo, Chief Human Resources Officer, San Diego Unified School District, notified the Board of Education of the San Diego Unified School District in writing of her recommendation to reduce or discontinue particular kinds of services for the upcoming school year. Huezo stated the reasons for the recommendation.

4. On March 10, 2011, the board adopted a resolution determining that it would be necessary to reduce or discontinue particular kinds of services at the end of the current school year. The board determined that the particular kinds of services that must be reduced for the 2011-2012 school year were the following full time equivalent (FTE) positions:

<u>Particular Kind of Service</u>	<u>Full-Time Equivalent</u>
<u>Administrators</u>	
Central Office Managers	12
Principals	8
Vice-principals	<u>15.5</u>
	35.5
<u>Career and Technical Education</u>	
Computer Concepts and Applications	3

² All respondents are permanent employees, since the district and the San Diego Education Association have a collectively bargained, separate process for the layoff of probationary employees that supersedes the process set forth in the Education Code. Accordingly, the term “certificated employees” in this proposed decision refers to certificated permanent employees, unless otherwise indicated.

The district initially identified 719 certificated employees for layoff. By the time the hearing began, the district had dismissed about half of the accusations, so that the number designated for layoff had been reduced to 352. During the course of the hearing, the accusations were dismissed as to 25 additional respondents. Finally, in the district’s post-hearing brief, the district identified 20 additional respondents whose accusations it proposed to dismiss, at least in the event the district’s final proposed layoff list was upheld by the administrative law judge. Ultimately, as discussed below, it is recommended that the accusations against these 20 respondents be dismissed, leaving 307 respondents whose layoffs are upheld. These 307 respondents are listed in Appendix A. The 20 respondents whose accusations will be dismissed as a result of this proposed decision are listed in Appendix B. The 25 respondents whose accusations were dismissed by the district at the hearing are listed in Appendix C.

<u>Support Services</u>	
Library Media	13
School Counseling	59
School Nurse	42
School Psychology	<u>5</u>
	119
 <u>Elementary Education</u>	
Child Development Center	8
Children Center Resource Teachers	4
State- Pre-School Teachers	22
Elementary (K-6)	<u>461</u>
	495
 <u>Middle/High/Alternative Education</u>	
Art	10
Business	2
English	83
Foreign Language: French	2.5
Foreign Language: German	0.2
Foreign Language: Mandarin	0.4
Foreign Language: Spanish	14
Home Economics	2.5
Industrial Technology	1
Mathematics	15
Music	45
Physical Education	20
Science: Biology	11
Science: General Science	3
Social Science	<u>20</u>
	229.6
 <u>Special Education</u>	
Mild/Moderate	38

The proposed reductions totaled 920.1 FTE positions.³

³ After March 10, 2011, the district continued to evaluate its personnel needs. After taking into account positively-assured attrition and other matters, the district has determined it can meet its fiscal needs for the 2011-2012 academic year by reducing services by a total of 801.1 FTE positions. The specific changes in FTE positions to be reduced are as follows: (i) counseling (54 FTE, instead of 59); (ii) nursing (21 FTE, instead of 42); (iii) elementary classroom teachers (383 FTE, instead of 461); and (iv) music teachers (30 FTE, instead of 45).

The proposed reductions were a response to a projected \$120,000,000 budget shortfall the district expects to experience at the close of the present academic year, and thus at the beginning of the 2011-2012 academic year.

5. The board further determined in the resolution that competency, as described in Education Code section 44955, subdivision (b), for the purposes of bumping, “must include status of ‘highly qualified’ for the subject or field within the meaning of the No Child Left Behind Act, and appropriate certification qualifications (including appropriate English Language authorizations).”

6. The board directed the superintendent or his designee to determine which employees’ services would not be required for the 2011-2012 school year as a result of the reduction of the foregoing particular kinds of services. The board further directed the superintendent or his designee to send appropriate notices to all certificated employees of the district who would be laid off as a result of the reduction of these particular kinds of services.

7. On or before March 15, 2011, the district timely served on respondents a written notice that the superintendent had recommended that their services would not be required for the upcoming school year. The notice set forth the reasons for the recommendation. The notice advised respondents of their right to a hearing, that each respondent had to deliver a request for a hearing in writing to the person sending the notice by the date specified in the notice, a date which in each case was more than seven days after the notice was served, and that the failure to request a hearing would constitute a waiver of the right to a hearing. The district subsequently timely served respondents with the accusation.

8. Respondents timely filed written requests for hearing and notices of defense. All pre-hearing jurisdictional requirements were met.

9. Respondents are permanent certificated employees of the district.

10. The services the board addressed in the resolution were “particular kinds of services” that could be reduced or discontinued within the meaning of Education Code section 44955. The board’s decision to reduce or discontinue these particular kinds of services was not arbitrary or capricious and constituted a proper exercise of discretion. No particular kinds of services were lowered to levels less than those levels mandated by state or federal law.

11. The reduction or discontinuation of particular kinds of services related to the welfare of the district and its pupils. The reduction or discontinuation of particular kinds of services was necessary to decrease the number of certificated employees of the district as determined by the board.

Respondents contended that the district acted arbitrarily with regard to the number of certificated employees designated for layoff, in light of a projected \$9,000,000 budget surplus expected at the end of the 2011-2012 fiscal year. Ron Little, the district’s chief

financial officer, testified that the board wishes to use the surplus to address certain financial risks, rather than to decrease the number of certificated staff to be laid off pursuant to the present proceeding. Out of a total annual district budget of over \$1.1 billion, it cannot be concluded that an anticipated reserve of \$9,000,000 constitutes an abuse of the board's discretion. In addition, it must be emphasized that the \$9,000,000 constitutes a projected surplus that is a year away. More significant is the \$120,000,000 projected shortfall for the end of the present school year, and thus the beginning of the upcoming school year. The evidence as a whole established that the board's decision was neither arbitrary nor capricious, but instead constituted a reasonable exercise of its discretion.

12. Respondent Patricia MacIntyre is currently the principal at iHigh Virtual Academy. She was hired by the district in July 2009, and is thus completing her second year as Academy principal. The Academy is an independent study high school. The curriculum is offered primarily online, though some courses (e.g., science labs) are offered in a traditional school setting. The Academy serves about 70 full-time and 500 part-time students, the latter coming from the several comprehensive programs in the district.

MacIntyre testified as to her specialized training that led to her being recruited for her position as Academy principal. MacIntyre has a Master's degree in computer education, and 20 years experience in math and computers. She served as a site tech coordinator for ten years. She was then employed at the San Diego County Office of Education as program manager for the California Technical Assistance Project. Thereafter, she served as director of Techsets, one of four statewide education technology services, which is housed at the County Office of Education. As a result of this experience, the district actively recruited MacIntyre to launch the iHigh Virtual Academy as a pilot program.

MacIntyre has a preliminary administrative services credential, a certificate of completion of staff development, a clear multiple subject credential, a life single subject credential in math, and a supplementary authorization in computer concepts and applications. She is NCLB certified in many fields.

MacIntyre testified that it takes specialized knowledge to serve as principal in a program such as iHigh. It is a new program and there are no models to which one may refer for guidance; instead, she must rely on her specialized training and skills. The program she oversees is not an "IT" program, but instead is one that integrates educational technology into the classroom. MacIntyre has found her position to be challenging.

MacIntyre testified that the only credential required for her position is an administrative services credential.

MacIntyre in essence asserted that she should have been protected from layoff (i.e., skipped) because of her specialized training and skills. Without question, MacIntyre has a great deal of experience, training, and skill, and the service she performs for the district is important. However, a decision not to skip a particular employee or group of employees is within the district's discretion. Stated differently, a district "may" (but is not required to) deviate from terminating employees in order of seniority. (Educ. Code, § 44955, subd.

(d)(1.) Here, the district decided not to seek authorization to skip any employees or groups of employees. The district's decision in this regard was permissible and constituted a proper exercise of its discretion.

13. Respondent Dr. Patrick Holland, a district administrator, was hired by the district based on his prior experience as an administrator and superintendent. He testified he believes that if he is laid off, he could be at a competitive disadvantage with regard to rehire, as compared to a younger teacher who has many years of service ahead of him or her. However, these matters do not provide a legal basis for the district to skip him or otherwise not to lay him off.

14. The board considered all positively assured attrition that existed as of the date the preliminary layoff notices were served on respondents, in determining the actual number of necessary layoff notices to be delivered to its employees.

15. No certificated employee junior to any respondent was retained to perform any services which any respondent was certificated and competent to render.

LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

1. Jurisdiction in this matter exists under Education Code sections 44949 and 44955. All notices and jurisdictional requirements contained in those sections were satisfied.

2. A district may reduce services within the meaning of section 44955, subdivision (b), "either by determining that a certain type of service to students shall not, thereafter, be performed at all by anyone, or it may 'reduce services' by determining that proffered services shall be reduced in extent because fewer employees are made available to deal with the pupils involved." (*Rutherford v. Board of Trustees* (1976) 64 Cal.App.3d 167, 178-179.)

3. Pursuant to section 44995, a senior teacher whose position is discontinued has the right to transfer to a continuing position which he or she is certificated and competent to fill. In doing so, the senior employee may displace or "bump" a junior employee who is filling that position. (*Lacy v. Richmond Unified School District* (1975) 13 Cal.3d 469.) In fact, the district has an obligation under section 44955 to determine whether any permanent employee whose employment is to be terminated in an economic layoff possesses the seniority and qualifications which would entitle him/her to be assigned to another position. (*Bledsoe v. Biggs Unified School Dist., supra.* at 136-137.)

4. The decision to reduce or discontinue a particular kind of service is not tied in with any statistical computation. It is within the governing authority's discretion to determine the amount by which a particular kind of service will be reduced or discontinued as long as the district does not reduce a service below the level required by law. (*San Jose Teachers Assn. v. Allen* (1983) 144 Cal.App.3d 627, 635-636.) A school district has wide discretion in setting its budget and a layoff decision will be upheld unless it was fraudulent or

so palpably unreasonable and arbitrary as to indicate an abuse of discretion as a matter of law. (*California Sch. Employees Assn. v. Pasadena Unified Sch. Dist.* (1977) 71 Cal.App.3d 318, 322.)

School districts have broad discretion in defining positions within the district and establishing requirements for employment. This discretion encompasses determining the training and experience necessary for particular positions. Similarly, school districts have the discretion to determine particular kinds of services that will be eliminated, even though a service continues to be performed or provided in a different manner by the district. (*Hildebrandt v. St. Helena Unified School Dist.* (2009) 172 Cal.App.4th 334, 343 Districts also retain discretion to determine standards of competency for purposes of teacher layoffs, and those standards will be upheld as long as they are reasonable. (*Duax v. Kern Community College District* (1987) 196 Cal.App.3d 555, 565.)⁴

5. Junior teachers may be given retention priority over senior teachers if the junior teachers possess superior skills or capabilities which their more senior counterparts lack. (*Santa Clara Federation of Teachers, Local 2393 v. Governing Board of Santa Clara Unified School District* (1981) 116 Cal.App.3d 831, 842-843; *Bledsoe v. Biggs Unified School Dist.* (2008) 170 Cal.App.4th 127, 134-135.)

6. The district has terminated certain administrative positions, and proposes to reassign certain of its administrators to classroom teaching positions or to other positions that do not require an administrative credential. The parties disagree as to how the seniority of these administrators is to be determined. More specifically, the parties differ as to the proper interpretation of Education Code section 44956.5. That section provides:

For a certificated employee initially employed in an administrative position on or after July 1, 1983, who transfers to a teaching position, the period of employment in the administrative position shall not be included in determining seniority for purposes of Sections 44955 and 44956, except for school site administrators who shall earn up to a maximum of three years seniority while serving as site administrators.

The district proposes to apply this provision so that: (i) individuals who were hired by the district after July 1, 1983, in site administrative positions earn a maximum of three years seniority while serving in that capacity; but (ii) individuals hired by the district after July 1, 1983, in teaching positions, but who later were promoted to administrative positions, retain their original seniority date, i.e., the three-year limit on accruing seniority in administrative positions does not apply.

⁴ *Duax* involved the layoff of community college teachers pursuant to Education Code section 97743, but is applicable here by analogy.

Respondents contend to the contrary that section 44956.5 is best interpreted as providing that individuals hired by the district after July 1, 1983, in teaching (or other non-administrative) positions, and who later are promoted to administrative positions, are limited to accruing three years of seniority for the period they served in the latter capacity.

Section 44956.5 is ambiguous. The ambiguity arises from the word “employed,” the past participle of the verb “to employ.” That verb, in the job context, means “to use or engage the services of” or “to provide with a job that pays wages or a salary.”⁵ When used in the sense of “engage the services of,” or “to provide with a job,” the term implies the act of hiring someone, i.e., it denotes a specific point in time. If that is the correct meaning of “employed” in section 44956.5, then the district’s position is correct. When used in the sense of “use the services of,” the term implies not the specific moment in time when the employee is hired, but instead the individual’s continuous, on-going employment status. If that is the correct meaning of “employed” in section 44956.5, then respondents’ position is correct.

No published judicial decisions have interpreted section 44956.5. No legislative history has been cited by the parties. And a precise purpose of the provision (i.e., sufficiently precise to address the issue presented here) cannot be discerned from the statutory language. One can reasonably infer from the fact that the section was enacted effective July 28, 1983, that the July 1, 1983, date was intended as some sort of grandfather clause meant to protect employees who met the required condition *before* that date. That observation does not, however, seem sufficient to permit with confidence an inference as to the meaning of the term “employed” in the present context.

An attempt to discern which interpretation of section 44956.5 better accords with public policy is likewise of no avail. On the one hand, it may be argued that the district’s interpretation avoids discouraging teachers from accepting administrative positions that could jeopardize years of seniority accrued while serving in that capacity. On the other hand, it may be argued that individuals with the most recent classroom experience (i.e., current teachers) are better equipped to teach students than those individuals who lack such recent classroom experience (i.e., current administrators), and that therefore respondents’ interpretation of section 44956.5, which favors the retention of teachers, is best calculated to meet the needs of students.

It is concluded that the term “employed” in section 44956.5 means to “engage the services of.” This conclusion is reached based on two considerations. First, though the provision is ambiguous, the interpretation accepted here seems a somewhat more natural and thus the more likely interpretation, in part because of the

⁵ These particular definitions are found at Merriam-Webster.com.

sense created by the use of the adverb “initially” to modify “employed.”⁶ Second, the interpretation accepted here seems more in accord with the fundamental grounding of the layoff statute in employee seniority. Stated otherwise, provisions of the statute that deviate from seniority are the exception, and ambiguities should thus not be construed so as to further such deviation. The district’s interpretation preserves the seniority of certificated staff; respondents’ interpretation partially eliminates it.

7. A preponderance of the evidence sustained the charges set forth in the accusation, except as to the 20 respondents listed in Appendix B. Cause exists under Education Code sections 44949 and 44955 for the district to reduce or discontinue particular kinds of services. The cause for the reduction or discontinuation of particular kinds of services related solely to the welfare of the schools and the pupils thereof. Cause exists to reduce the number of certificated employees of the district due to the reduction and discontinuation of particular kinds of services. The district identified the certificated employees providing the particular kinds of services that the Board be directed be reduced or discontinued. It is recommended that the board give the respondents listed in Appendix A notice before May 15, 2011, that their services are no longer required by the district.⁷

ADVISORY DETERMINATION

The following advisory determination is made:

1. The accusations served on the respondents listed in Appendix A are sustained. Notice may be given to such respondents before May 15, 2011, that their services will not be required because of the reduction or discontinuation of particular services as indicated.
2. The accusations served on the respondents listed in Appendix B are dismissed. Notice may not be given to such respondents that their services will not be required because of the reduction or discontinuation of particular services.

DATED: May 4, 2011

DONALD P. COLE
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings

⁶ By way of contrast, when one asks the question, “How long have you been employed?” the sense is clearly the on-going employment relationship, not the moment when that relationship was created. Lexical context helps to determine the meaning of words.

⁷ Since the accusations served on the respondents listed in Appendix C were dismissed at the hearing, no further finding, conclusion, or order is necessary in this proposed decision as to those respondents.

APPENDIX A

Abbott, Marcia
Aguirre, Olga
Allen, Alexandra
Allen, Sheryl Christina
Alluin, Laura M
Almader, Graciela
Ancora, Carmencita Maria
Anderson, Mark William
Archuleta, Erika A
Ashlock, Emily Marcella
Ashworth, Rodger N
Aviles, Shannon
Baca, Felicia W
Bader, Jennifer L
Bain, Joy Alicia
Baker, Anna K
Banuelos, Jessica Elizabeth
Barnard, Paula Marie
Barnett, Megan A
Barney, Kristin Jewell
Barragan, Frances R.
Bearden, Andrew Robert
Behr, Dana Elizabeth
Bella, Rosemarie Arguilla
Bennett, Jessica Lynn
Bermudez-Iglesias, Karina L
Bethany, Ebony Zakiyah
Bierkan, Janet Maureen
Block, Janell Sohmer
Boelzle, Amy Vince
Bolanos, Audrey Ang
Bondoc, Cherrylyn P
Borja, Akira R
Boughner, Robert G
Bowen, Ann E
Brauch, Cynthia Marie
Brodzki, Jessica Kay
Brown, Cameron Thomas
Buell, Allison Claire Vinci
Burks, Tony
Burningham, Lindsay S
Caducio, Monica
Carian, Melissa L
Carrasco, Griselda
Carrillo, Jesse
Carroll, Carinne C
Carter, William T
Catolico, Monalisa L
Chavira, Sylvia
Childress, Keva
Churchwell, Marissa Jarzyna
Coady, Natasha Margaret
Colby, Jonathan D
Coleman, Jennifer M
Concannon, Alycia
Cooke, Candice A.
Cordero, Tania
Cox, Allison
Cox, Patricia Joette
Curtis, Margaret Anne
Dale, Arlet S
Dancy, Winnona D
Davenport, Jamie N
Davies, Heather L
Delatorre, Nada
Demara, Liliana O
Diaz, Jessica Esmeralda
Diaz, Veronica
Dominguez, Griselda H
Donahue, Stacie S
Doolittle, Holly P.
Dove, Kristin Ann
Eden, Laura J.
Eide, Lisa Renee
Elliott, Cheree Danielle
Ely, Cora Liane
English, Kristenza Alaska
Feldman, Shoshana Ann
Fernandez, Carolina
Ferrante, Mackenzie L
Flinn, Nancy
Flores, Lidia
Flores, Marina Avelar
Fogleman, Amy Suzanne
Fox, Amanda Christine
Francke, Colleen
Garcia, Kathleen Loretta
Garcia, Maria Angela
Gavigan, Angela
Gaze, Ashley Abercrombie
Gergurich, Brooke Leilani
Givens, Theresa Marie
Goldberg, Marcos
Gomez, Elda
Gonzalez Castaneda, Linnette D
Gonzalez, Mary-Ann Caswell
Gonzalez, Veronica P
Granada-Mendez, Lorena
Granfield, Kelly R
Gray, Ana L
Greenhalgh, Patricia Kendel
Guerin, Erica Healy
Haling, Breanna Marie
Hammond, Susan
Hancock, Robyn S
Hansen, Marjorie
Harriman-Gomez, Audra Nicole
Harris, Michelle C
Hernandez, Jose A
Hernandez, Michael
Herrera, Erica
Herrera, Michelle Arlene
Herrmann, Alicia Catherine
Hess, Lisa Nguyen
Hoff, Cathleen Gallagher
Holland, Patrick
Howerton, Tiffany A
Icenhower, Amanda M
Icenhower, Michelle Elizabeth
Izzard, Amber Rhiannon
Jenkins, Tara
Jiampa, Carrie Maureen
Jimenez, Leslie Diana
Jimenez, Norma A
Jimenez, Rebecca A
Johnson, Jeralyn D
Johnson, Leedward
Jones, Brittany D
Kaase, Nancy A
Kagen, Catherine Ann
Kammerzell, Maria C
Keefe, Colleen E
Khiev, Sarin
Kidder, Anne Marie
Kilian, Kristen L
King, Jacqueline Marie
Klages, Stacie Lynette
Klinger, Lindsay A
Knox, Ashley Marie
Kratt, Christine Marie
Krylow Jr, John Paul
La Salle, Analicia
Lach, Robert
Laidlow, Sandra
Landsberg, Angela Noel
Lenham, Jami M
Leonard, Timothy P
Lerma, Santiago Ocampo
Lewis, Erin
Lewis, Gwenn
Lewis, Kenneth Michael
Liss, John W
Llamas, Richard
Lopez-Hudson, Laura
Lorden, Kathy
Luchans, Samantha L
Luxon, James L
Lynn, Erica Y
MacIntyre, Patricia Colombo
MacKnight, Charliza Javier
Maher, Dora
Mandock, Sheila Marie
Mann, Judy
Marticorena, Wendy Jee
Martinez, Mariana

Mathy, Sarah C
 McKee, Natalie
 McRae, Rebecca L
 Meier, Jessica A
 Mejorado, Patricia Hurtado
 Mellos, Leslie
 Mendoza, Laura Alvarez
 Merchant, Emily N
 Miller, Kelly Elizabeth
 Mochkatel, Lindsay A
 Moeller, Amy D
 Molinaro, Anthony P
 Montano, Norma A
 Moore, Melissa R
 Moravec, Jason C
 Mulvaney, Matthew Stephen
 Munoz, Yvonne
 Munro, Stanley Jeffery
 Munson, Kelly Mary
 Murad, Abigail D
 Murray, Laurisa Karleen
 Nava, Betty Joann
 Navarro, Gabriela R
 Negrete, Isabel Rosario
 Neil, Willie Lateef
 Nelson, Matthew A
 Nguyen, Minh Tam Thi
 Nielsen, Kelly Marie
 Norausky, Ashley Paiko
 Nordlow, Erin Quinn
 Nouvong, Trina Oribelle
 O'Brien, Tracy Miriam
 O'Donovan, Jacqueline Marie
 Oestreich, Jennifer M
 O'Hara, Jodi J
 Okin, Jacqueline J
 Olegario, Vang Xoua
 Olson, Anne M
 Oluwa, Skye C
 Orman, Tarynn
 Ortega, Ruben
 Pampo, Michelle Francisco
 Panerio, Camille Montalbano
 Parkinson, Dione L
 Pascoe, Susan G
 Patolai, Hagit
 Perkins, Amy Marie
 Petrov, Leticia
 Pettinelli, Gina A
 Polen, Heather Joanne
 Pulverenti, Brad M
 Quartuccio, Kristina Elaine
 Quezada, German
 Randall, Lauren A
 Reichel, Carla Elizabeth
 Reilly, Alita
 Renner, Michael E
 Richardson-Davidson, Mary
 Rick, Nicole Marie
 Roashan, Mariam
 Robinson, Alys Jasmine
 Robinson, Amanda Keate
 Rodriguez, Zuleika
 Romero, Brianna M
 Romero, Neysa Y
 Rose, Erica L
 Rosinski, Teri Lynn
 Ross, John Mark
 Rotkosky, Nicole
 Roy, Melissa D
 Russell, Jeffrey Lee
 Ryan, Jillian Whitney Bosman
 Rye, Amie E
 Saatkamp, Jessica Lenee
 Sanchez, Angelica
 Sanchez, Claudia E
 Schamp, Dennis W
 Shay, Karen D
 Shear, Laura Lynn
 Shepard, Deborah Elaine
 Shire, Shannon Grable
 Shoucair, Michelle M
 Shults, Kimberlee J
 Silva, Susan
 Sinclair, Rebecca Ann
 Small, Janell H
 Smith, Elizabeth M
 Soto, Rosa M
 Spiegel, Robyn Starr
 Stabile, Michelle L
 Stacy, Melanie Kristen
 Standley, Mayra Alejandra
 Staninger, Kimberly
 Steffan, Janna M
 Steiner, Stephanie H
 Stevens, Yumiko E
 Stoever, Matthew
 Strahan, Danielle E
 Sullivan, Sarah O
 Summers, Teresa E
 Thomas, Colette M
 Thomas, Jessica A
 Tidwell, Alma Rosa
 Tiong, Imelda
 Topliff, Kelli
 Torres, Esperanza
 Torres, Maria
 Tran, Quynh Mai
 Treamer, Celia Marie
 Trench, Kimberly Anne
 Trettevik, Kristen L
 Trocha, Shannon Korby
 Umada, Barbara
 Osborne, Scott D
 Valdos, Erika
 Valenzuela, Bertha C
 Valot, Brooke Ashley
 Van Beck, Debra Ann
 Vattuone, Vita Maria
 Veysey, Cherilyn Avedian
 Virtue, Francisca M
 Voet, Allison Elizabeth
 Wagner, Doreen Lascola
 Wagner, Katherine Lynn
 Welborn, Nicole E
 Welch, Jessica Anne
 Wiesner, Andrea M
 Williams, Laura J
 Wingler, Laura Rachel
 Wolfe, Penelope
 Wright, Erika Michelle
 Wright, Fiona A
 Wright, Marie N
 Yepiz, Michelle L
 Yin, Nina
 Young, Jaime H.
 Young, Lisa
 Zaragoza, Cynthia E
 Zdunich, Danielle L
 Zeichner, Lori
 Zizzo, Josephine G
 Zuill, Paula R

APPENDIX B

Aguilar, Marisela

Andrews, Sophie

Carrillo, Georgette Cristina

Folkman, Jason A

Gomez, Guillermo Antonio

Gomez, Roberto

Goss, Candice Paulette

Hallaran, Nicole D

Hopkins, Sara Kathleen

Kelly, Shannon M

Lugo, Kymberly

Mead, Kathryn M

Melling, Brooke Ann

Moos, Lynn Anne

Perez, Paula

Romo, Kathia M

Shea, Kerry F

Silva, Shelby

Webb, Ryan S

Wilson, Allison Rachel

APPENDIX C

Allen, Janette M
Anstead, Lisa Erin
Baker, Steve S
Best, Julie D
Bradshaw, Kelsey Joan
Dier, Christopher
Dohoney, Jennie Lee Labor
Ericson, Amy Elizabeth
Faddis, Desiree
Ford, Deborah B
Guterman, Sara Beth
Hassan, Joann
Hornbrook, Patrick G
Lawrence, Katee M
Lee, Stacy Hong
Lowe, Sally Mao
Nielsen, Eric B
Nunez, Carmen
Partridge, Tracey J
Profit, Toya Milawnn
Sanchez, Michelle Estella
Schliem, Alison Louise
Sparta, Christopher E
Taguiam, Ann Marie
Zafuto, Andrew C