

BEFORE THE
GOVERNING BOARD OF THE
SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

In the Matter of:

The Non-Reemployment of 506 Full-Time
Equivalent Certificated Employees,

Respondents.

OAH No. 2009020566

PROPOSED DECISION

This matter was heard by Administrative Law Judge David L. Benjamin, State of California, Office of Administrative Hearings.

Maribel S. Medina and Deborah A. Cooksey, Attorneys at Law, represented the San Francisco Unified School District (district).

Stewart Weinberg, Attorney at Law, Weinberg, Roger & Rosenfeld, represented the respondents identified as Core Substitutes, Site Support Substitutes, Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps, and Vocational Education on Appendices A, B, C and D, respectively; the appendices are attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference. All of these respondents are members of the United Educators of San Francisco (UESF).

Robert Links, Attorney at Law, Slote and Links, represented two respondents holding Administrative positions who were not identified by name, both of whom are members of the United Administrators of San Francisco (UASF).

Prior to the hearing that was set for April 13, 2009, the parties agreed to submit the matter on stipulated facts without a hearing. The parties' stipulations, and the exhibits attached thereto, were marked collectively as Exhibit I and admitted into evidence.¹ The record remained open to permit the parties to file simultaneous closing briefs, which were timely filed. UESF's brief was marked for identification as Exhibit II and the district's brief was marked for identification as Exhibit III.² With its brief, the district offered the Declaration of Angela Sagastume; her declaration and the exhibits attached thereto were

¹ All references to exhibits are to hearing exhibits. No hearing exhibits are attached to this decision.

² UASF did not file a brief and, in a telephone conference with all parties on April 24, 2009, Mr. Links stated that UASF has no interest in the disputed issues between the district and UESF.

marked collectively as Exhibit IV. In a telephone conference on April 24, 2009, Mr. Weinberg stated that UESF had no objection to the introduction of Exhibit IV as direct evidence, with the exception of paragraph 12 of the Sagastume declaration. The district agreed to strike paragraph 12 and, with that change, Exhibit IV was admitted into evidence. The parties requested an opportunity to file another round of briefs and their request was granted. UESF's brief was timely filed on April 24, 2009, and marked for identification as Exhibit V. The district's brief was timely filed on April 27, 2009, and marked for identification as Exhibit VI. With its brief, the district offered the Declaration of Reeta Madhavan, which was marked for identification as Exhibit VII. In a letter dated May 1, 2009 (Exhibit VIII), Mr. Weinberg stated that he had no objection to the admission of Exhibit VII, which was then admitted into evidence. The record closed and the matter was deemed submitted on May 1, 2009.

FACTUAL FINDINGS

Procedural background

1. On February 24, 2009, the governing board of the San Francisco Unified School District adopted Resolution 92-24S02, in which it resolved to reduce or discontinue the following particular kinds of services for the 2009-2010 school year, and directed the superintendent, or his designee, to give notice to certificated employees that their services would be terminated at the end of the 2008-2009 school year:

Administrative Services:	144 FTE ³
Instructional Services:	<u>362 FTE</u>
Total Full-Time Equivalent Reduction:	506 FTE

2. On March 9, 2009, the superintendent gave written notice to the governing board of his recommendation that notice be given to certificated employees in 506 FTE positions that their services would not be required for the 2009-2010 school year.

3. On March 9, 2009, respondents (and others) were timely served in the manner prescribed by law with written notice that it had been recommended that notice be given to them that their services would not be required for the 2009-2010 school year.

4. The district issued accusations against respondents and approximately 436 other certificated employees.

5. Each respondent herein timely requested a hearing to determine if there was cause for not reemploying him or her for the 2009-2010 school year. (Although the parties' stipulations do not expressly address the point, it is assumed that all respondents also filed a timely notice of defense, as there is no objection to jurisdiction.) All prehearing jurisdictional requirements have been met.

³ Full-time equivalent.

6. On April 2, 2009, the governing board rescinded and modified its original intent and now seeks to reduce or eliminate only the following particular kinds of services in the indicated full-time equivalents:

- a. Core Substitutes: full-time equivalent elimination or reduction – 15.0.
- b. Site Support Substitutes: full-time equivalent reduction – 39.00 (total number of positions 40, total number of certificated employees filling the 40 positions, 40)
- c. Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps: full-time equivalent positions – 12.
- d. Vocational Education positions:
 - 1. John O’Connell High School, Industrial – 0.20
 - 2. Abraham Lincoln High School, Computer Operations Education – 1.00
 - 3. George Washington High School, Computer Systems (Concepts Applications) – 1.00 FTETotal FTE – 2.20 (total number of positions – 3, total number of employees – 3)
- e. Administrative positions: full-time equivalent elimination or reduction - 2

The total number of positions sought to be reduced is 70.2 full-time equivalents.

Classification of Core Substitutes and Site Support Substitutes

7. The district contends that Core Substitutes and Site Support Substitutes are not permanent or probationary employees, and therefore are not entitled to the protections of Education Code sections 44949 and 44955.⁴ The district sent these employees layoff notices and served them with the accusation as a precautionary measure. UESF contends that the Core Substitutes and Site Support Substitutes are at least probationary employees, if not

⁴ All further statutory citations are to the Education Code.

permanent employees.⁵ Litigation is pending between the district and UESF on this issue, but no final decision has been issued.

Facts

8. The district created its Core Substitutes program about 10 years ago and its Site Support Substitutes program about five years ago. The programs were the subject of negotiations between the district and UESF and are identified in the contracts that the parties have entered into over the years. The general purpose of both programs is to support the district's "STAR" ("Students and Teachers Achieving Results") schools. A majority of the students at STAR schools underperform on standardized tests and those schools are located in the most economically disadvantaged parts of the city. STAR schools have high rates of teacher turnover and absenteeism and experience extreme difficulty securing substitutes from the district's day-to-day pool. The purpose of creating Core Substitutes and Site Support Substitutes was to allow STAR schools immediate access to substitute teachers for the district's most underserved students.

All of the Core Substitutes are full-time, fully-credentialed teachers. The district's contract with UESF describes them as "full-time non-tenure track temporary teachers." They are salaried employees who receive the same fringe benefits as regularly assigned teachers. Each Core Substitute is employed for the entire school year under a form contract which states that he or she is being hired as a temporary certificated employee. At the end of each school year, the contracts expire and the Core Substitutes are released by the district. Most of the district's 15 Core Substitutes have been working for the district for many years under this arrangement.

During the school year, Core Substitutes are assigned to STAR schools or other low performing sites, but they may be assigned to any school. Angie Sagastume, the district's Director of Certificated Staffing, states in her declaration that Core Substitutes "provide additional support and flexibility to allow the District to staff for probationary and permanent teachers who are absent or on leave." Sagastume also writes that, since the 2005-2006 school year and perhaps earlier, "the number of Core Substitutes employed by the District has not exceeded the number of permanent or probationary teachers absent or on leave."

The evidence does not establish that the number of Core Substitutes is limited to the district's need to replace teachers who have been granted leave for a semester or year, or who are experiencing long-term illness. Core Substitutes may substitute for employees who are on leave, but they also function as day-to-day substitutes. When respondent Stephen Dolgin was first employed as a Core Substitute in 2001, the district wrote to him and stated:

⁵ UESF also argues that the district cannot "unilaterally" eliminate the positions of Core Substitutes and Site Support Substitutes because both programs are included in UESF's contract with the district. Whether the district violated its contract with UESF, however, is not within the jurisdiction of this proceeding.

You will be expected to cover the difficult schools and assignments. We recommend that you do not arrange assignments with absent teachers or secretaries. You will receive your assignments on a daily basis from the substitute office instead of the system. All lengthy assignments must be pre-approved by the Substitute office staff.

9. The contract between the district and UESF describes Site Support Substitutes as “substitutes who are assigned to a site daily for the entire year to provide support for on-site professional development as well as continuity for regular substitute coverage.” Unlike Core Substitutes, Site Support Substitutes are categorically funded by Targeted Instructional Improvement Grant funds (TIIG). TIIG funding expires at the end of each school year.

Legal principles

10. Under the Education Code, certificated employees may be classified in one of four ways: permanent, probationary, substitute or temporary. (*Kavanaugh v. West Sonoma County Union High School Dist.* (2003) 29 Cal.4th 911, 916.) A teacher’s classification governs the level of job protection that the teacher enjoys and controls the procedural protections the teacher is entitled to before he or she is dismissed. (*Id.* at p. 917.) The code grants various protections to permanent and probationary employees. Substitute and temporary employees, on the other hand, “fill the short range needs of a school district and generally may be summarily dismissed . . .” (*Id.* at pp. 917-918.) Because teachers in the substitute and temporary classifications are not entitled to the same due process protections that permanent and probationary teachers receive, those classifications are “narrowly defined by the Legislature and should be strictly interpreted.” (*Balen v. Peralta Junior College Dist.* (1974) 11 Cal.3d 821, 826.) The classifications are intended to limit, rather than enlarge, a district’s power to classify employees as temporary. (*Bakersfield Elementary Teachers Assn. v. Bakersfield City School Dist.* (2006) 145 Cal.App.4th 1260, 1280.) Probationary status is the default classification. (*Ibid.*) A teacher who has not been classified as a permanent, substitute or temporary employee is a probationary employee. (*Ibid.*; § 44915.)

11. The district has classified Core Substitutes and Site Support Substitutes as “substitute/temporary teachers.”

Core Substitutes

12. The district asserts that Core Substitutes are either temporary employees under section 44920 or substitute employees under section 44917.⁶

⁶ The district also asserts that, because the contract with UESF has stated for many years that Core Substitutes are temporary non-tenure track employees, the Core Substitutes have either waived their right to challenge their classification, are estopped from doing so, or are precluded from doing so by laches. None of these defenses is persuasive. The Core Substitutes did challenge their classification during a layoff initiated by the district prior to the 2008-2009 school year and they are currently

13. Section 44920 states:

[T]he governing board of a school district may employ as a teacher, for a complete school year, but not less than one semester during a school year . . . any person holding appropriate certification documents, and may classify such person as a temporary employee. The employment of such persons shall be based upon the need for additional certificated employees during a particular semester or year because a certificated employee has been granted leave for a semester or year, or is experiencing long-term illness, and shall be limited, in number of persons so employed, to that need, as determined by the governing board.

A temporary employee under section 44920 does not need to replace a particular teacher. In *Santa Barbara Federation of Teachers v. Santa Barbara High Sch. Dist.* (1977) 76 Cal.App.3d 223, the court held that section 44920 only requires that the number of temporary teachers cannot exceed the number of probationary and permanent employees on leave at any one time.

Based upon the declaration of Sagastume, its Director of Certificated Staffing, the district argues that Core Substitutes fall within section 44920 because the “total number of Core Subs does not exceed the number of permanent or probationary teachers on leave.” Sagastume’s declaration, however, is insufficient to support the district’s argument. If the district is asserting that the number of Core Substitutes does not exceed the number of probationary and permanent employees on leave from STAR schools, Sagastume’s declaration does not say that. Sagastume states only that the “number of Core Subs employed by the District [does not exceed] the number of permanent or probationary teachers absent or on leave.” If, on the other hand, the district is asserting that the number of Core Substitutes does not exceed the number of teachers on leave in the entire district, its assertion has no probative value: the evidence does not establish the number of teachers on leave throughout the district, nor does it establish the total number of temporary employees hired under section 44920 to replace them, which must surely exceed the 15 Core Substitutes.

But the more fundamental flaw in the district’s position is that there is no evidence that the employment of Core Substitutes is “based upon the district’s need for additional certificated employees during a particular semester or year because a certificated employee has been granted leave for a semester or year, or is experiencing long-term illness,” and there

challenging their classification in court. In addition, it is well-settled that the rights of teachers under the Education Code are an expression of public policy and cannot be bargained away. (*Bakersfield Elementary Teachers Assn. v. Bakersfield City School Dist.*, *supra*, 145 Cal.App.4th at 1272-1276.) Any contractual provision which purports to waive those rights is null and void. (*Ibid*; § 44924.)

is no evidence that the employment of Core Substitutes is limited to that need. On the contrary: Core Substitutes are employed on a full-time basis for the entire school year to perform any substitute duties that may be necessary, whether long-term, day-to-day, or otherwise. As noted above in Finding 10, the classification of “temporary” certificated employee under the Education Code must be strictly interpreted. The evidence fails to establish that Core Substitutes are temporary employees under section 44920.

14. The district contends that if Core Substitutes are not temporary employees, then they are substitutes under section 44917, which reads in relevant part as follows:

Except as provided in Sections 44888⁷ and 44920, governing boards of school districts shall classify as substitute employees those persons employed in positions requiring certification qualifications, to fill positions of regularly employed persons absent from service.

After September 1 of any school year, the governing board of any school district may employ, for the remainder of the school year, in substitute status any otherwise qualified person who consents to be so employed in a position for which no regular teacher is available.

Core Substitutes fill positions of regularly employed persons absent from service, and therefore meet that element of section 44917. But section 44917 also limits the ability of districts to hire substitutes for the complete school year. It provides that “[a]fter September 1” the board may employ a substitute “for the remainder of the school year . . . in a position for which no regular teacher is available.” That is not the way Core Substitutes are employed. Core Substitutes are routinely employed for the entire school year. The contract for respondent Dolgin for the 2008-2009 school year, for example, was executed on August 19, 2008 and effective August 20, 2008. There is no evidence that, when Core Substitutes are hired for the year, they are employed “in a position for which no regular teacher is available.” Again, Core Substitutes are a pool of full-time teachers hired for a complete school year to support the district’s substitute needs as those needs arise. Core Substitutes are not substitute employees within the meaning of section 44917.

15. The district’s own classification of Core Substitutes – “substitute/temporary teachers” – is an apt description. Core Substitutes possess some of the characteristics of substitute employees and some of the characteristics of temporary employees. The district, however, must classify its certificated employees according to one of the four classifications set forth in the Education Code. Core Substitutes are not substitute employees under section 44917 and they are not temporary employees under section 44920. Since they fall into neither classification, they must be treated as probationary employees.

⁷ Section 44888 has been repealed.

16. Appendix A states the first date of paid service for each Core Substitute. For the purpose of this proceeding, the district must treat Core Substitutes as probationary employees with the seniority dates set forth in Appendix A.

17. UESF argues that some of the Core Substitutes should be classified as permanent employees. The apparent basis for this argument is section 44929.21, which states in relevant part that “[e]very employee of a school district . . . who, after having been employed by the district for two complete consecutive school years in a position . . . requiring certification qualifications shall, at the commencement of the succeeding school year be classified as . . . a permanent employee” This decision does not address or decide the question of whether some or all of the Core Substitutes should be permanent employees. Since they are probationary employees with identified seniority dates, it is not necessary to decide that question to resolve the issues presented under sections 44949 and 44955. (See *Schnee v. Alameda Unified School Dist.* (2004) 125 Cal.App.4th 555, 562.)

Site Support Substitutes

18. Undisputed evidence establishes that Site Support Substitutes are categorically funded within the meaning of section 44909. Employees in categorically funded positions are treated as temporary employees: their service does not count toward permanent status, and their employment rights are controlled by contract. (*Zalac v. Governing Bd. of Ferndale Unified School Dist.* (2002) 98 Cal.App.4th 838.)

UESF asserts, correctly, that even if Site Support Substitutes are categorically funded, they can only be laid off if the program that supports them has expired. The evidence establishes, however, that the district’s TIIG funding expires at the end of each school year.

Site Support Substitutes are temporary employees under section 44909.

Respondent Stephen Dolgin

19. Respondent Dolgin is a Core Substitute. He asserts that, because of his particular employment history with the district, he should be classified as a permanent employee and given a seniority date of August 23, 1999. As noted in Finding 17, it is not necessary to decide whether any Core Substitute is a permanent employee to resolve the issues presented by this layoff. Findings 15 and 16 have the effect of granting Dolgin the seniority date he seeks, and thus his claim to permanent status is moot for the purpose of this proceeding.

Other matters

20. All contentions made by respondents not specifically addressed above are found to be without merit and are rejected.

21. As to those respondents holding Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps, Vocational Education, and Administrative positions, no permanent or probationary employee with less seniority is being retained to render a service which those respondents are certificated and competent to provide.

22. The cause for the reduction in particular kinds of services relates to the welfare of the schools and their pupils.

LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

1. The district must treat Core Substitutes as probationary employees and assign them their seniority dates as set forth in Appendix A. (Findings 15 & 16.) The district must reconsider the status of each Core Substitute in the layoff on the basis of his or her seniority date. Pursuant to section 44955, subdivision (b), the district may not lay off a Core Substitute if it is retaining for the 2009-2010 school year an employee with less seniority than the Core Substitute to render a service which the Core Substitute is credentialed and competent to provide. If the district determines as to any Core Substitute that no such junior employee is being retained, cause exists to give that Core Substitute notice that, because of the reduction of particular kinds of services pursuant to section 44955, his or her 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.

2. Cause exists because of the reduction of particular kinds of services pursuant to section 44955 to give notice to respondents holding Site Support Substitute, Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps, Vocational Education, and Administrative positions 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.

ORDER

1. The district shall treat respondent Core Substitutes as probationary employees, assign each Core Substitute his or her seniority date as set forth in Appendix A, and reconsider the status of each Core Substitute in the layoff on the basis of his or her seniority date. The district shall dismiss the accusation against any Core Substitute if it finds that a junior employee is being retained to render a service that the Core Substitute is certificated and competent to provide. If there is no such junior employee, the district may give notice to the Core Substitute that his or her services will not be required for the 2009-2010 school year because of the reduction of particular kinds of services.

2. Notice may be given to respondents holding Site Support Substitute, Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps, Vocational Education, and Administrative positions that their services will not be required for the 2009-2010 school year because of the reduction or elimination of particular kinds of services.

DATED: _____

DAVID L. BENJAMIN
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings

Appendix A

APPOINTMENT TYPE:

TT - Core Subs

Empl ID:	Rcd:	Name:	Loc Type:	LocationDescr:	Appt Type:	FTE:	SenDate:	Credential:
9515	0	Choy, Tina Lee	A	Sub Pool	TT	1.00	08/25/04	CORE SUB
5547	0	Dolgin, Stephen M	A	Sub Pool	TT	1.00	08/23/99	CORE SUB
6242	1	Fox, Dennis Wayne	A	Sub Pool	TT	1.00	01/07/92	CORE SUB
11518	2	Freed, Linda Ann	A	Sub Pool	TT	1.00	08/26/02	CORE SUB
12190	1	Gutierrez, Dante	A	Sub Pool	TT	1.00	08/21/02	CORE SUB
5061	2	Hamilton, William A.	A	Sub Pool	TT	1.00	08/30/02	CORE SUB
3002	0	Jeske, Paul David	A	Sub Pool	TT	1.00	01/02/82	CORE SUB
4705	3	Lemon-Jones, Kanikah M	A	Sub Pool	TT	1.00	06/16/04	CORE SUB
5631	2	Linker, Sharon E	A	Sub Pool	TT	1.00	10/21/05	CORE SUB
5900	1	Markarian, Daniel J	A	Sub Pool	TT	1.00	11/14/90	CORE SUB
3074	2	O'Connor, Richard C	A	Sub Pool	TT	1.00	10/21/05	CORE SUB
2814	2	Petercupo, Nancy	A	Sub Pool	TT	1.00	08/25/04	CORE SUB
3574	2	Rosenman, David A	A	Sub Pool	TT	1.00	10/21/05	CORE SUB
5100	0	Simpson, Timothy J.	A	Sub Pool	TT	1.00	09/01/99	CORE SUB
4702	0	Soltis, Linda J.	A	Sub Pool	TT	1.00	10/19/87	CORE SUB

Total Number of Positions: 15

Total FTE: 15.00

Total Number of Employees: 15

Appendix B

APPOINTMENT TYPE:

TDTD - Site Support

Empl ID:	Rcd:	Name:	Loc Type:	LocationDescr:	Appt Type:	FTE:	SenDate:	Credential:
022502	2	Baron-Jordan,Roque T	E	Bryant E.S.	TDTD	1.00	08/22/07	SITE SUPPORT
025935	1	Bastidas,Marcos	M	Martin Luther King Jr M.S.	TDTD	1.00	02/17/09	SITE SUPPORT
025937	1	Boehm,Tara Jean	E	Cleveland E.S.	TDTD	1.00	01/05/09	SITE SUPPORT
024769	1	Buchanan,Sarah Lisa	M	Horace Mann Middle School	TDTD	1.00	08/20/08	SITE SUPPORT
022591	0	Cheshire,Ryan M.	E	El Dorado E.S.	TDTD	0.50	03/23/06	SITE SUPPORT
18484	0	Cox,Nathan D.	E	Malcolm X Academy	TDTD	1.00	11/21/02	SITE SUPPORT
13920	1	Dabo,Charles	E	Monroe Elementary School	TDTD	1.00	06/17/02	SITE SUPPORT
021995	3	Faubion,John C.	H	John O'Connell High School	TDTD	1.00	01/12/07	SITE SUPPORT
024121	0	Fernicola,Joseph	E	Harvey Milk Civil Rights Acade	TDTD	1.00	08/22/07	SITE SUPPORT
2177	0	Fong-Tsukuda,Lois	H	Thurgood Marshall High School	TDTD	1.00	11/06/07	SITE SUPPORT
024786	2	Fordyce,Jami Lee	E	Sanchez Elementary School	TDTD	1.00	02/02/09	SITE SUPPORT
026157	0	Gaskin,Jotbathah	E	Dr. G. Washington Carver E.S.	TDTD	1.00	01/15/09	SITE SUPPORT
023144	0	Gebremariam,Eden	E	Rosa Parks Elementary School	TDTD	1.00	09/05/06	SITE SUPPORT
024649	1	Gibson,Matthew J	H	Mission High School	TDTD	1.00	12/10/08	SITE SUPPORT
024386	1	Gonzalez,Silvia N	E	Cesar Chavez E.S.	TDTD	1.00	04/08/08	SITE SUPPORT
12326	1	Gonzalvez,Claudia Regina	E	Sheridan Elementary School	TDTD	1.00	08/22/07	SITE SUPPORT
023323	4	Grenawalt,Ashleigh S.	H	Philip & Sala Burton High Sch	TDTD	1.00	08/20/08	SITE SUPPORT
14657	3	Hart,Judson Duncan	M	James Lick Middle School	TDTD	1.00	02/29/08	SITE SUPPORT
025717	0	Haworth,Trisha Monique	E	Hillcrest Elementary School	TDTD	1.00	09/25/08	SITE SUPPORT
025632	1	Jackson,Patricia Anne	E	Glen Park E.S.	TDTD	1.00	10/20/08	SITE SUPPORT
6128	5	Lagumbay,Owen K	H	Philip & Sala Burton High Sch	TDTD	1.00	08/23/06	SITE SUPPORT
023572	0	Lawson,Marc G.	H	Balboa High School	TDTD	1.00	02/07/07	SITE SUPPORT
024815	1	Lee,Jibraan A	E	El Dorado E.S.	TDTD	0.50	08/20/08	SITE SUPPORT
024292	0	Luger,Joseph Paul	E	Paul Revere E.S.	TDTD	1.00	08/22/07	SITE SUPPORT
15582	0	Macinnes-	E	Dr. William Cobb Elem Sch	TDTD	1.00	08/02/00	SITE SUPPORT
024245	1	Manning,Tafara Raashida	E	Willie L. Brown College Prep A	TDTD	1.00	08/20/08	SITE SUPPORT
6085	2	Mata'U,John	M	Visitacion Valley M.S.	TDTD	1.00	09/17/07	SITE SUPPORT
025634	0	McNerney,Francis William	E	Leonard Flynn E.S.	TDTD	1.00	08/25/08	SITE SUPPORT
020781	0	Modarai,Asadullah Qorosh	E	Fairmount E.S.	TDTD	1.00	08/23/06	SITE SUPPORT
18795	6	Novoa,Luis Alberto	E	Marshall E.S.	TDTD	1.00	08/23/06	SITE SUPPORT
025936	1	Oh,Saewon	E	John Muir Elementary School	TDTD	1.00	01/28/09	SITE SUPPORT
7084	4	Ong,Melvin D	E	Starr King Elementary School	TDTD	1.00	08/22/07	SITE SUPPORT
11136	3	Restani,Kevin G.	H	Balboa High School	TDTD	1.00	02/05/04	SITE SUPPORT
024401	0	Robinson,Coygon Jr.	M	James Denman Middle School	TDTD	1.00	01/25/08	SITE SUPPORT
17399	2	Rowley,Margaret E.	M	Everett Middle School	TDTD	1.00	08/20/08	SITE SUPPORT
13198	3	Schillinger,Ben Ari	E	Bret Harte E.S.	TDTD	1.00	02/21/01	SITE SUPPORT

Appendix B (cont.)

024635	1	Seryozhko, Yevheniy V	H	International Studies Academy	TDTD	1.00	12/12/08	SITE SUPPORT
025613	1	Stankiewich, Carolina N	E	Junipero Serra E.S.	TDTD	1.00	11/10/08	SITE SUPPORT
5345	0	Tang, Johnny	E	Daniel Webster Elementary Sch	TDTD	1.00	08/22/07	SITE SUPPORT
12149	4	Wherity, William Mordaunt	H	Mission High School	TDTD	1.00	08/22/00	SITE SUPPORT

**Total Number
of Positions: 40**

Total FTE: 39.00

**Total Number
of Employees: 40**

Appendix C

Subject:

R.O.T.C.

Empl ID:	Rcd:	Name:	Loc Type:	LocationDescr:	Appt Type:	FTE:	SenDate:	Credential:
10977	0	Bullard,Doug	H	Lowell H.S.	TPER	1.00	08/24/98	ROTC/CLAD
18714	0	Collier,Michael	H	Mission High School	TPER	1.00	08/21/02	ROTC/CLAD
6783	0	Conley,Elmo F.	H	Balboa High School	TPER	1.00	09/07/93	ROTC/CLAD
022896	0	Daniels,Darius X	H	Philip & Sala Burton High Sch	TPER	1.00	08/23/06	ROTC
020429	1	Hardee,Stephen S.	H	Galileo Academy of Science & T	TPER	1.00	02/09/04	ROTC/CLAD
20009	0	McCoy,Dennis C.	H	George Washington H.S.	TPER	1.00	08/22/03	ROTC/CLAD
8221	0	Paratore,Gerald L.	H	Balboa High School	TPER	1.00	10/18/95	ROTC/CLAD
3112	0	Powell Jr,Robert L.	H	Abraham Lincoln H.S.	TPER	1.00	10/06/82	ROTC/CLAD
020150	0	Smith,Ray C.	H	Mission High School	TPER	1.00	09/15/03	ROTC/CLAD
6544	0	Washington,Melvin Harris	H	Abraham Lincoln H.S.	TPER	1.00	01/11/93	ROTC/CLAD
6962	0	Windham,Robert	H	George Washington H.S.	TPER	1.00	10/12/93	ROTC/CLAD
9209	0	Wiseman,David R.	H	Abraham Lincoln H.S.	TPER	1.00	08/26/96	ROTC/CLAD

**Total Number
of Positions: 12**

Total FTE: 12.00

**Total Number
of Employees: 12**

Appendix D

Subject:

Voc. Ed.

Empl ID:Rcd:	Name:	Loc Type:	LocationDescr:	Appt Type:	FTE:	SenDate:	Credential:
024069 0	Gray,Donald	H	John O'Connell High School	TPR2	0.20	08/22/07	INDUSTRIAL
18907 0	Jones,Douglas Sidney	H	Abraham Lincoln H.S.	TPER	1.00	08/21/02	COMPUTER
022055 0 SYSTEMS	Olmedo,Cynthia I.	H	George Washington H.S.	TPER	1.00	09/12/05	COMPUTER

**Total Number
of Positions: 3**

Total FTE: 2.20

**Total Number
of Employees: 3**