

BEFORE THE
BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE
ALVORD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

OAH No. 2009030477

Respondents listed in Appendix A.

PROPOSED DECISION

Donald P. Cole, Administrative Law Judge, Office of Administrative Hearings, State of California, heard this matter in Riverside, California on April 16, 2009.

John W. Dietrich, Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo, Attorneys at Law, represented the Alvord Unified School District.

Carlos R. Perez, Reich, Adell & Cvitan, represented the respondents listed in Appendix A, except for respondent Carolyn Hester.

No appearance was made by or on behalf of respondent Carolyn Hester.

The matter was submitted on April 20, 2009.¹

FACTUAL FINDINGS

1. Craig Wells, Assistant Superintendent, Personnel Services of the Alvord Unified School District, made and filed the amended accusation² dated March 13, 2009, in his official capacity as the designee of Dr. Wendel Tucker, Ph.D., district Superintendent.

¹ Prior to the conclusion of the hearing, the parties stipulated that the district would proffer by April 20, 2009, a document listing each district certificated employee in either a TOSA or a project specialist position, along with the seniority date of each such employee. The district transmitted the list to the Office of Administrative Hearings on April 20, 2009. On the same date, the list was marked for identification as Exhibit 25 and received in evidence, the record was closed, and the matter was deemed submitted.

² An initial accusation was made and filed on March 10, 2009.

2. Respondents³ are certificated district employees.

3. On March 5, 2009, in accordance with Education Code sections 44949 and 44955, the Superintendent notified the Board of Education of the Alvord Unified School District in writing of his recommendation to reduce or discontinue particular kinds of services for the upcoming school year. The Superintendent stated the reasons for the recommendation. The recommendation that respondents be terminated from employment was not related to their competency as teachers.

4. On March 5, 2009, the board adopted Resolution No. 32, 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 2009-2010 school year were the following full-time equivalent (FTE) positions:

<u>Particular Kind of Service</u>	<u>Full-Time Equivalent</u>
Elementary Teacher	137
Social Science Teacher – 1 MS and 1 HS	2
English Teacher – High School	1
Freshman Focus Teacher – High School	1
Agriculture Teacher – High School	2
Art Teacher – Middle School	1
Computer Literacy Teacher – Middle School	2
Industrial Technology Teacher – Middle School	2
Journalism Teacher – Middle School	1
Leadership Teacher – Middle School	0.2
AVID Teacher – Middle School	0.6
Counselor	6
Psychologist	2
Nurse	2

The proposed reductions totaled 159.8 FTE positions.

5. The board further determined in Resolution No. 32 that “competency,” as described in Education Code section 44955, subdivision (b), for the purposes of bumping, “shall necessarily include all credentials, authorizations, training and experience possessed by the employee to be bumped that are relevant to the subject matter area of the position to be filled, including BCLAD or equivalent authorization.”

³ The District initially identified 165 certificated employees as respondents, 13 of whom did not request a hearing and one of whom (see below) did not *timely* request a hearing. The District subsequently dismissed eight other employees, based on attrition and for other reasons. Accordingly, 143 respondents remain in this proceeding and are listed in Appendix A.

6. The board directed the Superintendent or his designee to determine which employees' services would not be required for the 2009-2010 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, 2009, 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 recommendation that respondents be terminated from employment was not related to their competency as teachers.

On or before March 13, 2009, the district timely served on respondents the amended accusation, along with required accompanying documents.

8. Respondents timely filed written requests for hearing to determine if there was cause for not reemploying them for the upcoming school year.⁴ Respondents timely filed notices of defense. All pre-hearing jurisdictional requirements were met.

9. Respondents are probationary or permanent certificated employees of the district.

10. The services the board addressed in Resolution No. 32 were "particular kinds of services" that could be reduced or discontinued within the meaning of Education Code section 44955. Except as discussed below, 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.

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.

⁴ One certificated employee, Brenda Gutierrez, did not file a request for hearing and notice of defense until April 13, 2009. The request for hearing was thus untimely filed; the district declined to waive the time requirement as to Gutierrez, who was thus determined no longer to remain a respondent in this matter as of the date of the hearing.

12. The board considered attrition, including resignations, retirements and requests for transfer, in determining the actual number of necessary layoff notices to be delivered to its employees. No evidence was presented that any known positively assured attrition was not considered.

13. The project specialist position is categorically funded. Persons holding this position do not teach in a classroom, but coordinate categorical funding at schools and are used as coaches for teachers. Project specialists receive special training that other certificated employees do not possess. For example, project specialists meet for nearly three hours each week for additional teacher coaching training. The specific kinds of training that is unique to project specialists include reading first coach institutes, principal/coach summit narrowing the equity gap through instruction, and reading/language arts framework rollout.

While going through the process of identifying which certificated staff would be laid off, the district did not review the files of individual teachers for the purpose of determining whether any teachers could bump into project specialist positions. Instead, the district essentially made the assumption that no teachers had the rigorous training necessary to satisfy the competency criteria of Resolution No. 32. The district's credential technician, who prepared the district's bump analysis, testified that she did not know whether any senior teachers were trained so as to be able to perform project specialist work.

a. Kristy Orona-Ramirez teaches fifth grade, has a clear multiple subject credential, and is NCLB compliant (multiple subject). Her seniority date is August 24, 2006. She was hired by the district in 2006 as a project specialist. In 2007, she was offered a project specialist position for the upcoming school year, but she elected to return to the classroom. She has had substantial training, some of which appears to be unique to project specialists, i.e., not offered to teachers at large. She has a master's degree in administration and educational leadership. She contended that she had greater seniority than two project specialists who were retained by the district, Jennifer Long and Jean Hernandez, both of whom are temporary employees. The district intends to terminate the services of all temporary employees before laying off certificated personnel. Accordingly, neither Hernandez nor Long will be retained.

b. Debbie Pence teaches first grade, has a clear multiple subject credential, and is NCLB compliant (multiple subject). Her seniority date is July 26, 2002. She was a project specialist from 2004 to 2006. In 2006, she was offered a project specialist position for the upcoming school year, but she elected to return to the classroom. When she was a project specialist, she attended several (more than two) reading first institutes for coaches, and also attended the weekly project specialist meetings. Pence contended that two project specialists with less seniority than she, Nihung Nguyen and Victoria Mims, were retained. Pence did not know whether the reading first coach training she received was different than or the same as that received by Mims. District records proffered at the hearing do not reflect what, if any, special training Nguyen may have received.

c. Stacey Lyn Steel teaches first grade, has a clear multiple subject credential, and is NCLB compliant (multiple subject). Her seniority date is July 2, 2004.

She was a project specialist from 2005 to 2007. In that capacity, she attended weekly project specialist meetings, coaches institutes, including three five-day trainings,⁵ and also a principal coach summit training. Steel contended that she should be able to bump the less senior Victoria Mims, if the training she (Steel) received was the same as that received by Mims.

14. No certificated employee junior to any respondent was retained to perform any services which any respondent⁶ was certificated and competent to render.

a. Azizi Sheffield is a seventh grade English teacher. Her seniority date is August 24, 2006. She has a preliminary single subject credential in English, and is No Child Left Behind (NCLB) compliant (English). She was bumped by Alice Stevens, an elementary school teacher who holds a multiple subject credential with a special authorization in English. According to the district's seniority list, Stevens is NCLB compliant in the multiple subject area, but not in English. However, the district's credential technician testified that, despite the seniority list, Stevens is in fact NCLB compliant in English, and that, therefore, Stevens is certificated and competent to bump Azizi. The district's determination in this regard was proper.

b. Jeannette Mabee is a sixth grade language arts and history core teacher. Her seniority date is August 28, 2002. Mabee holds a multiple subject credential and a supplemental authorization in English, and is NCLB compliant (multiple subject). She is not NCLB compliant in English.⁷ Mabee contends that she is certificated and competent to bump the more junior Alice Stevens, an elementary school teacher.⁸ Stevens, like Mabee, holds a multiple subject credential with a supplemental authorization in English, and is NCLB compliant (multiple subject). Unlike Mabee, and as found above, Stevens is also NCLB compliant in English. Accordingly, the district properly determined that Mabee was not certificated and competent to bump Stevens.

c. Jennifer Simmons teaches special education sixth and seventh grade science, and sixth grade history. Her seniority date is October 13, 2008. She holds a

⁵ Steel testified more specifically that the three training periods she attended covered what are known as "modules" one through 25. She stated that the total number of modules is greater than 30; she did not know the precise number. Project specialists attend these training modules whenever they commence their service in that assignment, and, if they remain project specialists a sufficiently long period of time, will eventually attend the complete cycle of training modules.

⁶ Respondents' argument that Brenda Gutierrez should have been able to keep 0.2 FTE of her position after she was bumped is rejected, since Gutierrez waived her right to a hearing and is not a respondent in this matter, so that the administrative law judge does not have the authority to make a determination in this regard.

⁷ Mabee testified that she is NCLB compliant in English, but provided no documentation in support of her testimony. The district's records, reflected in its seniority list, reflect that Mabee is NCLB compliant only in the multiple subject area.

⁸ Mabee also contends she is eligible to bump Shawn O'Rafferty. Since O'Rafferty is, however, already designated by the district for layoff, Mabee's contention in this regard is a moot point.

preliminary special education mild to moderate (M/M) credential and is NCLB compliant (multiple subject). She was bumped by Kisha McMullen, a psychologist. Simmons did not deny that McMullen was certificated and competent to bump her, but contended that Chance Vincent, also a middle school special education teacher, but who has less seniority than Simmons, should have been laid off instead of Simmons. The district's credential technician testified that Simmons was correct, in the sense that Vincent was inadvertently omitted from lay off. The technician explained, however, that Mindy Gould, not Simmons, was the most senior certificated employee prejudiced by the district's error, and that Gould's lay off notice was therefore rescinded. Accordingly, the district properly determined that Simmons was subject to lay off pursuant to the bump analysis.

d. Campbell McGowan teaches ninth grade "opportunity" at the district's Alternative Education Center. He teaches and works with students who are "at risk," i.e., do not attend classes, are receiving F's, and are essentially on the verge of dropping out completely. McGowan holds a multiple subject credential and is NCLB compliant (multiple subject). He also holds a pupil personnel service (PPS) credential, and has a master's degree in school psychology. He does not have a counseling credential, but does have a counseling background, has worked in at-risk programs for seven years, has provided special training in that area, and has worked with students who had bipolar disorder, social anxiety, and other psychological conditions. His seniority date is October 1, 2007. McGowan was bumped by the more senior Paulette Perry, a middle school computers/AVID teacher who holds a clear business credential. McGowan expressed the view that in order to teach in his assignment, one should have a multiple subject credential (since he teaches all subjects) and/or a PPS credential, with a master's degree in school psychology (since his position involves counseling and psychological services). McGowan did not testify that, in fact, either of these credentials is required by law or any educational entity to teach the opportunity class. Based on his testimony, it is clear that McGowan has a great deal of education, training, and experience that is related to his teaching assignment, and that he cares passionately for the students he teaches.

The district credential technician testified that a teacher may teach the opportunity class with any credential, and that accordingly, the more senior Perry is certificated and competent to bump McGowan, based on her clear business credential. The technician conceded that she did not take McGowan's training and experience into account in reaching this determination. The district's determination that Perry was certificated and competent to bump McGowan was nonetheless proper.⁹

e. Archalous Gharibian teaches sixth grade core in language arts and history. She has a clear multiple subject credential. Her seniority date is August 24, 2006. She contended that the tiebreaker criteria were improperly applied to her in that she has a master's degree, which the district failed to take into account. The district's credential technician conceded that if Gharibian's master's degree had properly been taken into account, Gharibian would have had a higher seniority ranking pursuant to the tiebreaker

⁹ It may be that the district could have chosen to retain McGowan pursuant to Education Code section 44955, subdivision (d)(1), but it was not *required* to do so.

criteria, but added that Gharibian would still have been laid off, and that the higher ranking would only have been relevant for purposes of possible rehire. Accordingly, the failure of the district to properly apply the tiebreaker criteria to Gharibian does not affect the district's determination that she is subject to lay off, and thus does not constitute prejudicial error.

f. Maria Larios-Anaya teaches English Language Development (ELD), a program for English learners, at grades six through eight. She has a clear multiple subject credential and is NCLB compliant (multiple subject). Her seniority date is November 27, 2006. Larios-Anaya was bumped by elementary school teacher Rosa Maria Dreisbach. Larios-Anaya did not deny that Dreisbach was certificated and competent to bump her, but contended that she herself should be permitted to bump the less senior Teresa Corbet, who also teaches ELD, though at the high school level. Corbet has a preliminary single subject Spanish credential. Larios-Anaya also contended she should be permitted to bump Lisa Funke, who teaches ELD "self-contained," and who, like Larios-Anaya, teaches at the middle school level and has a multiple subject credential.

The district's credential technician testified that Corbet's single subject credential permits her to teach through grade 12, whereas Larios-Anaya's credential only permits her to teach up to ninth grade in a self-contained environment. The technician testified further that Funke has a BCLAD authorization, while Larios-Anaya does not, and that, therefore, Larios-Anaya is not competent to bump Funke. Accordingly, the district properly determined that Larios-Anaya was not certificated and competent to bump either Corbet or Funke.

15. Priscilla Grijalva is a high school counselor. She holds a PPS-school counseling credential. Her seniority date is November 27, 2006. She testified that seven counselors received lay off notices, six of whom were hired under Assembly Bill 1802 for the purpose of lowering the caseload of secondary school counselors and to help at risk students to pass the California High School Exit Examination. She stated that she has 465 students on her caseload; she estimated that the caseload of high school counselors would increase by about 100 if the counselor lay offs are effectuated. She added that graduation promotion rates have increased due to AB 1802 funding. She did not contend that any counselor with less seniority than she was retained.

The district assistant superintendent for personnel services testified that the district did take AB 1802 into account in deciding whether to eliminate the six counselor FTE positions. He added that the district will receive some AB 1802 funding next year, though he believes the funding will be in a reduced amount. The funds will be used for both counseling and non-counseling services, which is permissible under the bill.

Though Grijalva made a strong and articulate plea on behalf of the retention of high school counselors, it is beyond the jurisdiction of the administrative law judge to evaluate the propriety, as a matter of public policy, of the district's decision to reduce counseling services. It was not established that any more junior certificated employee was retained to render a service for which Grijalva was certificated and competent to render.

16. Tiffany Star Madrienne Ferreira teaches elementary school and has a clear multiple subject credential. Ferreira testified that at an April 2, 2009, board meeting, the board voted unanimously to adopt a 24.49 to 1 student to teacher ratio on a district-wide basis. She claimed that the significance of this decision was that only 56 teachers should be laid off, because if more than that number were laid off, the 24.49 to 1 ratio could not be met. Though Ferreira contended that the April 2 vote in effect constituted an implicit modification of Resolution 32, she did not contend that the board took any explicit action to rescind that resolution.

The district's assistant superintendent for personnel services confirmed that on April 2, 2009, the board took formal action to approve a reduction in class size in grades kindergarten through third grade, such that the student to teacher ratio would be 24.49 to 1. The board did not, however, either via the April 2, 2009 vote or in any other manner, direct any change in the FTE's identified for reduction in Resolution 32.

Accordingly, the board's action on April 2, 2009, did not require the board to rescind the elimination of any of the FTE positions identified in Resolution 32.

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. 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.) 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.)

4. A school district's decision to reduce a particular kind of service must not be fraudulent, arbitrary or capricious. (*San Jose Teachers Assn v. Allen* (1984) 144 Cal.App.3d 627, 637.) "In determining whether the decision of a school board is reasonable as distinguished from fraudulent, arbitrary, or capricious, its action is measured by the standard set by reason and reasonable people, bearing in mind that such a standard may permit a difference of opinion on the same subject." (*Campbell Elementary Teachers Assn, Inc. v.*

Abbott (1978) 76 Cal.App.3d 796, 807-808 [citation omitted].) In *Campbell*, the court determined that the district's decision was "supported by a fair and substantial reason."

The district's determination that no regular teachers were competent to bump project specialists was not reasonable. The district made the unwarranted assumption that no regular teachers had received the special training that project specialists had. While in most instances, the district was undoubtedly correct, the evidence presented at the hearing established that certain employees who had previously been project specialists had received at least some specialized training. The district argued that since the teachers who had previously served as project specialists did not know whether the training they received was equivalent to that received by current project specialists, it is speculative whether they were competent to bump the current specialists. However, the testimony of Orona-Ramirez, Pence, and Steel that they previously served as project specialists, that they received special training while doing so, and that they were invited to remain in their project specialist positions, was sufficient to establish their competency to serve again in the upcoming school year in that capacity. Further, any speculation that may exist with regard to the relative training of these three individuals and current project specialists is due to the district's failure to investigate whether any specific non-project specialists might be competent to bump more junior employees currently in that assignment. The district's argument in effect places the burden of establishing arbitrariness on the employees, who cannot be expected to know what training other employees have received.

Accordingly, the district acted in an arbitrary and capricious manner with regard to its proposed layoff of Kristy Orona-Ramirez, Debbie Pence and Stacey Lyn Steel. Since Pence and Steel have greater seniority than other individuals who currently render services as project specialists, they may not be laid off. However, the district's error with regard to Orona-Ramirez was not prejudicial, since no probationary or permanent certificated project specialists junior to her are being retained by the district. Accordingly, the district may proceed with its proposed lay off of Orona-Ramirez.

5. A preponderance of the evidence sustained the charges set forth in the accusation, except with regard to respondents Debbie Pence and Stacey Lyn Steel. 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 directed be reduced or discontinued. It is recommended that the board give all respondents, except for respondents Debbie Pence and Stacey Lyn Steel, notice before May 15, 2009, that their services are no longer required by the district.

6. A preponderance of the evidence did not sustain the charges set forth in the accusation as to respondents Debbie Pence and Stacey Lyn Steel. It is recommended that the board not give these two respondents notice that their services will no longer be required by the district.

7. Respondents argued that the district improperly treated employees in certain categorically funded positions as temporary instead of probationary. Whether or not respondents' contention is correct, these categorically-funded employees were not served with the accusation and thus lacked standing in this administrative proceeding to raise the issue. Neither the administrative law judge nor the Office of Administrative Hearings have jurisdiction under the Education Code to resolve issues involving misclassification of persons not served with required process and afforded a right to a hearing. The power to compel the district to reclassify categorically funded employees and to reinstate them to employment if there was misclassification rests with the Superior Court (e.g., *California Teachers Assn. v. Vallejo City Unified School Dist. (Vallejo)* (2007) 149 Cal.App.4th 135).

ADVISORY DETERMINATION

The following advisory determination is made:

1. The accusations served on all respondents except Debbie Pence and Stacey Lyn Steel are sustained. Notice shall be given to all respondents except Debbie Pence and Stacey Lyn Steel before May 15, 2009, that their services will not be required because of the reduction or discontinuation of particular services as indicated.

2. The accusation served on respondents Debbie Pence and Stacey Lyn Steel is not sustained and the accusation related to these two respondents is dismissed.

DATED: _____

DONALD P. COLE
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings

Appendix A

1. Ina Alexandre
2. Yesenia Alvarez
3. Charles Angelucci
4. Carmen Aparicio
5. Vicky Backes
6. Sarah Baker
7. Sharon Hobbs-Bennett
8. Michelle Bodily
9. Kelly Boesen
10. Gloria Bracamonte
11. Michelle Brazeal
12. Matthew Bright
13. Emily Burton
14. Carla Calderon
15. Jessica Cassese
16. Briana Chavez-Monroe
17. Denise Chesebro
18. Carolyn Cordova
19. Kristy Cordova
20. Claudia Cruz
21. Barbara Damron
22. Amanda Davis
23. Deserae Devlin
24. Jennifer Doiron
25. Ian Enriquez
26. Monica Eppinger
27. Cheryl Erskine
28. Tiffany Star Madrienne Ferreira
29. Kelsey Finnicum
30. Amber Fleeman
31. Traci Flores
32. Kimberly Fortune
33. Adrienne Fraire
34. Jeff Frieden
35. Diane Frymire
36. Kimberly Gallo
37. Jamie Garcia
38. Russell Geisner
39. Archalous Gharibian
40. Jenny Gouveia
41. Lisa Green
42. Shanna Green
43. Priscilla Grijalva
44. Erin Hallihan

45. Jessica Hansen
46. Yvette Haskins
47. Jill Heinz
48. Stacey Henss
49. Monica Herman
50. Carolyn Hester
51. Nancy Hollingsworth
52. Adrianna Hovde
53. Anita Santiago Jaramillo
54. Faith Johnson
55. Robert Joy
56. Linda Kieding
57. Carlyn Knowles
58. Deanna Kuchenbecker
59. Maria Larios-Anaya
60. Christine Ledesma
61. Michele Lenertz
62. Sinar Lomeli
63. Tameka Lopez
64. Wendy Lopez
65. Jennifer Lupinski
66. Jeannette Mabee
67. Campbell McGowan
68. Enedilia Medina
69. Luis Medina
70. Beatriz Mejia
71. Gwenett Mendez
72. Monica Meurer
73. Michelle Milano
74. Julie Mitchell
75. Joanna Molo
76. Albert Montoya
77. Eloise Montoya
78. Theresa Montoya
79. Kelly Mullaly
80. Tina Naif
81. Justin Norman
82. Paul Oeser III
83. Shawn O'Rafferty
84. Kristy Orona-Ramírez
85. Deborah Pence
86. Audrey Popoff
87. Heidi Powers
88. Lori Prather
89. Marie (Pam) Prescott
90. Marla Preston-O'Hara

91. Marla Punsalan
92. Sydney Quick (Scattergood)
93. Susana Quintero
94. Misty Rathbun
95. Daniel Reyes
96. David Rhea
97. Linnea Rietkerk
98. Valerie Rodarte (Enyeart)
99. Elaine Rodriguez
100. Judith Rodriguez (Bonilla)
101. Danielle Romain
102. Lilia Roney
103. Michelle Ross
104. Kristin Rush
105. Mary Salas
106. Victoria Salgado
107. Christina Salomón
108. Kelli Seibert
109. Azizi Sheffield
110. Blanca Silva-Hill
111. Jennifer Simmons
112. Audrey Slavin
113. Stephanie Small
114. Julie Stanfield
115. Christine Stebbing
116. Stacey Steel
117. Jennifer Stipp
118. Wayne Stumpf
119. Minhwa Suh
120. Maureen Swalm
121. Cara Sweeney
122. Andrea Tackman
123. Nadia Templeton
124. Dennis Thompson
125. Mary Thrasher
126. Rachel Thurman
127. Desiree Trapp
128. Gregory Twogood
129. Nancy Valdez
130. Alejandrina Vasquez
131. Lynne Vasquez
132. Rosalva Veladrez
133. Andrea Vinciguerra
134. Michelle Vines
135. Tawni Webster
136. Sheila Wellar

137. Samantha Wharton
138. Eva Marina Williamson
139. Jeri Wilson
140. Theresa Wilson
141. Any Yan
142. Katrina Yuson
143. Daniel Zamora