

BEFORE THE
GOVERNING BOARD
TEMECULA VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

OAH No. 2010011030

Respondents listed in Appendices A and B.

PROPOSED DECISION

Donald P. Cole, Administrative Law Judge, Office of Administrative Hearings, State of California, heard this matter in Temecula, California on April 12, 2010.

Melanie A. Petersen, Fagen Friedman & Fulfroost LLP represented the Temecula Valley Unified School District.

Jon Y. Vanderpool, Tosdal, Smith, Steiner & Wax, represented the respondents listed in Appendix A to this Proposed Decision.

No appearance was made by or on behalf of the respondents listed in Appendix B to this Proposed Decision.

The matter was submitted on April 12, 2010.

FACTUAL FINDINGS

General Findings

1. Chris Cordner, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources of the Temecula Valley Unified School District, made and filed the accusations dated March 5, 2010 in his official capacity as the designee of Carol A. Leighy, Ed.D., Superintendent of the District.

2. Respondents¹ are certificated employees of the district.

¹ Initially, 168 individuals were named as respondents. However, through attrition, the failure to request a hearing or otherwise, the number of respondents had by the conclusion of the hearing been reduced to the 116 individuals identified below in Appendices A and B. Unless otherwise indicated, all references to respondents in this Proposed Decision are to these 116 individuals.

3. In early 2010, in accordance with Education Code sections 44949 and 44955, the district notified the governing board of the district of its recommendation to reduce or discontinue services for the upcoming school year.

4. On February 23, 2010, the governing board adopted Resolution No. 2009-10/19, determining that it would be necessary to reduce particular kinds of services at the end of the current school year. The Governing Board determined that the particular kinds of services that must be reduced for the 2010-2011 school year were the following full time equivalent (FTE) positions:

<u>Particular Kind of Service</u>	<u>Full-Time Equivalent</u>
K-6 th Grade Teacher	102.6
K-12 th Grade P.E. Teacher	3
K-12 th Grade Special Education – Adaptive P.E.	0.6
6 th -8 th Grade Social Science/History Teacher	1
6 th -8 th Grade Home Economics Teacher	1
6 th -8 th Grade Math Teacher	2
6 th -8 th Grade English Teacher	1
9 th -12 th Grade Math Teacher	7
9 th -12 th Grade English Teacher	10
9 th -12 th Grade Biological Science Teacher	3
10 th -12 th Grade Chemistry Teacher	1
9 th -12 th Grade Social Science/History Teacher	4
9 th -12 th Grade Health Teacher	1
9 th -12 th Grade Industrial Arts Teacher	0.6
9 th -12 th Grade Spanish Teacher	1
6 th -12 th Grade Counselor	10

The proposed reductions totaled 148.8 full-time equivalent (FTE) positions.

5. The Governing Board further determined in Resolution No. 2009-10/19 that it would be necessary to retain certificated employees who possess special training and competency that other certificated employees with more seniority might not possess, to wit:

a. Certificated personnel who possess a credential authorizing service in special education, including intern specialist, who are presently assigned within the scope of that credential, and who will be assigned within the scope of that credential for the 2010-2011 school year.

b. Certificated personnel who possess a credential authorizing service in world languages ASL, French and P.E. with Dance Authorization, who are presently assigned within the scope of that credential, and who will be assigned within the scope of that credential for the 2010-2011 school year.

c. Certificated personnel who possess a credential authorizing service as a Special Education program Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA) assigned to Special Education Department or Autism Specialist programs who are presently assigned within the scope of that credential, and who will be assigned as a TOSA within the scope of that credential for the 2010-2011 school year.

d. Certificated personnel who possess a credential authorizing service as a Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA) assigned as a part-time 60% TOSA to the EETT grant implementation program who are presently assigned within the scope of that credential, and who will be assigned as a 60% TOSA within the scope of that credential for the 2010-2011 school year.

e. Certificated personnel who possess administrative credentials who are currently assigned to administrative positions, and who will be assigned to administrative positions for the 2010-2011 school year.

The board's skipping criteria were neither arbitrary nor capricious, but reflected a reasonable exercise of its discretion.

6. The governing board directed the superintendent to determine which employees' services would not be required for the 2010-2011 school year as a result of the reduction of the aforementioned particular kinds of services. The governing board further directed the superintendent 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. Subsequent to the action the governing board took on February 23, 2010, to reduce services by 148.8 FTE positions, the district continued to evaluate personnel needs in the district. Since the governing board's action, after taking into consideration upcoming positively assured attrition, resignations, and retirements, the district has now determined it can meet its fiscal needs by reducing services by a total of 138.8 FTE positions for the 2010-2011 school year.

8. On or before March 15, 2010, the district timely served on respondents a written notice that the superintendent had recommended, and that the governing board had determined, that their services would not be required for the upcoming school year. The notice set forth the reasons for the recommendation and determination. The notice advised respondents of their right to a hearing, and those respondents each had to deliver a request for a hearing in writing to the person sending the notice of termination by a specific date, which date was more than seven days after the notice of termination was served.

The recommendation and determination that respondents be terminated from employment was not related to their competency as teachers.

On or before March 15, 2010, the district timely served on respondents an accusation.

9. Respondents timely filed written requests for hearing and notices of defense. The district timely served respondents with a notice of hearing. All pre-hearing jurisdictional requirements were met.

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

11. The services the governing board addressed in Resolution No. 2009/10-19 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, but constituted a proper exercise of discretion.

12. 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 governing board.

13. The board considered all known attrition, resignations, retirements and requests for transfer in determining the actual number of necessary layoff notices to be delivered to its employees.

14. Initially, 168 certificated employees received layoff notices in connection with the 148.8 FTE positions the governing board resolved to eliminate. This was due to three factors: (i) Some of the teachers in question worked on a part-time basis; (ii) the district had not yet heard back from teachers who had been on a leave of absence as to whether they planned to return to the district; and (iii) anticipated bumping issues. The district took great care in attempting to determine the likelihood that particular individuals in particular assignments would or might reasonably be subject to layoff. The district’s issuance of 168 termination notices was based on its careful and reasonable assessment, constituted a proper exercise of its discretion, and was neither arbitrary nor capricious.

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

Findings as to Specific Certificated Employees²

16. From time to time and on a year-to-year basis, the district has pursuant to Education Code section 44263³ given special authorization to certain certificated employees to teach subjects outside the scope of their credentials. Such authorization may be given to individuals who during their undergraduate studies completed a specified number of academic units in the subject area of their special district authorization (e.g., 12 semester units or six upper division classes, in order to qualify for special authorization to teach a subject at the middle school level). Site administrators grant such authorization based on the specific teaching needs of the particular school in a given academic year. The district does not know and cannot predict which such authorizations may be needed for future school years.

Respondent Timothy Woods, Andrew Hajdu, and Jacqueline Hilton are expressed concerns relating to special district authorization. Woods and Hilton, who both hold supplementary authorizations, expressed concern that more senior colleagues who did not hold supplementary authorizations, but who did hold special district authorizations, were retained while they themselves were designated for lay off. Woods, Hilton and Hajdu all stated that the district never advised them that they could possibly qualify for special district authorization, and/or that, had they been so informed and been given an opportunity, they would have sought to qualify for it.

While the concerns of these teachers are understandable, the district's actions with regard to special authorizations were neither arbitrary nor capricious, but instead constituted a proper exercise of its discretion. Especially to the extent respondents in essence question the district's potential decisions as to what if any special authorizations to grant in the

² In respondents' joint notice of defense, questions were raised with regard to the proposed layoff of certain named employees whom the district ultimately decided not to layoff, to wit, Ronnie Plottner, Danny Garcia, Nicole Lombardi-Riesen, Amber Lane, Richard Salcedo, Michelle Balland. These allegations are therefore moot.

In respondents' joint notice of defense, it was asserted that Tara Fry and Erin O'Sullivan were improperly slated for layoff, when a more junior teacher, Lesliane Bouchard, was retained. Fry and O'Sullivan teach elementary school, but have supplementary authorizations in English. Bouchard teaches middle school language arts, so respondents' position was deemed to be that Fry or O'Sullivan should have been permitted to bump the more junior Bouchard. However, no contentions were made on behalf of Fry or O'Sullivan at the hearing, and neither employee testified. Respondents' initial assertions that Fry and O'Sullivan were improperly slated for layoff are deemed withdrawn. Further, a review of the district's seniority list reflects that neither Fry nor O'Sullivan has NCLB certification in English, whereas Bouchard does. This would appear to explain why the district did not permit Fry or O'Sullivan to bump Bouchard, and why respondents withdrew their challenge as to those two employees.

³ Education Code section 44263 provides, "A teacher licensed pursuant to the provisions of this article may be assigned, with his or her consent, to teach a single subject class in which he or she has 18 semester hours of coursework or nine semester hours of upper division or graduate coursework or a multiple subject class if he or she holds at least 60 semester hours equally distributed among the 10 areas of a diversified major set forth in Section 44314. A three-semester-unit variance in any of the required 10 areas may be allowed. The governing board of the school district by resolution shall provide specific authorization for the assignment. The authorization of the governing board shall remain valid for one year and may be renewed annually."

upcoming school year, it would be inappropriate for the administrative law judge to prejudge such matters so as effectively to limit in advance the discretion of district administrators to make decisions on the basis of future (and thus yet unknown) circumstances.

17. Derek Heid teaches English and drama at Temecula Valley High School. He is one of the district's most junior secondary English teachers and thus was properly noticed for layoff. Heid expressed concern as to the future of the drama program at Temecula Valley High School if he is laid off. He also noted that the drama program generates revenue for the district, and that the revenue for the current school year substantially surpasses that of recent prior years. Heid's genuine concern for the strength of the drama program and the welfare of his students was very evident from his testimony. However, pursuant to California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) guidelines, any teacher with a single subject English credential may teach drama, and a special authorization to teach drama does not exist. Accordingly, the district's issuance of a lay off notice to Heid was neither arbitrary nor capricious, but instead constituted a proper exercise of its discretion.

18. Timothy Woods teaches middle school physical education (P.E.) He expressed concern that at least five P.E. teachers, though not he himself, have given up their preparation period in order to teach an extra class (for a total of six teaching periods instead of five), and as a result receive additional compensation. Woods stated that if the district did not permit these five or more teachers to give up their preparation time and teach an extra period, the savings achieved would permit the employment of an additional P.E. teacher, i.e., one less teacher would have to be laid off.

Woods also expressed concern about the district's decision to exempt from lay off P.E. teachers with a supplementary authorization in dance. Woods himself does not hold such an authorization, but does teach dance as a unit in his P.E. classes. In enthusiastic, uniquely colorful fashion, Woods stated that if given an opportunity to teach dance classes, "I would teach the heck out of it." Woods' sincerity and his commitment to teaching were evident during his testimony, but the board's exemption of persons with a special authorization in dance was nonetheless neither arbitrary nor capricious but instead constituted a proper exercise of its discretion. The district explained, for example, that having individuals with a special dance authorization to teach dance classes qualifies those classes to meet fine arts college entrance requirements.

19. David Reska is the district's only counselor who works with emotionally disturbed high school students. Reska is a nationally board-certified counselor, who holds not only a bachelor's degree in social work but also a master's degree in counseling. Reska expressed concern that if the district lays off ten of its 40 counselors, the student counselor ratio would increase from 500:1 to about 600:1. He also expressed concern that special education teachers were given exemptions from lay off, but not counselors like himself who work with special education students. Though a PPS (pupil personnel services) credential authorizes any counselor to work with emotionally disturbed students, Reska questioned whether counselors lacking his experience could work effectively with that group. Reska did not identify any credentialed counselors with less seniority than he whom the district intends to retain next year.

Gretchen Daley works in the district, servicing students at nine sites as a special education counselor. She conducts personal social counseling for special education students who may, *inter alia*, be emotionally disturbed, autistic, or behaviorally challenged. Daley expressed concern about the district's decision to exempt from layoff certain special education personnel (TOSAs assigned to autism specialist programs) and not counselors such as herself. Daley testified as to her specialized training to deal with emotionally disturbed and fragile students.

The concerns of Reska and Daley are understandable. However, the district's exemption of certain special education teachers and not counselors who work with emotionally disturbed and other fragile students was neither arbitrary nor capricious, but instead constituted a proper exercise of its discretion. The district explained, for example, that it has experienced difficulty retaining special education teachers, and that accordingly it has historically exempted that group from layoff. Further, and in contrast to credentials available to teachers, a special education credential is not available to counselors; instead the PPS credential applies to all school counselors, whether they work with the traditional student population or, instead, with special education students.⁴

20. Derren Drago teaches Spanish at Temecula Valley Charter School.⁵ He testified that the charter school mandates use of a special Spanish-teaching program, using the TPRS (teaching proficiency through reading and storytelling) method. He stated that few teachers are familiar with this relatively new method, and he expressed concern whether a more senior district Spanish teacher would be able to teach Spanish effectively at the charter school.

Drago's concerns are understandable. However, the district's decision not to exempt charter school employees from lay off, including more specifically those teaching foreign languages, was neither arbitrary nor capricious, but instead constituted a proper exercise of its discretion.

21. Debra Tarantino teaches fifth grade at a district elementary school. She is currently being trained to provide EETT (enhancing education through technology) services. She stated that the district's \$940,000 grant for this program involved a two-year commitment, the first year of which involves training of EETT personnel (such as Tarantino) and the second year of which constitutes implementation of the program in the classroom. Tarantino expressed concern that if she and others who are presently being trained in EETT are laid off, then the district will have to start over training new personnel. Tarantino also expressed concern that her EETT trainer falls within the EETT exemption, but (again) not trainees such as herself.

⁴ In respondents' joint notice of defense, it was asserted that another counselor, Matthew Razukas, was improperly denied the right to bump less senior individuals. No specific individuals were named. No contentions were made on behalf of Razukas at the hearing, and he did not testify. Respondents' initial assertions with regard to Razukas are deemed withdrawn.

⁵ All employees of the charter school are district employees; only the administrator is not.

Tarantino's concerns are understandable. However, the district's decision to exempt certain but not all EETT personnel was neither arbitrary nor capricious, but instead constituted a proper exercise of its discretion.⁶

22. Jean Brown teaches home economics at Temecula Valley High School. She is not directly impacted by the layoff, since the only home economics position slated for layoff is at the middle school level. However, she is subject to lay off via bumping by a more senior middle school teacher. Brown testified that her enrollment numbers are strong and that she is building up the high school home economics program. She also felt it would be appropriate for the middle school teacher to be placed at the only district high school that has just one home economics teacher.

Brown's concerns are understandable. However, the district properly determined that Brown could be bumped by a more senior middle school teacher. The district's decision not to redeploy its teachers to create a balance of two home economics teachers at each high school was neither arbitrary nor capricious, but instead constituted a proper exercise of its discretion.

23. Susan Myers is scheduled for lay off, but testified that she believes the tie-breaker criteria were improperly applied to her. Specifically, she believes that she should be given four tiebreaker points based on her eligibility to receive an administrator's credential. She explained that she took and passed a school leaders licensure assessment and is thus presently eligible to receive this credential, and has not received it only because it is only granted to individuals who are in fact administrators.

Even if Myers were granted the four additional tiebreaker points, she would still be subject to lay off in this proceeding. However, in order to provide possible guidance to the parties for the future, eligibility for a credential is distinct from actual possession of the credential. The district's decision to award tie-breaker points only for "each valid clear or preliminary credential *on file*" (emphasis added) was neither arbitrary nor capricious, but instead constituted a proper exercise of its discretion. Accordingly, Myers is not entitled to the additional four tie-breaker points.

24. Jacqueline Hilton was assigned a seniority date of November 26, 2007. She was employed by the district from 2002 to 2006 on a half-time basis. She resigned her district employment in June 2006. She was reemployed by the district in August 2007 on a substitute basis, and under a regular contract as of November 26, 2007. The break in Hilton's employment precludes granting her her original seniority date. Instead, the district properly determined her seniority date to be November 26, 2007.

25. Kim Ferrera was assigned a seniority date of August 16, 2006. She attended a new teacher orientation before the 2006-2007 school year began. Attendance at the orientation was voluntary. Though under the collective bargaining agreement new teachers

⁶ Further, the EETT exemption issue is moot, since the only employee who would have been skipped had sufficient seniority that she would not in any event have been laid off.

were paid a stipend if they chose to attend the orientation, program was not part of the employees' regular 185-day contract year. Thus, attendance at the orientation did not constitute a first day of paid service with the district within the meaning of section 44845, and the district properly assigned Ferrera an August 16, 2006 seniority date.

26. Tiffany Aptaker was assigned a seniority date of July 16, 2007. She served as a long-term substitute from April 30 to June 16, 2007. Since she did not serve as a substitute teacher on 75 percent of the school days during the 2006-2007 school year, the district properly excluded the period of her long-term substitute service from her seniority date.

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 as to all respondents.

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. 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.)

4. 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.)

5. 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.) 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.)

The district has an obligation under section 44955, subdivision (b), 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.)

6. If a certificated employee resigns and is thereafter reemployed, her date of employment is normally—and with exceptions inapplicable here—deemed by Education Code section 44848 to be the date of reemployment. (*San Jose Teachers Association v. Allen* (1983) 144 Cal.App.3d 627, 641.)⁷

Education Code section 44931 does not affect this conclusion. That section provides that when a permanent certificated employee resigns, and then is reemployed within 39 months, the district shall “disregarding the break in service, classify him or her as, and restore to him or her all of the rights, benefits and burdens of, a permanent employee, *except as otherwise provided in this code.*” (emphasis added). While section 44931 refers in general terms to “rights, benefits, and burdens,” section 44848 more specifically addresses the date of reemployment. As such, reemployment rights are “otherwise provided in this code” and constitute an exception to section 44931.

7. Pursuant to Education Code section 44845, certificated employees are deemed “to have been employed on the date upon which he first rendered paid service in a probationary position.”

8. Pursuant to Education Code section 44918, subdivision (a), “an employee classified as a substitute or 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.”

⁷ Section 44848 provides:

“When any certificated employee shall have resigned or been dismissed for cause and shall thereafter have been reemployed by the board, his date of employment shall be deemed to be the date on which he first accepted reemployment (if reemployed before July 1, 1947) or rendered paid service (if reemployed after June 30, 1947) after his reemployment. When an employee’s services are terminated for lack of enrollment or discontinuance of service or are otherwise interrupted in a manner declared by law not to constitute a break in service, his original order of employment shall stand.”

9. Cause exists under Education Code sections 44949 and 44955 for the Temecula Valley Unified School 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. A preponderance of the evidence sustained the charges set forth in the accusation. It is recommended that the Board give the respondents identified in Appendices A and B notice before May 15, 2010, that their services are no longer required by the District.

ORDER

The accusations served on all respondents identified in Appendices A and B are sustained. Notice shall be given to these respondents before May 15, 2010, that their services will not be required for the upcoming school year because of the reduction or discontinuation of particular services as indicated.

DATED: _____

DONALD P. COLE
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings

Appendix A

1. Acosta, Omar
2. Aptaker, Tiffany
3. Barnett, Kandra
4. Beato, Dennis
5. Benham, Dane
6. Bonaventura, Annette
7. Bonaventura, John
8. Brown, Jean
9. Brown, Jodie
10. Burlingham, Eric
11. Burnett, Eric
12. Burns, Tamara
13. Caster, Darren
14. Castro, Juan
15. Chavez, Jennifer
16. Constein, Troy
17. Cooper, Laura
18. Crabtree, Vicki
19. Cruz, Alexander
20. Cueva, Angela
21. Cunningham, Amber
22. Daley, Gretchen
23. Davis, Therese
24. DeLa Cruz, Noel
25. DeLa Cruz, Patrick
26. Denny, Kassie
27. Drago, Darren
28. Duncan, Brian
29. Easley, Andrea
30. Egus, Tanya
31. Eliaba, Jolene
32. Ellinger, Cristin
33. Farmer, Kristin
34. Ferns, Sheryl
35. Ferrera, Kim
36. Forhane, Donald
37. Foster, Emily
38. Fry, Tara
39. Fuhrman, Tammie
40. Garcia, Rachel
41. Garrison, Casey
42. Giaquinto, Michelle
43. Gradstein, Kelly

44. Grover, Sonja
45. Hagenbuch, Tanya
46. Hajdu, Andrew
47. Harris, James
48. Heeren, Bridget
49. Heid, Derek
50. Hernandez, Darcy
51. Hickey, Robert
52. Hilton, Jacqueline
53. Hoden, Heather
54. Hudson, Kyle
55. Hunter, Stephanie
56. Jackson, Tonia
57. Janis, Heidi
58. Kanow, Carynn
59. Key, Heather
60. Khoyi, Shahrzad
61. Knight, Michael
62. Lippe, Colleen
63. Lytle, Linda
64. Marble, Zsanna
65. Mason, Lindsey
66. Matzke, Theresa
67. Mills, Alan
68. Moore, Evan
69. Moore, Keith
70. Morales, Kristan
71. Morel, Christopher
72. Morrison, Creighton
73. Moser, Megan
74. Mowrer, Donald
75. Myers, Susan
76. Newton, Dana
77. Nielsen, Russ
78. O'Connor, Caroline
79. O'Sullivan, Erin
80. Palmer, Anna
81. Paul, Tarvinder
82. Pinckard, Jim
83. Pruett, Randall
84. Rascon, Ashley
85. Rasmussen, Ashley
86. Razukas, Matthew
87. Reska, David
88. Salcido, Luz
89. Santone, John

90. Scholz, Jennifer
91. Scofield, Linda
92. Simon, Felicia
93. Skumawitz, Jennifer
94. Sosa, David
95. Stevens, Michelle
96. Stone, Nicole
97. Strandberg, Sarah
98. Sumner, Jennifer
99. Tapley, Anna
100. Taratino, Debra
101. Thyfault, Wendy
102. Townley, Meagan
103. Trierweiler, Emily
104. Natalie, Waddell
105. Weeg, Robert
106. Wells, Jessica
107. Werts, Nga
108. Winger, Craig
109. Woods, Meagan
110. Woods, Timothy

Appendix B

1. Arrieta, Shannon
2. Fenny III, James
3. Fox, Andrew
4. Larrabee, Diana
5. Olin, Christine
6. Pickup, Angela