

BEFORE THE
GOVERNING BOARD
OF THE
RIVERSIDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Layoff/Accusation
Against:

200 CERTIFICATED EMPLOYEES,

Respondents.

OAH No. 2010030980

PROPOSED DECISION

This matter came on regularly for hearing before Roy W. Hewitt, Administrative Law Judge, at Riverside, California on April 26 and 30, 2010.

Bradley E. Neufeld, Esq. of Gresham, Savage, Nolan & Tilden, PC represented the Riverside Unified School District (the district).

Marianne Reinhold, Esq. of Reich, Adell & Cvitan represented all respondents who participated in the hearing with the exception of Teri Stamen, Taryn Ontiveros and Terrilyn Bresette-Neve.

William J. Ward, Esq. represented respondent Teri Stamen (respondent Stamen).

Taryn Ontiveros and Terrilyn Bresette-Neve represented themselves.¹

Oral and documentary evidence was received and the matter was submitted on April 30, 2010.

FACTUAL FINDINGS

1. On February 1, 2010, the Governing Board of the district (the board) adopted Resolution number 2009/10-32, determining that it would be necessary to reduce or

¹ Taryn Ontiveros participated in part of the hearing and then left the hearing after determining that she had no issues pertaining to these proceedings. Terrilyn Bresette-Neve discussed her issue(s) with district representatives and elected not to participate in the hearing.

discontinue particular kinds of services (PKS) at the end of the current school year. The board determined that the PKS that must be reduced for the 2010-2011 school year were the following full time equivalent (FTE) positions:

<u>PKS</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Elementary Teachers: Class Size Reduction (3d Grade)	51.0
Elementary Teachers: Class Size Reduction (K-2)	73.0
Total FTE positions to be reduced or eliminated	<u>124.0</u>

The services listed above are PKS, which may be reduced or discontinued within the meaning of Education Code section 44955.

2. On February 1, 2010, the board adopted Resolution number 2009/10-36, determining that it would be necessary to reduce or discontinue particular kinds of services (PKS) at the end of the current school year. The board determined that the PKS that must be reduced for the 2010-2011 school year were the following full time equivalent (FTE) positions:

<u>PKS</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Elementary Teachers	36.0
Total FTE positions to be reduced or eliminated	<u>36.0</u>

The services listed above are PKS, which may be reduced or discontinued within the meaning of Education Code section 44955.

3. On February 16, 2010, the board adopted Resolution number 2009/10-45, determining that it would be necessary to reduce or discontinue particular kinds of services (PKS) at the end of the current school year. The board determined that the PKS that must be reduced for the 2010-2011 school year were the following full time equivalent (FTE) positions:

<u>PKS</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Assistant Principals	34.0
Instructional Services Specialist	14.0
Total FTE positions to be reduced or eliminated	<u>48.0</u>

The services listed above are PKS, which may be reduced or discontinued within the meaning of Education Code section 44955.

4. On February 16, 2010, the board adopted Resolution number 2009/10-40, determining that it would be necessary to reduce or discontinue particular kinds of services (PKS) at the end of the current school year. The board determined that the PKS that must be reduced for the 2010-2011 school year were the following full time equivalent (FTE) positions:

<u>PKS</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Business Teacher	1.0
Elementary Teachers	8.0
English Teachers	9.0
Home Economics Teachers	3.0
Mathematics Teachers	4.0
Music Teachers	3.0
Science Teachers	4.0
Social Studies Teachers	8.0
Spanish Teachers	5.0
Special Education Teachers	7.0
Visual Arts/Art Teacher	1.0
Total FTE positions to be reduced or eliminated	<u>53.0</u>

The services listed above are PKS, which may be reduced or discontinued within the meaning of Education Code section 44955.

5. On February 16, 2010, the board adopted Resolution number 2009/10-46, determining that it would be necessary to reduce or discontinue particular kinds of services (PKS) at the end of the current school year. The board determined that the PKS that must be reduced for the 2010-2011 school year were the following full time equivalent (FTE) positions:

<u>PKS</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Elementary Teachers: Class Size Reduction (K-3)	19.0
Total FTE positions to be reduced or eliminated	<u>19.0</u>

The services listed above are PKS, which may be reduced or discontinued within the meaning of Education Code section 44955.

6. On March 1, 2010, the board adopted Resolution number 2009/10-48, determining that it would be necessary to reduce or discontinue particular kinds of services (PKS) at the end of the current school year. The board determined that the PKS that must be reduced for the 2010-2011 school year were the following full time equivalent (FTE) positions:

<u>PKS</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Counselors	4.0
Total FTE positions to be reduced or eliminated	<u>4.0</u>

The services listed above are PKS, which may be reduced or discontinued within the meaning of Education Code section 44955.

7. On March 1, 2010, the board adopted Resolution number 2009/10-49, determining that it would be necessary to reduce or discontinue particular kinds of services (PKS) at the end of the current school year. The board determined that the PKS that must be reduced for the 2010-2011 school year were the following full time equivalent (FTE) positions:

<u>PKS</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Art Teachers	6.0
English Teachers	15.0
French Teacher	1.0
Health Teachers	2.0
Home Economics Teachers	1.8
Mathematics Teachers	14.0
Science Teachers (Life and Physical)	14.0

Social Studies Teachers	14.0
Spanish Teachers	6.0
Total FTE positions to be reduced or eliminated	<u>73.0</u>

The services listed above are PKS, which may be reduced or discontinued within the meaning of Education Code section 44955.

8. On March 1, 2010, the board adopted Resolution number 2009/10-50, determining that it would be necessary to reduce or discontinue particular kinds of services (PKS) at the end of the current school year. The board determined that the PKS that must be reduced for the 2010-2011 school year were the following full time equivalent (FTE) positions:

<u>PKS</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Elementary Teacher	0.6
English Teachers	11.8
Health Teacher	0.8
Home Economics Teacher	0.2
Mathematics Teachers	2.8
Physical Education Teacher	0.8
Science Teacher (Life)	0.6
Science Teacher (Physical)	0.8
Social Science Teachers	2.6
Spanish Teachers	2.0
Special Education Teacher	0.2
Total FTE positions to be reduced or eliminated	<u>23.2</u>

The services listed above are PKS, which may be reduced or discontinued within the meaning of Education Code section 44955.

9. On March 1, 2010, the board adopted Resolution number 2009/10-51, determining that it would be necessary to reduce or discontinue particular kinds of services

(PKS) at the end of the current school year. The board determined that the PKS that must be reduced for the 2010-2011 school year were the following full time equivalent (FTE) positions:

<u>PKS</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Business Teacher	0.6
Elementary Teachers	2.0
English Teachers	0.8
Mathematics Teacher	0.8
Science Teacher (Life)	1.4
Social Science Teacher	0.2
Special Education Teacher	0.2
Total FTE positions to be reduced or eliminated	<u>6.0</u>

The services listed above are PKS, which may be reduced or discontinued within the meaning of Education Code section 44955.

10. On March 11, 2010, the board adopted Resolution number 2009/10-57, determining that it would be necessary to reduce or discontinue particular kinds of services (PKS) at the end of the current school year. The board determined that the PKS that must be reduced for the 2010-2011 school year were the following full time equivalent (FTE) positions:

<u>PKS</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Librarians	11.6
Total FTE positions to be reduced or eliminated	<u>11.6</u>

The services listed above are PKS, which may be reduced or discontinued within the meaning of Education Code section 44955.

11. On March 11, 2010, the board adopted Resolution number 2009/10-58, determining that it would be necessary to reduce or discontinue particular kinds of services (PKS) at the end of the current school year. The board determined that the PKS that must be reduced for the 2010-2011 school year were the following full time equivalent (FTE) positions:

<u>PKS</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Adult Education	18.0
Total FTE positions to be reduced or eliminated	<u>18.0</u>

The services listed above are PKS, which may be reduced or discontinued within the meaning of Education Code section 44955.

12. Based on the board’s resolutions, the Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources, designee for the Superintendent of the district, recommended, with regard to the ensuing school year, that the board reduce or eliminate the specified PKS provided by the district for the 2010-2011 school year by notifying the certificated employees listed in Exhibit A, attached hereto, that their services will not be required for the 2010-2011 school year.²

13. The district’s recommendations and the board’s decisions to reduce or discontinue the services listed in Findings 1 through 11, above, were neither arbitrary nor capricious; rather, the recommendations and decisions were based on the projected 50 million dollar budget deficit. Thus, the board’s decisions represent proper exercises of its discretion.

14. The reduction and discontinuation of services is related to the welfare of the district and its pupils, and it has become necessary to decrease the number of certificated employees as determined by the board.

15. The Assistant Superintendent designated the respondents, permanent or probationary teachers employed by the district, by creating a seniority list, first selecting teachers to be laid off in the inverse of the order in which they were employed, then assigning and reassigning employment in such a manner that all employees to be retained will be retained so as to render services which their seniority and qualifications entitle them to render.

16. Prior to March 15, 2010, the certificated employees (respondents) listed in Exhibit A, attached hereto, affected by the layoffs received written notice notifying them that, pursuant to Education Code sections 44949 and 44955, their services “will be terminated at the end of the current school year:”

17. On March 26, 2010, the Superintendent of the district made and filed an accusation in his official capacity.

² Originally, over 400 FTE positions were slated for layoff; however, by the second day of hearing (April 30, 2010) the number of respondents was reduced to the 200 respondents identified in Exhibit A, attached hereto. Consequently, this proposed decision focuses exclusively on the Exhibit A respondents.

18. Prior to March 15, 2010, all respondents were served with copies of the board resolutions, a Notice of Recommendation that Services Will Be Terminated, a Request for Hearing form, and copies of Education Code sections 44949 and 44955. The Notice of Recommendation that Services Will be Terminated advised respondents as follows:

“You are hereby notified that the undersigned has recommended to the Governing Board of the School District that you be given notice that your services may be terminated at the close of the current school pursuant to Education Code sections 44949 and 44955. The reasons for this action are set forth in the attached Resolutions adopted by the Governing Board on February 1, 2010.

You are advised you may request a hearing to determine if there is cause for not reemploying you for the 2010-2011 school year.

Your request for hearing must be in writing and delivered before February 19, 2010. If you fail to request the hearing on or before this date, your failure will constitute a waiver of your right to a hearing.”
(Exh. 25.)

19. All 200 respondents timely submitted their notices of defense requesting a hearing to determine if cause exists for not re-employing them for the ensuing year.

20. Each respondent who requested a hearing and filed a Notice of Defense was timely served with a Statement to Respondent, a copy of the Accusation, Copies of Education Code sections 44949 and 44955 and Government Code sections 11506, 11507.5, 11507.6, 11507.7 and 11520, a Blank Notice of Defense and a Notice of Hearing that properly notified respondents of the date, time, and place of the instant hearing.

21. All prehearing jurisdictional requirements were met.

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

23. The district has considered, and continues to consider all positively assured attrition.

24. The layoffs will not reduce any of the district’s offerings in code mandated courses below the level required by law.

25. The following issues were raised during the hearing:

- a) Should respondent Melissa Gill (Gill) be allowed to “tack” on one year of seniority?

- b) Does long-term substitute experience with the district count as “Prior contracted certificated experience” with the district for purposes of acquiring one (1) tie-breaking point?
- c) Should certain training taken by some respondents prior to the start of their first school year with the district be considered in determining those respondents’ seniority dates?

26. The issues set forth in Finding 25, above, do not alter the fact that the 200 respondents listed in Exhibit A, attached hereto, will remain subject to being laid off in the instant reduction in force (RIF) proceedings. Since jurisdiction in this matter only extends to a recommendation concerning the RIF, the district’s relevancy objection to the evidence concerning these issues was sustained. However, there were concerns expressed about the proper forum in which such issues should be resolved, as they are important issues that relate to recall and substitute teaching order. It seems that the only procedural mechanism currently in place to address differences in opinion concerning seniority dates is by way of Writ proceedings in the Superior Court.³ In order to minimize the need to resort to Writ proceedings that would only serve to further burden the already over-burdened Superior Courts, the ALJ elected to receive evidence on the seniority issues and include a recommendation concerning those issues in the instant recommendation to the board concerning the relevant RIF evidence. In view of this recurring problem in RIF proceedings the parties, through their bargaining units, are encouraged to establish administrative procedures, whether through the Office of Administrative Hearings or a similar agency, to address seniority issues when differences arise. With respect to the seniority issues presented in the instant proceedings, the evidence revealed the following:

- a) Gill was hired as an intern on July 27, 2005 and worked in that capacity until she was released from service on June 30, 2006. Gill was then rehired as a “Sub” on August 28, 2006, approximately two months after her June 30, 2006 release. Gill worked as a “Sub” for the district at Educational Options Center for 51 days and was then hired as a “Prob 1” on November 13, 2006. Given this employment history, Gill should be given credit for one year of prior service to be “tacked on” to her current seniority date.
- b) Board resolution number 2009/10-38, which was duly adopted by the board on February 1, 2010, established tie-breaking criteria that apply to certificated probationary employees with shared seniority dates. Pursuant to this resolution, criterion F provides that certificated probationary employees with “prior contracted certificated experience” with the district are credited with one (1) tie-breaking point. If, as suspected, the respondents with prior long-term substitute experience with the district worked under contract with the district for their long-

³ In this regard, the ALJ finds that the parties have no administrative remedies currently in place; therefore, they have exhausted their administrative remedies for purposes of pursuing Writs in the Superior Court.

term employment they should be credited with one (1) tie-breaking point for their prior teaching experience.

- c) Testimony was presented that focused on several types of training that were taken by certain respondents during the summer break, prior to the start of the official school year. The trainings included new teacher training/orientation, technology training for newly designed, state of the art classrooms, GATE training, and “Houghton-Mufflin” training. The district intended to convey the information to respondents that although it was not mandatory for them to attend training in the summer, before the start of the school year, it was mandatory that they complete the training within a reasonable time after commencing their employment with the district, whether on weekends, during the school day, or after hours. District schedules for the programs revealed that there were dates for training during the school year as well as during the summer, before the school year commenced. Notwithstanding the district’s intent, the evidence revealed that in numerous instances school principals provided only partial information to respondents that led them to reasonably believe that summer training, prior to the start of the school year, was mandatory so that they would be up to speed with new techniques and new technology before the first day of class. Although the respondents were paid at the contractually agreed upon reduced “in service” training rate of pay, the teachers were only aware of the fact that they were being paid for their services and assumed they were getting the reduced rate because they were not fully engaged in classroom teaching. Respondents, who were newly hired teachers, did not question the site principals about the need to attend the summer trainings because they were thankful for their employment and did not want to start out by being perceived as less than fully committed to their teaching careers. In some cases, respondents canceled pre-planned vacations, diverted their family and child care duties to others, and made other sacrifices to clear their schedules so they could attend the “mandatory” training.

Administrative Proposed Decisions regarding what constitutes the “first date of paid service” for purposes of establishing seniority dates focus on evaluating the evidence to see if the training was mandatory or voluntary and whether the teachers were paid a per diem rate of pay based on their employment contract rate of pay. However, there is no statute, regulation, or case law that expressly states that the first day of paid service has to be at per diem rate based on an employee’s contractual rate of pay. Consequently, it seems that the rate of pay is only one factor to be considered in evaluating whether the training was mandatory or voluntary. Certainly, if teachers are not being paid for their training the training date can not be their first day of “paid” service. However, if they are being paid for the training, even at a reduce rate of pay, it is a “paid” day of service. The pivotal question boils down to whether the paid service is “mandatory.” If it is mandatory and the teachers are paid, it is then the first day of paid service for purposes of establishing a seniority date.

The district and the school site principals control the flow of information to the teachers. It is up to the district and its agents (the school principals and administrators) to make it clear to new teachers when training is mandatory. Consequently, for purposes of determining when training is “mandatory,” the analysis, which is factually based, must focus upon what an ordinary, reasonably prudent, person (ORPP) in the same or similar position would have reasonably believed. In the present instance, the testimony of respondents Teri Stamen, Jamie Aballi, Danielle Wertz, and Amanda Etheredge established that they, and respondents in their same situations, reasonably believed that the summer training sessions they attended were mandatory. Their testimony further established that an ORPP in their position would have reasonably reached the same conclusions. They were paid for their attendance and they, and other respondents in the same or similar situations, should be credited with their first date of training attendance as their initial seniority dates.

27. Pursuant to the stipulation of the parties, the layoff notices were rescinded and the accusation was dismissed as to Alexander Bumpus and Mary Gonzalez; therefore, they are not listed on Exhibit A, attached hereto. Additionally, pursuant to stipulation, several seniority dates were changed with respect to certain respondents. Since those modifications have already been made and the changes do not alter the fact that those respondents remain part of the instant RIF proceedings, that information will not be set forth herein.

LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

1. Jurisdiction for the instant proceedings exists pursuant to Education Code sections 44949 and 44955, and all notices and other requirements of those sections have been provided/met, as required.

2. The services listed in Factual Findings 1 through 11 are PKS that can be reduced or discontinued pursuant to Education Code section 44955. The board’s decision to reduce or discontinue the identified services was neither arbitrary nor capricious, and was a proper exercise of its discretion.

3. Based on the Factual Findings, considered in their entirety, cause exists to reduce the number of certificated employees of the District due to the budget crisis described in Factual Finding 13.

4. Cause to reduce or discontinue services relates solely to the welfare of the District’s schools and pupils within the meaning of Education Code section 44949.

5. No junior certificated employee is scheduled to be retained to perform services which a more senior employee is certificated and competent to render.

6. Cause exists to notify all of the respondents listed in Exhibit A, attached hereto, that their services will not be needed during the 2010-2011 school year due to reduction or discontinuance of PKS

ADVISORY DETERMINATION

WHEREFORE, THE FOLLOWING ADVISORY DETERMINATIONS are hereby made:

1. The Accusation is sustained. The district shall notify the 200 respondents listed in Exhibit A, attached hereto, that their services will not be needed during the 2010-2011 school year due to lack of funds and the resulting need to reduce or discontinue PKS.

2. The district shall re-evaluate and alter district personnel records in conformity with the recommendations contained in Finding 26.

DATED: May ___, 2010

ROY W. HEWITT
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings

EXHIBIT "A"

Respondents in Alphabetical Order as of April 30, 2010

- 1) Joy Abad
- 2) Jamie Aballi
- 3) Maria Aguayo
- 4) Zachariah Aguirre
- 5) Carina Alejo
- 6) Frank Allen
- 7) Ana Andalon
- 8) Elizabeth Arceo
- 9) Patricia Ascencio
- 10) Guadalupe Avila
- 11) Ivette Barajas
- 12) Oswaldo Baraj
- 13) Angelica Barboza Dominguez
- 14) Brandi Bauder
- 15) Brendy Berry
- 16) Michelle Birchak
- 17) Roberta Blasjo
- 18) Victor Blass
- 19) Laura Boling
- 20) Terrilynn Bresette-Neve
- 21) Jaimianne Brewer
- 22) Catherine Breyer
- 23) Danica Brisco
- 24) Keren Broderick
- 25) Clarissa Brown
- 26) Longina Burroughs
- 27) Natalie Bushman
- 28) Jedidiah Butler
- 29) Michael Caliari
- 30) AneshaCamacho
- 31) Sami Cash
- 32) Krystal Cauffiel
- 33) Tracy Cauthen
- 34) Kathleen Clark
- 35) Lacey Clark
- 36) Michelle Clayton
- 37) Aaron Codiga
- 38) Joanna Contreras
- 39) Sabine Cooke
- 40) Elizabeth Copeland
- 41) April Corby
- 42) Heather Crane
- 43) Jennifer Curl
- 44) Sophie Curtin

- 45) Cathy Decker
- 46) Andrea Dedic
- 47) Mary DeGuzman
- 48) Monica Diaz-Hewatt
- 49) Scott Dickerson
- 50) Lily Dinh
- 51) April Donahoo
- 52) Robin Doneff
- 53) Nancy Esparza
- 54) Amanda Etheredge
- 55) Mary Everett
- 56) Elizabeth Faulkner
- 57) Heather Feeley
- 58) Casey Finfrock
- 59) Valerie Flotron
- 60) Sarah Francis
- 61) Kristal Fryan
- 62) Luis Fuentes
- 63) Kelly Gaffney
- 64) Deborah Garner
- 65) Erin Garrett
- 66) Daniel Genung
- 67) Melissa Gill
- 68) Edward Gonsalves
- 69) Daniel Gonzalez
- 70) Maria Gonzalez
- 71) Elizabeth Good
- 72) Wendy Gore
- 73) Sara Gramalki
- 74) Jeanette Gray
- 75) Charity Greenwalt
- 76) Kimberly Grote
- 77) Jalyn Guidangen
- 78) Timothy Hall
- 79) Shaun Harris
- 80) Billie-Joyce Hatzidakis
- 81) Natalie Hernandez
- 82) Claudia Herrera
- 83) Lorena Herrera
- 84) Heather Holland
- 85) Robert Hutcheson
- 86) Laurie Irvin
- 87) Jessica Jimenez
- 88) Casondra Johnson
- 89) Troy Johnson
- 90) Nylma Jorns
- 91) Philip Kasinski
- 92) Moira Kaufhold

- 93) Hermann Kieffer
- 94) Elizabeth Kimble
- 95) Jenna King
- 96) Kristin Kitagawa
- 97) Amanda Kraft
- 98) Christina Kras
- 99) Melissa Kromas
- 100) Delmi Lara
- 101) Kristina LaRochelle
- 102) Tracy Lawrence
- 103) Karla Lechuga
- 104) Mi Yeon Lee
- 105) Rene Levario
- 106) Lindsay Litvinoff
- 107) Vanessa Lopez
- 108) Kimberly Luginbill
- 109) Kimberly Lukens
- 110) Karina Marquez
- 111) Brandi Marsh
- 112) Marjorie Mathews
- 113) Stacy Mattson
- 114) Catherine McBride
- 115) Jayme McCabe
- 116) Karlene McCann
- 117) Kristina McCann
- 118) Kristi McCormack
- 119) Sara McDonnell
- 120) Erin Medina
- 121) Mary Michalak
- 122) Dax Mims
- 123) Mari Miranda
- 124) Dawn Monte
- 125) Guadalupe Morales
- 126) Lucrecia Moreno
- 127) Gloria Murrietta
- 128) Brandi Neal
- 129) Vincent Olague
- 130) Heather Olea
- 131) Taryn Ontiveros
- 132) LisaMarie Orosco
- 133) Giovanni Ortiz
- 134) Marissa Padilla
- 135) Kathleen Parker
- 136) Gloria Peña
- 137) Donna Perez
- 138) Viviana Perez
- 139) Julie Pfeiffer
- 140) Stephanie Pfeiffer

- 141) Shanda Pham
- 142) Marina Porrás-Codiga
- 143) Philene Potter
- 144) Randi Potwardowski
- 145) Christina Ramirez
- 146) Cindy Ramos
- 147) Articia Reed (Wheeler)
- 148) Casey Richards
- 149) Cheryl Richardson
- 150) Coretta Richardson
- 151) Tina Ricketts
- 152) Jennifer Riddle
- 153) Tasha Runyan
- 154) Shiva Salehpour
- 155) Casey Salinas
- 156) Cristina Sanchez
- 157) Stefanie Santana
- 158) Matthew Saucedo
- 159) Kristen Schechtman
- 160) Kimberly Schmit
- 161) Kendra Schwartz
- 162) Julie Serna
- 163) Crystal Sheplor
- 164) Lezlie Sheskey
- 165) Joy Sinclair
- 166) Deborah Smith
- 167) Kristyn Smith
- 168) Tiffany Speck
- 169) Jennifer Squire
- 170) Teri Stamen
- 171) Carol Stevens
- 172) Marisol Stokes
- 173) Vanessa Stoneberg
- 174) Jillian Tandeski
- 175) Jose Tapia
- 176) Julie Tenette
- 177) Janet Terry
- 178) Jennifer Thomas
- 179) Yselle Thomas
- 180) Frances Torres
- 181) Linda Tran
- 182) Brandi Troxel
- 183) Michelle Umana
- 184) Tabitha Ungarayawong
- 185) Matthew Van
- 186) Alicia Vannatter
- 187) Vanessa Vasquez
- 188) Sandra Villasenor

- 189) Raphaela Wallace
- 190) Anna Waters
- 191) Danielle Wertz
- 192) Toya West
- 193) Melinda Wickstrom
- 194) Nicole Wilder
- 195) Alexia Wilson
- 196) Angelita Yadao-Payad
- 197) Sonya Younan
- 198) Lizandra Zavala
- 199) Anthony Zlaket
- 200) Gina Zlaket