BEFORE THE
BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE
FONTANA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

In the Matter of the Reduction in Force Proceedings Concerning: RESPONDENTS LISTED IN APPENDICES B and C.	OAH No. 2014040003

PROPOSED DECISION

Beth Faber Jacobs, Administrative Law Judge, Office of Administrative Hearings, State of California, heard this matter on April 28, 2014, in Fontana, California.

Mark W. Thompson and Brooke E. Jimenez, Attorneys at Law, of Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo, APC, represented the Fontana Unified School District.

Marianne Reinhold, Attorney at Law, of Reich, Adell & Civitan, APC, represented all respondents listed in Appendices B and C, except for Anya P. Harvey.

There was no appearance by or on behalf of respondent Anya P. Harvey.

Prior to the hearing, the district rescinded the layoff notices served on Aleece Abbisso, Robert Aguilar, Renee Bristel, Artie Casas, Rebekah Cherniss, Jessi Carroll, Jodi Dominguez, Monica Heredia, Leticia Miranda, Mary Santini, and Hugo Sierra.

The matter was submitted on April 28, 2014.

DEFAULT

Respondent Anya P. Harvey timely requested a hearing but did not appear at the noticed hearing. The district established that it complied with Government Code sections 11505 (regarding service of documents) and 11509 (regarding notice of the hearing) for all respondents. As to respondent Harvey, this matter proceeded as a default pursuant to Government Code section 11520.

FACTUAL FINDINGS

1. David C. Creswell, Associate Superintendent of Human Resources for the Fontana Unified School District (the district) made and filed the district's Statement of Reduction in Force, dated March 13, 2014, while acting in his official capacity. Mr. Creswell signed the Statement of Reduction in Force as the duly appointed designee of the district's Superintendent.

2. Respondents listed in Appendices A, B, and C are certificated employees of the district.

Background

3. On March 12, 2014, the district's Board of Education (the board) adopted Resolution No. 14-14, which determined that it would be necessary to reduce or discontinue particular kinds of services at the end of the current school year due to staffing and financial considerations. The board determined that the following particular kinds of services, which reflect 56 full time equivalent (FTE) positions, must be reduced or discontinued for the 2014-2015 school year:

High School Automotive	1.00	F.T.E.
High School English	3.00	F.T.E.
High School Mathematics	1.00	F.T.E.
High School Social Science	2.00	F.T.E.
Middle School Core/Self-Contained	43.00	F.T.E.
Middle School Computers/Technology	1.00	F.T.E.
Middle School Physical Education	3.00	F.T.E.
High School Instructional Support/Community Liaison-Safe & Supportive Schools	2.00	F.T.E.
TOTAL CERTIFICATED POSITIONS	**56.00**	**F.T.E.**

4. The services listed in Finding Number 3 are particular kinds of services that may be reduced or discontinued within the meaning of Education Code section 44955.

5. Resolution 14-14 directed the superintendent or his designee to identify the employees whose services would not be required for the 2014-2015 school year as a result of the reduction of these particular kinds of services and to send appropriate notices to those certificated employees.

6. Under Education Code section 44955, subdivisions (b) and (c), school districts must retain senior employees over more junior employees and retain permanent employees over temporary employees. Education Code section 44955, subdivision (d), provides an exception and permits a district to deviate from terminating a certificated employee in order of seniority for either of the following reasons:

> (1) The district demonstrates a specific need for personnel to teach a specific course or course of study, or to provide services authorized by a services credential with a specialization in either pupil personnel services or health for a school nurse, and that the certificated employee has special training and experience necessary to teach that course or course of study or to provide those services, which others with more seniority do not possess.
>
> (2) For purposes of maintaining or achieving compliance with constitutional requirements related to equal protection of the laws."

7. Pursuant to Education Code section 44955, subdivision (d)(1), above, the governing board of the district resolved to deviate from terminating employees in the order of seniority. The district identified the courses or courses of study as ones creating a specific need for personnel. The board found a compelling need to employ and retain certificated employees for middle school Common Core mathematics (algebra/geometry) positions "who possess the necessary training and experience to best serve middle school students, [as] evidenced by possession of Highly Qualified ('HQ') status in mathematics under the No Child Left Behind Act ('NCLB')."

8. 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, 473-474.) The district implemented a bump analysis to identify the employees who could bump into a position being held by a junior employee. A district may move a junior employee upward from the bottom of a seniority list, "skipping" over more senior employees, so long as the junior employee is certificated and competent to render specified services that the more senior employee is not competent to render and the more junior employee is retained to render those services. (*Alexander v. Board of Trustees of the Delano Joint Union High School District* (1983) 139 Cal.App.3d 567, 572-573.) The district implemented a skipping analysis as well.

9. Resolution 14-14 included "competency" criteria for the purposes of "bumping and reemployment," which provided:

> D. That "competency" as described in Education Code section 44955(b), 44956 and 44957 for the purposes of bumping and reemployment shall necessarily include (1) HQ status under NCLB; (2) to bump a holder of a single subject credential in a departmentalized secondary assignment, an equivalent single subject credential; (3) to bump a middle school core math teacher holding HQ status in math, equivalent HQ status in mathematics; (4) to bump into a specialty position including but not limited to teacher-librarian, ASB advisor, or AVID, at least one (1) year of prior experience in the assignment within the past five (5) years, and (5) to bump into a teacher on assignment or consulting teacher/support provider position, possession of equivalent training, experience and qualifications necessary to perform the duties of the position.
>
> E. That bumping shall only be allowed in cases where the senior employee possesses 0ll [all] credentials necessary to assume the whole assignment of the junior employee.

10. There is no evidence that the district's competency criteria were arbitrary, capricious, or otherwise invalid.

11. Tie-breaking criteria were used to determine the order of termination for employees sharing the same seniority date. No issue related to use of the tie-breaking criteria was raised by any respondent.

12. On March 13, 2014, the district served forty-seven (47) certificated employees with the Notice of Recommendation that Services Will Not Be Required; the board's Resolution No. 14-14; Notice of District Statement of Reduction in Force; the district's Statement of Reduction in Force; a blank "Request for Hearing and Notice of Participation" form; and relevant sections of the California Education Code and California Government Code (collectively referred to as "layoff packets"). The layoff packets identified the reasons for the recommended reduction in force, advised the certificated employee of his or her right to a hearing, and explained that if the employee wanted to participate in a hearing, he or she must send written request for a hearing by March 26, 2014, or the employee's right to a hearing would be deemed waived.

13. The 47 employees to whom layoff notices were issued are listed in Appendix A, which is attached and incorporated herein.

14. Of these employees, 39 timely submitted a "Request for Hearing and Notice of Participation" to determine if there was cause for not reemploying that employee for the 2014-2015 school year. Those certificated employees timely requesting a hearing are

respondents in this matter and are identified in Appendix B, which is attached and incorporated herein.

15. Antonio C. Alvarado, Anna Arguijo, Arlene Arroyo, Kathlyn Cleary, Monique Marintez, Erica Perea, Yessenia Rojas, and Nicole White did not request a hearing. The district may proceed with termination notices against these employees by way of default under Government Code section 11520.

16. In accordance with Government Code section 11509, on April 11, 2014, the district served all respondents with a Notice of Hearing, advising each respondent that a hearing had been set for April 28, 2014.

17. All prehearing jurisdictional requirements were satisfied.

Additional Evidence

18. Assistant Superintendent Creswell assumed his district position as head of Human Resources in December 2013. Mr. Creswell testified about the rationale for reducing the particular kinds of services reduced by the district. According to Mr. Creswell, the district was losing its QEIA funding source, which previously was used to fund smaller middle school classes. In addition, because of a change in Common Core under No Child Left Behind (NCLB), middle school math is moving to an integrated approach, rather than separate classes in algebra, math 7 or math 8. This led to a goal of ensuring a sufficient number of teachers who were highly qualified (HQ) under NCLB to teach Common Core middle school algebra and/or geometry. As a result, middle school positions having an algebra and geometry component and requiring HQ status under NCLB were slated to be skipped. The purpose was to protect HQ math teachers at the middle school level.

19. The district considered all positively assured attrition in determining the actual number of final layoff notices that needed to be delivered to its certificated employees.

Stipulations

20. The district and all respondents except for Ms. Harvey entered into numerous stipulations. They stipulated that the board used tie-breaking criteria adopted the prior year, on March 6, 2013, in Resolution No. 13-14; that the district timely served the certificated employees layoff notices; that those employees requesting a hearing (respondents) were timely served notice of hearing; and that all jurisdictional requirements under Education Code sections 44949 and 44955 had been met.

Layoff Rescissions

21. Prior to the hearing, the district rescinded the layoff notices issued to the following certificated employees: Aleece Abbisso, Robert Aguilar, Renee Bristel, Artie

Casas, Rebekah Cherniss, Jessi Carroll, Jodi Dominguez, Monica Heredia, Leticia Miranda, Mary Santini, and Hugo Sierra.

Challenges Made by Certain Respondents

22. Respondent Ashley Milakovich[1] challenged the district's issuance of a layoff notice to her. Ms. Milakovich was initially skipped, then bumped, and thereafter subject to a more junior person having his layoff noticed rescinded. She contends that she was impermissibly bumped and that the district, by rescinding the layoff notice of a more junior person, impermissibly retained an employee with less seniority to render a service she is certificated and competent to teach.

Ms. Milakovich's seniority date is September 19, 2013. Her status is probationary I, and she holds a Multiple Subject teaching credential and a supplemental subject matter authorization in Introductory Math (IM I). Her credentials authorize her to teach up to and including a 9th grade math curriculum to students in grades 9 through 12. She is currently teaching middle school common core Algebra/Science 8 Core, which is an advanced math class for middle school students, and requires HQ math status under NCLB. By virtue of her supplemental qualification, Ms. Milakovich is highly qualified in math under NCLB.

Ms. Milakovich was initially skipped because her assignment was one of the HQ middle school math positions identified for skipping. However, Ms. Milakovich was bumped by Reza Kavianian, a permanent employee with a seniority date of August 9, 2007. Mr. Kavianian holds a clear Multi Subject credential and supplemental credentials in math and business. Reza Kavianian's assigned middle school math class did not require HQ status and was a particular kind of position eliminated or reduced by the district. Ms. Milakovich argued that she was improperly bumped because she believes her subject matter authorization is higher than Mr. Kavianian's supplemental credential in math and renders her more qualified. The bumping criteria, however, did not make the distinction. Under Resolution 14-14, section D(3), a more senior teacher is competent to bump a middle school common core mathematics (algebra/geometry) teacher holding HQ status in mathematics with "an equivalent HQ status in mathematics." This criteria was not arbitrary or capricious. Both teachers hold an equivalent highly qualified status in mathematics. Consequently, the district properly determined that Mr. Kavianian, who is HQ in math under NCLB and has an earlier seniority date than Ms. Milakovich, should bump Ms. Milakovich under the criteria established in Resolution 14-14.

Ms. Milakovich also asserted that after several individuals had their layoff notices rescinded, she remained on the layoff list even though she had greater seniority than Hugo Sierra, whose layoff notice was among those rescinded. Ms. Milakovich contends the district

---

[1] Ms. Milakovich is identified on the district's seniority list as reference number 1959.

may not lay her off while retaining Mr. Sierra, who is a more junior employee.[2] Mr. Sierra's seniority date is November 8, 2013, his status is probationary 0, and he is currently teaching high school mathematics. He holds a single subject credential in foundational level math. By virtue of his credentials, he is, as is Ms. Milakovic, highly qualified in mathematics under NCLB.

The evidence established that Mr. Sierra is qualified and authorized to teach 9th and 10th grade math curriculum to students in the 9th through 12 grades. No evidence was offered, however, to establish Mr. Sierra's current assignment (whether it is 9th or 10th grade math curriculum, or both), nor his specific assignment for the 2014-2015 school year. If Mr. Sierra is assigned to teach 9th grade math curriculum, Ms. Milakovich is competent and qualified to teach that class.

When Mr. Creswell, the Associate Superintendent of Human Resources and only witness for the district, was initially asked why the layoff notice for Mr. Sierra was rescinded and the notice for Ms. Milakovich was not, he did not have an answer. While he could identify that Ms. Milakovich held a subject matter authorization in math and that Mr. Sierra held a foundational level authorization, and that under NCLB both were highly qualified in math, when asked about the difference between these credentials, Mr. Creswell testified that he was "not sure of the difference." He testified that he had no reason to think that he didn't follow the correct bumping procedures, and that Resolution 14-14, subdivision (d) was applied to both bumping and rescission of layoffs. He later testified that he felt that Mr. Sierra had "greater breadth" in what he could teach, but his testimony was equivocal, at best. He did not articulate any need for specific instruction at the high school level, a requirement that high school teachers must be able to teach more than one year's curriculum, or any specific criteria other than that identified in the Resolution.

In closing argument, the district's counsel argued that it was appropriate to retain Mr. Sierra, a more junior teacher, over Ms. Milakovich, a more senior certificated employee, because Mr. Sierra would have greater "versatility" in teaching high school math. In support, the district cited *Bledsoe v. Biggs Unified School District* (2008) 170 Cal.App.4th 127, 131. *Bledsoe* does not assist the district on this issue. With respect to the issue of "versatility," the court in *Bledsoe* discussed the determination of seniority among two individuals <u>who shared the same seniority date</u> and concluded that an employee having a more "versatile" credential in an area "where the district anticipated needing to move teachers" had seniority over the other with the same seniority date. (*Bledsoe v. Biggs Unified School District*, *supra*, 170 Cal.App.4th 127, 133.) The "versatility" comment in *Bledsoe* is not on point because Ms. Milakovich and Mr. Sierra do not share the same seniority date; Ms. Milakovich is senior to Mr. Sierra.

Bledsoe also addressed skipping – where a more junior teacher is retained over a more senior certificated teacher. In *Bledsoe*, the district <u>articulated</u> a specific need for teachers to

---

[2] On the district's seniority list, Hugo Sierra's reference number is 1971.

teach in a community day school, which required special training and experience to perform those duties. Mr. Bledsoe was skipped over by two junior certificated employees who were retained by the district to teach at the community day school. The court upheld the skipping, emphasizing a litany of distinctions between Mr. Bledsoe's experience and that of the more junior employees who were retained to teach at the community day school. It concluded that "the evidence supports the finding that Bledsoe does not possess the special training and experience that [the more junior, retained teachers] possess," for teaching in that program. (*Bledsoe v. Biggs Unified School District, supra,* 170 Cal.App.4th 127, 142.) The court emphasized two required components that permit skipping under Education Code, section 44955, subdivision (d)(1): "a district must not only establish a specific need for personnel to teach a specific course of study, but establish that the certificated employee it proposes to retain 'has special training and experience necessary to teach that course or course of study or to provide those services." (*Bledsoe, supra*, at p. 138.)

In this case there was no evidence provided about a specific need for high school math teachers to be able to teach more than 9th grade, or a requirement that high school math teachers must be able to teach both 9th and 10th grade curriculum. There was no testimony about the district's anticipated needs for high school, the specific assignment taught by Mr. Sierra, or the specific assignment that he would be assigned to teach in 2014-2015. Although counsel for the district argued that it would be important to retain a high school teacher who can teach 9th and 10th grade math curriculum over a teacher who could teach only 9th grade curriculum, there was no evidence presented on that issue; indeed, the repeated emphasis was on the need to protect highly qualified middle school math teachers at the IMI level, not high school.

In order to retain Mr. Sierra over Ms. Milakovich, the district must establish that no junior certificated employee was scheduled to be retained to perform services a more senior employee was certificated and competent to render – that Mr. Sierra, although junior to Ms. Milakovich, was retained to perform services that Ms. Milakovich is not competent to perform. Ms. Milakovich is certificated and competent to teach 9th grade math to high school students, grades 9 through 12. She has greater seniority than Mr. Sierra. Without evidence concerning the specific grade curriculum that that Mr. Sierra was retained to provide, the district failed to prove that Ms. Milakovich is not competent to render the services for which Mr. Sierra is being retained. Her layoff notice must be dismissed.

23. Respondent Jennifer Quezada challenged the issuance of a layoff notice to her. Her status is probationary II; her seniority date is August 16, 2012; and she holds a Multiple Subject credential, as well as a single subject credential in English.[3] She teaches language arts and has an additional certification as an ALD (academic learning development) teacher for students undergoing long-term English learning. Two of her class periods are ALD, and this is the second year the district has offered the program. Ms. Quezada was bumped by a

[3] On the seniority list, Ms. Quezada's reference number is 1877.

senior employee, Julia Lopez, reference number 1847, who teaches high school English and holds a Single Subject credential in English with a BCLAD in Spanish.

Ms. Quezada felt that her two ALD classes should have been considered a specialty assignment and taken into consideration under the criteria in Resolution 14-14, subdivision (D)(4), related to bumping into specialty assignments.[4] She emphasized that to earn her ALD certification, the district required that she receive 40 hours of additional training and provided a substitute teacher for her while she attended that training. According to Ms. Quezada, the employee who bumped her, Ms. Lopez, does not have an ALD. Ms. Quezada believed that her ALD should be considered a specialty and that she could be bumped only by an individual who had at least one year of ALD service in the past five years.

Ms. Quezada's ALD certification was not listed on the seniority list, as she had not realized the significance of including it on the list. According to Ms. Quezada, another employee, Felishia Santiago, reference number 1867, also took the ALD training at the same time she did. Ms. Quezada explained that Ms. Santiago also held the ALD certification; that Ms. Santiago's ALD certification was included on the seniority list; that Ms. Santiago was also given a layoff notice, and that she was also bumped by a more senior teacher who did not hold an ALD certification. Ms. Quezada believed that both she and Ms. Santiago were improperly bumped.

Under Resolution 14-14, the bumping criteria in section D(4) permits a senior teacher to bump into "a specialty position <u>including but not limited to</u> teacher-librarian, ASB advisor, or AVID." (Emphasis added.) Ms. Quezada believed that ALD should be among those included as a specialty position. Although Ms. Quezada has received training that is valuable to the district, she did not establish that ALD is the type of specialty position for which section D(4) – and special bumping rights - were created. Consistent with the district's argument that ALD is not a specialty for which the special bumping rules in section D(4) apply, there was no evidence that any teacher holding an ALD certification was spared, nor evidence that the district had previously considered teaching ALD to be a specialty position.

The District properly issued the layoff notices to respondents Quezada and Santiago.

24. The services that the Board proposed to reduce were "particular kinds of services" that can 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.

25. The Board's reduction or discontinuance of particular kinds of services related to the welfare of the District and its pupils. The reduction or discontinuance of particular

---

[4] This criteria established that "to bump into a specialty position including but not limited to teacher-librarian, ASB advisor, or AVID, [the bumping teacher must have] at least one (1) year of prior experience in the assignment within the past five (5) years."

kinds of services was necessary to decrease the number of certificated employees of the district as determined by the board.

LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

1. Jurisdiction in this matter exists under Education Code sections 44949 and 44955. All notices and jurisdictional requirements contained in these sections are 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. The decision to reduce or discontinue a particular kind of service is matter reserved to the district's discretion and is not subject to second-guessing in this proceeding. (*Rutherford v. Board of Trustees of Bellflower Unified School District, supra,* 64 Cal.App.3d 167.) A school district's decision to reduce a particular kind of service must not be fraudulent, arbitrary or capricious. (*San Jose Teachers Association v. Allen* (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 627, 637.)

4. 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 discontinuance of particular kinds of services is related solely to the welfare of the schools and their pupils.

5. Education Code section 44955, subdivision (c) requires districts to make assignments in such a way as to protect seniority rights. Employees must be retained to render any service their seniority and qualifications entitle them to render. Thus when a senior teacher and is certificated and competent to render a service a junior teacher is rendering, the district must retain the senior teacher. The burden of proof is on the district to establish that it is justified in terminating the employment of any senior teacher. (Evid. Code, § 500.)

6. Education Code, section 44955, subdivision (d), authorizes a district to deviate from issuing certificated employee terminations in order of seniority for either of the following two reasons:

> 1. The district demonstrates a specific need for personnel to teach a specific course or course of study, or to provide services authorized by a services credential with a specialization in either pupil personnel services or health for a school nurse . . . .

2. For purposes of maintaining or achieving compliance with constitutional requirements related to equal protection of the laws.

Ms. Milakovich received a termination notice while a more junior teacher had his termination notice rescinded and was retained. The district argued that his credentials gave him more versatility at the high school level. The district, however, did not present evidence as required under Education Code section 44955, subdivision (d)(1), to "demonstrate a specific need for personnel to teach a specific course or course of study." The district failed to prove that Ms. Milakovich is not certificated and competent to render the services that a junior employee is being retained to render.

7. Other than Ms. Milakovich, no employee with less seniority than any respondent is being retained to perform a service that any respondent is certificated and competent to render.

8. Other than with respect to Ms. Milakovich and respondents whose notices have been rescinded, cause exists to give notice to respondents that their services will not be required for the 2014-2015 school year.

9. Appendix C, which is attached and incorporated, is the list of respondents who may receive notice that their services will not be required for the 2014-2015 school year. The list does not include those individuals who did not request a hearing, referred to above in Finding of Fact Number 15, and against whom the district may proceed with termination notices by way of default under Government Code section 11520.

ORDER

1. Except as to Ashley M. Milakovich, the district's Statement of Reduction in Force is sustained.

2. The district shall not give a layoff notice to Ashley M. Milakovich. The Statement of Reduction in Force is dismissed as to Ms. Milakovich.

3. The district may give notices to the employees in Appendix C that their employment will be terminated at the close of the current school year and that their services will not be required for the 2014-2015 school year.

DATED: May 7, 2014

_____

BETH FABER JACOBS
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings

APPENDIX "A"

FONTANA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

All Certificated Employees Served with Layoff Notice

1.	ABBISSO	ALEECE
2.	ABUNDIS	SANDY C.
3.	AGUILAR	ROBERT
4.	ALVARADO	ANTONIO C.
5.	ANDERSON	MARCO L.
6.	ARGUIJO	ANNA P.
7.	ARROYO	ARLENE B.
8.	BRISTEL	RENEE
9.	CABALLERO	APRIL A.
10.	CAMACHO	WENDY L.
11.	CARROLL	JESSI
12.	CASAS	ARTIE
13.	CHERNISS	REBEKAH
14.	CLEARY	KATHLYN M.
15.	CYPHER	MELISSA J.
16.	DELGADO-ORAMAS	MELANIE A.
17.	DOLVEN	TIFFANY F.
18.	DOMINGUEZ	JODI
19.	DUPAS	AMY I.
20.	FIGUEROA	JENNIFER
12.	GALVEZ	LAURA B.
22.	GARCES	ANA O.
23.	GREEN	MICHELLE L.
24.	HAMMOND	JULIA M.
25.	HARVEY	ANYA P.
26.	HEREDIA	MONICA
27.	HERNANDEZ	KRISTINA L.
28.	JIMENEZ	PATSY J.
29.	JUHAS	DAWN M.
30.	KIRBY	VERLENE K.
31.	MARTINEZ	MONIQUE S.
32.	MILAKOVICH	ASHLEY M.
33.	MIRANDA	LETICIA
34.	MORENO	REY A.
35.	MUHAREB	SAHAR S.
36.	PEREA	ERICA N.
37.	PEREZ	MEGAN M.
38.	PINON	GUSTAVO
39.	QUEZADA	JENNIFER
40.	RIGGIO-OCAMPO	CLARICE M.
41.	RODRIGUEZ	VERONICA
42.	ROJAS	YESSENIA M.
43.	SANTIAGO	FELISHIA M.
44.	SANTINI	MARY
45.	SIERRA	HUGO
46.	WHEELER	RACHEL E.
47.	WHITE	NICOLE S.

APPENDIX "B"

FONTANA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Respondents – Employees Timely Filing a Request for Hearing & Notice of Participation

1.	ABBISSO	ALEECE E.
2.	ABUNDIS	SANDY C.
3.	AGUILAR	ROBERT J.
4.	ANDERSON	MARCO L.
5.	BRISTEL	RENEE
6.	CABALLERO	APRIL A.
7.	CAMACHO	WENDY L.
8	CARROLL	JESSI
9.	CASAS	ARTIE A.
10.	CHERNISS	REBEKAH i.
11.	CYPHER	MELISSA J.
12.	DELGADO-ORAMAS	MELANIE A.
13.	DOLVEN	TIFFANY F.
14.	DOMINGUEZ	JODI M.
15.	DUPAS	AMY I.
16.	FIGUEROA	JENNIFER
17.	GALVEZ	LAURA B.
18.	GARCES	ANA O.
19.	GREEN	MICHELLE L.
20.	HAMMOND	JULIA M.
21.	HARVEY	ANYA P.
22.	HEREDIA	MONICA
23.	HERNANDEZ	KRISTINA L.
24.	JIMENEZ	PATSY J.
25.	JUHAS	DAWN M.
26.	KIRBY	VERLENE K.
27.	MILAKOVICH	ASHLEY M.
28.	MIRANDA	LETICIA
29.	MORENO	REY A.
30.	MUHAREB	SAHAR S.
31.	PEREZ	MEGAN M.
32.	PINON	GUSTAVO
33.	QUEZADA	JENNIFER
34.	RIGGIO-OCAMPO	CLARICE M.
35.	RODRIGUEZ	VERONICA
36.	SANTIAGO	FELISHIA M.
38.	SIERRA	HUGO
39.	WHEELER	RACHEL E.

37. SANTINI MARY R.

APPENDIX "C"

FONTANA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Final Layoff List – Respondents

1.	ABUNDIS	SANDY C.
2.		
3.	ANDERSON	MARCO L.
4.		
5.		
6.	CABALLERO	APRIL A.
7.	CAMACHO	WENDY L.
8.		
9.	CYPHER	MELISSA J.
10.	DELGADO-ORAMAS	MELANIE A.
11.	DOLVEN	TIFFANY F.
12.	DUPAS	AMY I.
13.	FIGUEROA	JENNIFER
14.	GALVEZ	LAURA B.
15.	GARCES	ANA O.
16.	GREEN	MICHELLE L.
17.	HAMMOND	JULIA M.
18.	HARVEY	ANYA P.
19.	HERNANDEZ	KRISTINA L.
20.	JIMENEZ	PATSY J.
21.	JUHAS	DAWN M.
22.	KIRBY	VERLENE K.
23.		
24.		
25.	MORENO	REY A.
26.	MUHAREB	SAHAR S.
27.		
28.	PEREZ	MEGAN M.
29.	PINON	GUSTAVO
30.	QUEZADA	JENNIFER
31.	RIGGIO-OCAMPO	CLARICE M.
32.	RODRIGUEZ	VERONICA
33.		
34.	SANTIAGO	FELISHIA M.
35.	WHEELER	RACHEL E.
36.		