

BEFORE THE  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
LAKE ELSINORE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

OAH No. 2010030133

Respondents listed in Appendix A.

---

**PROPOSED DECISION**

Donald P. Cole, Administrative Law Judge, Office of Administrative Hearings, State of California, heard this matter in Lake Elsinore, California on April 20, 2010.

Mark W. Thompson, Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo, Attorneys at Law, represented the Lake Elsinore Unified School District.

Jon Y. Vanderpool, Tosdal, Smith, Steiner & Wax, Attorneys at Law, represented all of the respondents listed in Appendix A, except for those listed immediately below.

No appearance was made by or on behalf of respondents Amity Amacker, Julie Conaway, Stephanie Dowell, Christopher A. Jones, Laurie Luebs, Jami Passarella, Suzette Rehrer, Robert Steinbock, and Kandace Wiese.

The matter was submitted on April 20, 2010.

**FACTUAL FINDINGS**

1. Kip Meyer, Assistant Superintendent, Lake Elsinore Unified School District, made and filed the accusation dated March 10, 2010, in his official capacity as the designee of Dr. Frank Passarella, District Superintendent.

2. Respondents<sup>1</sup> are certificated district employees.

---

<sup>1</sup> Respondents are the individuals identified in Appendix A. The district initially identified other individuals for layoff or for precautionary layoff, but who are not included in Appendix A because they do not appear on the district's final proposed layoff list. Eleven individuals did not request a hearing and thus are not respondents in this matter. The majority of these individuals (Jill Daniels, Sharon King Seelman, Janet Niles, Rachael Panza, Lori Robertson, Henry Shimojyo, Yamileth Shimojyo, and Chelsea Traylor) are on the district's final layoff list. However, since they are not formally respondents, their names do not appear in Appendix A.

3. On February 11, 2010, in accordance with Education Code sections 44949 and 44955, the superintendent notified the Board of Trustees of the Lake Elsinore 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 February 11, 2010, the board adopted Resolution No. 2009-10-052, 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 2010-2011 school year were the following full time equivalent (FTE) positions:

<u>Particular Kind of Service</u>	<u>Full-Time Equivalent</u>
K-5 Elementary Teachers	133
Middle School Core Teachers	17
Middle School Keyboarding Teacher	1
Middle School Art Teacher	1
Middle School Agricultural Sciences Teacher	1
High School Life/Biology Sciences Teachers	13
High School English Teachers	5
High School Social Sciences Teachers	5
High School Mathematics Teachers	5
Physical Education Teachers	3
Counselors	9
Nurse	1
Psychologist	4

The proposed reductions totaled 195 FTE positions.

5. The board further determined in Resolution No. 09-10-052 that “competency,” as described in Education Code section 44955, subdivision (b), for the purposes of bumping, “shall necessarily include possession of: (1) A valid credential in the relevant subject matter area; (2) ‘highly qualified’ status under the No Child Left Behind Act in the position to be assumed; (3) an appropriate formal (not emergency) EL authorization, if required by the position to be assumed; and (4) for positions in earth and physical sciences, a specific credential for each and physical sciences.”

6. The board further determined in Resolution No. 2009-10-052 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 employees who have authorization to teach English Learner (EL) students, employees who are “highly qualified” in their subject matter areas and who possess the training and experience that comes therewith, and employees who possess specific credentials to teach earth and physical sciences and the training and experience that comes therewith.

7. The board directed the superintendent or his designee to determine which employees' services would not be required for the 2010-2011 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.

8. On or before March 15, 2010, 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, along with the related accusation. 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.

9. Respondents timely filed written requests for hearing and notices of defense. All pre-hearing jurisdictional requirements were met.

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

11. The services the board addressed in Resolution No. 09-10-052 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 and constituted a proper exercise of the board's 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 board.

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

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

15. Jasmine Fry teaches elementary school and has a seniority date of August 16, 2007. During the 2007-2008 school year, Fry worked a two-thirds rather than a full-time assignment. Fry worked in a full-time assignment the following school year. Fry claimed that she should have permanent status, whereas the district seniority list reflected her status

as second year probationary. The district apparently reached this conclusion based on the fact that Fry only worked a two-thirds assignment during the 2007-2008 school year. However, at the hearing, the district conceded that if its records are consistent with Fry's testimony that she worked 75% of the school days during the 2007-2008 school year, then her status should and will be changed to permanent, regardless of the fact that she worked in a part-time assignment during that year.<sup>2</sup>

16. Cynthia Seymour teaches elementary school. She was first employed by the district in 1991. She worked for five years and then took a leave of absence when her first child was born. She had a second child and extended her leave. In 1995, she was told that her leave could not be extended: She either had to return to work or resign her employment. Seymour decided to resign. She was reemployed by the district on August 19, 2004. She believed she should be given credit for her initial four to five years of district service.

In January 2010, the district sent each of its certificated employees a verification form, which provided information concerning the employee's seniority date, credentialing, and other matters relevant to a potential layoff proceeding. Seymour received such a form, and she returned it to the district after checking the box stating that the district's information (including the August 19, 2004 seniority date) was accurate. Seymour never thereafter advised the district that her seniority date was incorrect.

Pursuant to Education Code section 44848, Seymour's seniority date is the date of her reemployment. Accordingly, the district corrected determined her seniority date was August 19, 2004.

17. Kebra Deckert is a middle school counselor. The district has assigned her a seniority date of August 9, 2007. Deckert attended an AVID conference in about the third week of July 2007, and she therefore believed that her seniority date should be modified to reflect her attendance at that conference. If her position on this issue is rejected, then she believed that her seniority date should be August 1, 2007, the date she first met with her principal. Deckert testified that her principal "asked" her to attend the AVID conference. She testified that she did not believe that her attendance at the AVID conference was part of her contractual 195-day school year. She believed, but was not certain, that August 1, 2007, was part of her 195-day contract year.

When Deckert returned the January 2010 verification form, she checked the box stating that the district's information (including the August 9, 2007 seniority date) was accurate. Deckert never thereafter advised the district that her seniority date was incorrect.

Deckert's testimony did not establish that she was formally required to attend the AVID conference as a part of her 195-day employment contract or that she was paid to do so under that contract. Her testimony concerning the nature of her meeting with the principal

---

<sup>2</sup> The parties are in agreement that this change to permanent status would not affect Fry's layoff, but it would affect her placement on a recall list.

was vague, and she did not establish that that meeting was required by her contract, that it occurred during her contract year, or that she was paid to attend. As of January 2010, and for a substantial period of time thereafter, Deckert apparently believed the district had correctly assigned her correct seniority date. Based on the evidence presented, Deckert's attendance at the training conference and the meeting with the principal did not constitute her first day of paid date or probationary service with the district within the meaning of section 44845. The district correctly determined that Deckert's seniority date was August 9, 2007.<sup>3</sup>

18. Golden Crews is a high school counselor. Shortly after he signed his district employment contract in July 2009, Crews was told that his position was funded under Assembly Bill 1802<sup>4</sup> and that the position was protected as long as funding existed. Crews did not claim that he was told that his employment was itself protected.

In Resolution No. 09-10-052, the board did not segregate AB 1802 counselors from non-AB 1802 counselors. In fact, the duties of district counselors do not differ based upon the source of their funding. Regardless of which counselors are laid off, the funded AB 1802 positions will be preserved. For example, if a counselor who currently holds an AB 1802 position is laid off, that position can be filled next year by a counselor who currently holds a regular counseling position.

The decision not to segregate AB 1802 and non-AB 1802 counselors for purposes of this layoff was neither arbitrary nor capricious, and it constituted a proper exercise of the board's discretion. The layoff of Crews was proper.

19. Helen Mauldin-Pelaez is an elementary school teacher. She holds a preliminary multiple subject credential and is NCLB highly qualified to teach in a self-contained K-8 core assignment. She believed she should be able to bump several less senior teachers who were also currently in elementary school assignments, but who, though subject to layoff in terms of their seniority as elementary teachers, were able to bump into secondary school teaching positions by virtue of their credentials and authorizations. Specifically: Tom Haldeman was able to bump into a middle school math position by virtue of his supplementary authorization in math; Holly Spillman was able to bump into a middle school language arts position by virtue of her supplementary authorization in English; Sabrina McFarlane was able to bump into a high school special education position by virtue of her special education credential; and Bonnie Henry was able to bump into a middle school math position by virtue of her supplementary authorization in math. Mauldin-Pelaez does not hold a supplementary authorization and she did not identify a secondary school teaching position which she was competent and credentialed to occupy over a more junior employee.

---

<sup>3</sup> Even if Deckert were given the requested July 2007 seniority date, she would apparently still be laid off, since counselors hired well before July 2007 are also designated for layoff. Similarly, though Deckert has a multiple subject credential, elementary teachers with far more seniority than she are designated for layoff, so it would not appear that Deckert could bump into an elementary teaching position.

<sup>4</sup> Assembly Bill 1802, enacted several years ago, provided special state funding for certain public school counseling positions. As of the date of the hearing, state funding under AB 1802 was continuing.

Accordingly, the district correctly designated Mauldin-Pelaez for layoff.

20. Dana Minock teaches high school Intensive English. The district's records reflect that Minock has preliminary single subject credentials in English and health science. Minock believed the district should deem her English credential as clear for purposes of this layoff proceeding and that, if it did so, she would move up 20 to 30 places on the seniority list so that she might possibly avoid layoff either directly or through an opportunity to bump a more junior employee in another assignment. Minock testified that she could not secure a clear English credential until she had completed all EL requirements, that she completed those requirements (specifically, her CLAD coursework) in April 2009, that she did not realize until recently that her credential was still not clear, and that the paperwork by which she was to gain her clear credential was not signed until March 24, 2010. She added that the district had all of her paperwork in April 2009.

Minock returned the January 2010 verification form. She disputed certain information contained in the form, but she did *not* dispute the preliminary nature of her credentials. She was unable to explain this omission during her testimony, though she did state that the form she received from the district prompted her to look into why her credential had not yet cleared.

Minock's testimony was unclear with regard to what occurred or did not occur between April 2009 and March 2010, or what the precise reason was for the delay in having her credential cleared. The evidence did not establish that the cause was any failure on the part of the district.

The evidence established that Minock did not have a clear English or health science credential as of March 15, 2010, the deadline for the issuance of layoff notices in this matter. The district is not required to consider subsequent events. The district properly designated Minock for layoff.

21. Lori Edwards was first employed by the district on August 11, 2003. In August 2006, Edwards requested a leave of absence from her employment in order to care for her daughter, who was suffering from serious medical problems, and her daughter's infant child. Edwards testified that the district refused to grant her a leave of absence, thus requiring her to resign her district employment, effective August 17, 2006. Edwards was rehired by the district on August 16, 2007,<sup>5</sup> which the district therefore claimed was her

---

<sup>5</sup> The circumstances of Edwards' rehire are in dispute. The district claims that Edwards was rehired as a long-term substitute, that she served as a long-term substitute in the position vacated by another teacher who was on an extended leave during the 2007-2008 school year, and that Edwards was hired in a permanent position for the 2008-2009 school year. Since Edwards worked more than 75% of the 2007-2008 school year in a substitute position, the district tacked on that year of service for seniority purposes, and assigning her a seniority date of August 16, 2007. Edwards contends to the contrary that she was hired for the 2007-2008 year as a permanent employee. A resolution of this dispute is unnecessary here, however, since: (i) As noted, the district assigned Edwards a seniority date coinciding with the commencement of the 2007-2008 school year; and (ii) it is of course undisputed that Edwards is currently a permanent employee, and thus has all the rights that status confers, including those relating to this layoff proceeding.

seniority date pursuant to Education Code section 44848. Edwards, on the other hand, claimed that her break in service should not operate to cut off her original seniority date, despite section 44848, because the district's refusal to provide her with a leave of absence violated the Family Medical Leave Act.

The Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) provides certain employees with up to 12 weeks of unpaid, job-protected leave per year. It also requires that group health benefits be maintained during the leave. The FMLA applies, *inter alia*, to all employees of public elementary and secondary schools. No published California decision has addressed whether the FMLA has any applicability to teacher layoff cases under Education Code section 44955. The FMLA does not on its face, however, appear to affect the operation of the layoff statute, and the concerns underlying the FMLA appear to be distinct from those underlying the layoff statute. No authority was presented to support the position that the FMLA was intended to overrule the detailed, carefully-balanced, interrelated provisions of the layoff statute, in particular section 44848. Further, the FMLA is enforced by the U.S. Labor Department's Employment Standards Administration, Wage and Hour Division. If violations cannot be satisfactorily resolved, the Department may bring action in court to compel compliance. An eligible employee may also bring a private civil action against an employer for violations. No authority was presented to suggest that an administrative law judge has jurisdiction to enforce alleged violations of the FMLA in the context of a teacher layoff proceeding, and it is concluded that an administrative law judge lacks such jurisdiction.

Edwards also asserted that her proposed layoff was the result of discrimination by the district as a result of union activity on her part.<sup>6</sup> However, no evidence was presented to suggest possible anti-union animus against her. Further, while she claimed that the district was using the layoff proceeding also to terminate other union representatives for their engagement in protected activities, no other such employee so testified at the hearing.

Finally, Edwards, who is African American, raised several issues pertaining to alleged racial discrimination by the district in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other federal legislation. First, she asserted that the district's administration of the current layoff has a disproportionate impact on racial minority groups. In support of her position, Edwards asserted, *inter alia*, that she is the only African American teacher at her school site, that less than two percent of district teachers are African American, that many district school sites have no African American teachers, and that if the layoff proceeds as the district proposes, there will not be enough African American teachers to place even one at each school site. Second, Edwards asserted that the percentage of African American and other minority teachers in the district was substantially lower than the percentages of those groups in the general population served by the district. Edwards claimed that the relevant statistics constituted clear evidence of underrepresentation of protected groups in the district. Third, Edwards asserted that the district willfully and maliciously engaged in discriminatory practices against her on the basis of her race. In support of her position, she asserted

---

<sup>6</sup> Edwards has held several union positions, such as site representative and association grievance team member.

numerous allegations of illegal, discriminatory conduct on the part of the district since the 2006-2007 school year.

Enforcement of Title VII and other federal employment discrimination legislation is entrusted to such agencies as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and/or is conferred on private parties through civil suits. No authority was presented to suggest that an administrative law judge has jurisdiction to enforce alleged violations of civil rights statutes in the context of a teacher layoff proceeding, and it is concluded that an administrative law judge lacks such jurisdiction.

Further, no evidence was presented to suggest the district's implementation of the layoff was motivated to any extent by an actual intent to discriminate against Edwards or any other individual on the basis of race or any other improper classification. Instead, the evidence established that the district did nothing more and nothing less than attempt to administer its PKS layoff pursuant to the requirements of section 44955 without regard to racial or ethnic considerations. No legal authority was offered that any alleged disparate impact on minority groups of a non-discriminatorily motivated PKS layoff renders the layoff unlawful.<sup>7</sup>

## 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. 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."

---

<sup>7</sup> Contrary to Edwards' assertion, Education Code section 44100 does not constitute such authority.



5. 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.”

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.)<sup>8</sup>

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 constitutes 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. A preponderance of the evidence sustained the charges set forth in the accusation. 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 respondents notice before May 15, 2010, that their services are no longer required by the district.

---

<sup>8</sup> 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.”

## ADVISORY DETERMINATION

The following advisory determination is made:

The accusations served on respondents are sustained. Notice may be given to such respondents before May 15, 2010, that their services will not be required 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. Jennifer Adams
2. Karla Alfaro
3. Amanda Allen
4. Marcelino Allison
5. Maria Alvarado
6. Amity Amacker
7. Carol Anderson
8. Christian Arteaga
9. Denise Ascencio
10. Robin Bartee
11. Carolyn Bartel
12. Kimberly Baxter
13. April Beltzner
14. Allegra Benson
15. Darlene Blakeley
16. Camilla Blea
17. Brandi Blue
18. Jacob Brown
19. Matthew Brumbach
20. Denise Burton
21. Wendy Campbell
22. Michelle Carlisle
23. Teresa Casey
24. Andrea Chamberlain
25. Jady Clark
26. Robert Cleary
27. Michelle Colburn
28. Julie Conaway
29. Britni Conner
30. Norma Coronel
31. Blanca Cortez
32. Nancy Cowan
33. Golden Crews
34. Kebra Deckert
35. Sheryl deGraaff
36. Danielle Dickens
37. Julie Dietsch
38. Marie Dillon
39. Stacey Doak
40. Anthony Donley
41. Stephanie Dowell
42. Lisa Downing
43. Sarah Doyle
44. Jamie Duncan
45. Lori Edwards

46. Diana Engels
47. Steven Falls
48. Susan Fannon
49. Anne G. Fernandez
50. Steven Fitch
51. Suzanna Flournoy
52. Judith Freund
53. Jasmine Fry
54. Gloria Fuentes
55. Christine Fuori
56. Camille Galindo
57. Sara Gallandt
58. Teresita Garcia
59. Dawna Gatrost
60. Cynthia Girard
61. Dinah Greene
62. Rachel Hall
63. Jennifer Hamm
64. Carol Hawkins
65. Pauahi Harding
66. Brian Henderson
67. Amy Hernandez
68. William Hernandez
69. Monique Hinojosa
70. Derek Hoak
71. Crystal Hofmann
72. Phyllis Hofmeister
73. Devin Holveck
74. Inga Hughes
75. Tracy Jefferson
76. Christopher A. Jones
77. Karen S. Jones
78. Amy Jordan
79. Michelle Kemp
80. Kristen Kennedy
81. Janelle Kerber
82. Jamie Kirk-Warner
83. Randy Kirschman
84. Janice Klumpp
85. Carin Lamm-Genty
86. Linda Larkins
87. Robin LeBlanc
88. Betty Lightfoot
89. Cathy Locky
90. Laurie Luebs
91. Rosa Lugo-Trujillo
92. Dawn Lydon
93. Luke Majeske

94. Erick Marroquin
95. Lorraine Mauldin-Pelaez
96. Robert McEvilly
97. Kelsie McKenzie
98. Shamar McKenzie
99. Cheryl Meeks
100. Kelli Meyer
101. Rosa Meza
102. Dana Minock
103. Veronica Mondragon
104. Amanda Montemayor
105. Winston Morgan
106. Justin Morris
107. Ryan Mulvanny
108. Sarah Murillo
109. Christina Neilsen
110. Aaron Nessman
111. Michele Neubauer
112. Sandra Nicholson
113. Ronald Norwood
114. Alicia Olmos
115. Christy Ortega
116. Jami Passarella
117. Andrew Penwarden
118. Edith Pineda
119. Diane Pinto
120. Laura Podmaniczky
121. Nicole Porec
122. Jean Powell
123. Carla Price
124. Shannon Raines
125. Perla Ramirez
126. Suzette Rehrer
127. Glenda Rhea
128. Jennifer Rodriguez
129. Christopher Rogers
130. Christopher Romero
131. Amanda Ross
132. Jesse Rubner
133. Edgar Sanchez Raygoza
134. Cynthia Seymour
135. Cynthia Shafer
136. Eric Shelburn
137. Jeannie Sherman
138. Kimberly Shotts
139. Jennifer Smith
140. Tyler Smith
141. Kelly Staib

142. Jennifer Starkey
143. Robert Steinbock
144. Deanna Steria
145. Jessica Stuhlmiller
146. Wendy Sweet
147. Bernardette Thar-Flanagan
148. Cheryl Thomas
149. Heather Thomas
150. Jennifer Thomasian
151. Tisha Thomsic
152. Trina Tridwell
153. Heidi Torres
154. Shana Travers
155. Jennifer VanGinkel
156. Maria Vargar
157. Diana Vera
158. Luanne Vicnaire
159. Christina Viveros
160. Pamela Walton
161. Jamie Webber
162. Julie Whaley
163. Jason Wheelock
164. Jaimie White
165. Kandace Wiese
166. Jerry Wiley
167. Angela Williams
168. Janine Williams
169. L. Leslie Williams
170. Jennifer Wolfe
171. Laura Wooten