

BEFORE THE
GOVERNING BOARD OF THE
GROSSMONT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

OAH No. 2012030413

RESPONDENTS LISTED IN EXHIBIT "A"

PROPOSED DECISION

Administrative Law Judge Vallera J. Johnson, State of California, Office of Administrative Hearings, heard this matter in El Cajon, California, on April 11, 2012.

William A. Diedrich, Esq. and Amy W. Estrada, Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo, represented Complainant Steven L. Sonnich, Associate Administrator, Human Resources, Grossmont Union High School District.

There was no appearance by or on behalf of Respondents Richard Hogue, Cody Kuhliken and/or David Yang.

Respondents Michele Frans and Anthony Santana were present and represented themselves.

With the exception of Respondents Richard Hogue, Cody Kuhliken, David Yang, Michele Frans and Anthony Santana, Fern M. Steiner, Esq., and Jon R. Cadieux, Esq., Tosdal Smith Steiner & Wax represented Respondents listed in Exhibit 24.

The matter was submitted on April 23, 2012.¹

¹The record remained open for additional documentary evidence and closing briefs.

On April 16, 2012, the parties filed Stipulation to the Admission of Additional Exhibits into Evidence. Attached to this Stipulation were:

- Exhibit 29 (List of all permanent and probationary certificated employees of the Grossmont Union High School District who are partially assigned to a categorical program or project)

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED DECISION

The Board of Education of the Grossmont Union High School District determined to reduce or discontinue particular kinds of services provided by teachers for budgetary reasons. The decision was not related to the competency and/or dedication of the individuals whose services the Board seeks to reduce or eliminate.

District staff carried out the Board's decision by using a selection process involving review of credentials and seniority, "bumping" and breaking ties between/among employees with the same first date of paid service. The selection process was in accordance with the requirements of the Education Code.

FACTUAL FINDINGS

1. Respondents listed in Exhibit "A" (Respondents) are certificated employees of the Grossmont Union High School District (District).

2. On March 7, 2012, Ralf Swenson, the District's Superintendent (Superintendent), notified the District's Governing Board (Board) of his recommendation to reduce and/or eliminate particular kinds of services due to financial conditions for the 2012 - 2013 school year.

3. On March 7, 2012, the Board adopted Resolution No. 2012-44 reducing or eliminating particular kinds of services for the ensuing school year and establishing "competency" criteria for purposes of displacement. In a separate resolution, the Board adopted criteria for breaking ties in seniority related to the certificated layoffs. The Board directed the Superintendent or his designated representative to send notices to all employees possibly affected by the reduction or elimination of particular kinds of services.

-
- Exhibit 30 (Organizes information regarding permanent and probationary certificated district employees at least partially assigned to a categorical program or project by subject areas in which these Employees are competent and credentialed to teach or otherwise render service. Also, Exhibit 30 consolidates the information with information regarding temporary employees in categorical programs during the 2011-2012 school year (contained in Exhibit 23).

Pursuant to the Stipulation of Parties, Exhibits 29 and 30 are admitted into evidence.

On April 18, 2012, the District's Closing Brief was filed (Exhibit 31). Respondents' Closing Brief was filed on April 20, 2012 (Exhibit 32). On April 23, 2012, District's Reply to Respondents' Closing Brief was filed on April 23, 2012 (Exhibit 33).

On April 23, 2012, the record was closed, and the matter was submitted.

Resolution No. 2012-44 states in pertinent part:

Administrators	6.5	F.T.E.
Art Teachers	2.0	F.T.E.
Business Teachers	1.6	F.T.E.
Counselors	7.0	F.T.E.
Curriculum Specialists	1.0	F.T.E.
English Teachers	12.6	F.T.E.
French Teachers	1.6	F.T.E.
German Teachers	0.333	F.T.E.
Home Economics Teachers	1.0	F.T.E.
Home Choice Teachers	1.0	F.T.E.
Industrial & Technology Education Teachers	2.8	F.T.E.
Mathematics Teachers	7.0	F.T.E.
Music - Instrumental Teachers	1.4	F.T.E.
Opportunity/Phoenix/E2020 Teachers	1.8	F.T.E.
Physical Science Teachers	0.6	F.T.E.
Social Science Teachers	5.8	F.T.E.
Special Education (LH SAI Teachers)	5.0	F.T.E.
Special Education (PH/DIS [Home Hospital] Teachers)	1.0	F.T.E.
Special Education (Psychologists)	1.0	F.T.E.
Subtotal	61.033 55.033	F.T.E.

*CATEGORICAL SERVICES AS FOLLOWS		
Business Teachers	0.333	F.T.E.
Child Development Teachers	2.0	F.T.E.
Counselors	1.0	F.T.E.
English Teachers	8.2	F.T.E.
Industrial & Technology Education Teachers	1.267	F.T.E.
Life Science Teachers	1.4	F.T.E.
Mathematics Teachers	4.0	F.T.E.

Subtotal	18.2	F.T.E.
ADULT EDUCATION SERVICES AS FOLLOWS		
Computer Teachers	1.0	F.T.E.
Career Change Teachers	1.0	F.T.E.
GED Test Preparation Teachers	4.0	F.T.E.
Employment Advisors	5.0	F.T.E.
Subtotal	11.0	F.T.E.
Total Certificated Employees	90.233 84.233	F.T.E.

**Inclusion of categorically funded services within this Resolution is not intended to grant those individuals who are impacted any rights greater than provided by law, nor to nullify any provisions within each impacted individual's employment contract, nor to supersede any other Resolution by this Governing Board to release or otherwise terminate the services of any impacted individual.*

The proposed reductions totaled 84.233 full-time equivalent (FTE) positions.

4. The Board established “competency” criteria in its Resolution, which states in part:

[¶ . . . ¶]

- D. That, for those employees other than those serving in Adult School positions, “competency” as described in Education Code section 44955(b) for the purposes of bumping shall necessarily include: (1) possession of a valid credential in the relevant subject matter area; (2) “highly qualified” status under the No Child Left Behind Act in the position into which the employee is bumping; (3) an appropriate EL authorization (if required by the position)²; and (4) with respect to specialty positions such as JROTC Instructor, Special Education Program Specialist, Safe and Supportive Schools (S3) Grant Coordinator, and/or AVID teachers, at least one (1) complete year of experience in the position or assignment within the last three (3) years.
- E. That, for those employees serving in Adult School Positions, “competency” as described in Education Code section 44955(b) for the purposes of bumping shall

² For employees serving in positions identified for layoff that do not require an EL authorization competency Criteria 3 shall not apply.

necessarily include: (1) possession of a valid credential in the relevant subject matter area; and (2) at least one (1) complete year of experience in the District within the last three (3) years in the subject matter area to be assumed (based on curriculum rather than course title)³

The Board established the competency criteria for purposes of bumping or displacing more junior employees with senior employees who were competent and credentialed to hold the position held by the junior employees. There is no evidence that the competency criteria were arbitrary or capricious or otherwise invalid.

5. Between/among employees who first rendered paid service to the District on the same date, the Board adopted Resolution No. 2012-44, “Resolution to Adopt Criteria for Resolving Ties in Seniority Related to Certificated Layoffs”, and provided clear instruction for implementation of the criteria. The order of termination under the tie-breaking criteria was based on the needs of the District and its students.

6. On March 8, 2012, Steven Sonnnich, the District’s Associate Administrator, Human Resources (Associate Administrator), served permanent and probationary certificated Respondents with “Notice of Recommendation That Services Will Not Be Required” (Notice), relevant portions of Board Resolution No. 2012-44 and stated the reasons for the Board’s action. In addition, the Notice included the Accusation Against Respondents (made and filed by the Superintendent on March 8, 2012), blank Request for Hearing and Notice of Defense, and relevant sections of the Education Code and the Government Code. The District’s Associate Administrator advised Respondents of the right to hearing, that the Request for Hearing and Notice of Defense must be delivered to the District’s office no later than March 26, 2012, and that the failure to request a hearing would constitute waiver of the right to hearing.

7. On March 8, 2012, the District’s Associate Administrator served Respondents (under a temporary contract of employment) with “Notice of Release from Temporary Employment/Right to Request a Hearing” (Notice). In the Notice, the District’s Associate Administrator stated, in pertinent part:

Please be advised that on March 7, 2012, the Governing Board of the Grossmont Union High School District took action to release you as a temporary certificated employee, effective June 30, 2012 or upon the expiration of your temporary contract, whichever is first. This notice is provided pursuant to the terms of your employment contract and/or Education Code section 44954.

³ For those employees serving in Adult School classes, bumping shall only be permitted within the Adult School Program. No Adult School employee may displace an employee in the District’s general or special education programs.

In addition to this letter, the District has provided you with a notice of layoff and right to request a hearing in connection with the layoff proceedings applicable to probationary and permanent employees under Education Code sections 44949 and 44955. **Please read that packet carefully.** This notice is provided to you as a precaution by the District. Based on your service under a valid temporary contract of employment, the District believes you are correctly classified as a temporary employee, and not entitled to participate in the layoff or hearing process. However, that packet is provided in the event you believe, or it is determined, your status is other than that of a temporary employee, and you wish to contest your release as a temporary employee or otherwise seek a determination whether there is cause for not reemploying you for the next school year.

By providing this right to request a hearing, it is not the District's intent to convert your temporary employment status to that of a probationary or permanent employee. In the event it is determined you are a probationary or permanent employee by operation of law, your right to a hearing, and any accompanying layoff rights, has been afforded under Education Code sections 44949 and 44955 via that notice.

He attached a copy of relevant portions of Board Resolution No. 2012-44 and stated the reasons for the Board's action. In addition, the Notice included the Accusation Against Respondents (made and filed by the Superintendent on March 8, 2012), Request for Hearing and Notice of Defense, and relevant sections of the Education Code and the Government Code. The District's Associate Administrator advised Respondents of the right to hearing, that the Request for Hearing and Notice of Defense must be delivered to the District's office no later than March 26, 2012, and that the failure to request a hearing would constitute waiver of the right to hearing.

8. Respondents submitted a timely Request for Hearing and Notice of Defense to determine if there was cause for not re-employing him or her for the ensuing school year.

9. On March 26, 2012, the District served Notice of Hearing in accordance with Government Code section 11509 on Respondents, setting the hearing for April 11, 2012.

10. All prehearing jurisdictional requirements were satisfied.

11. There was no appearance by or on behalf of Respondents Richard Hogue, Cody Kuhlken and David Yang.

12. The District rescinded layoff notices issued to Respondents Marguerite Rohmer, Bridgett Desonia and Jose Garcia.

13. The District seeks to release temporary employees in the EIA/SCE⁴ and QEIA⁵ programs, categorically funded programs.

14. Respondent Jennifer Serban (Respondent Serban) and Respondent Ashley Worth (Respondent Worth) entered into contracts with the District to perform services in the EIA/SCE program, a categorically funded program, not required by federal or state statute.

The District identified the contract for which the services were performed. Respondent Serban's contract was effective August 31, 2011, and Respondent Worth's contract was effective January 30, 2012. Each contract terminated on June 21, 2012. Each contract indicates that the certificated employees were hired pursuant to Education Code section 44909 and were temporary employees. Respondents Serban and Worth were employed for the "entire or remaining term of the contract or project."

Through the EIA/SCE program, the District receives supplemental funds from the State for economic impact aid. Typically it is targeted for students who need assistance increasing their English language abilities.

In order to receive funding for the EIA program (as well as some other categorically funded programs), the District submits a Consolidated Categorical Funding Application (Application) to the California Department of Education. When the funding is authorized, the duration of funding is a fiscal year. In this case, funding for the EIA/SCE program is for July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012. As such, the funding allocation ends on June 30, 2012. The District has not received funding for this categorical program for the 2012/2013 school year, and the Application is not due for the ensuing school year until June 2012. As such, the District's Associate Administrator of Human Resources testified that he cannot state with confidence that the EIA/SCE funding will be available for 2012 - 2013 school year; at this time, the District does not have EIA/SCE funding for the 2012 - 2013 school year; if the District does not receive the EIA/SCE funding, the District will end the project for the 2012 - 2013 school year. Considering the foregoing facts, it is determined that the District's EIA/SCE program is a year-to-year categorical program; funding for the EIA/SCE program will terminate on June 30, 2012; termination of funding constitutes expiration of the EIA/SCE program.

Based on the foregoing, the District intends to release Respondents Serban and Worth.

15. Respondents Alicea Leroy, Marilyn Sue Asch, Michelle Clark-Cadwell, Tara Egipto, Travis Engstrand, Michael French, Annika Goodin, Cleophus Harris Jr., Sophia Jacoub, Jose Lucero, Erica Luster, Matthew McGlenn, Carma Sanchez and Matthew Udvarhelyi (collectively referred to as QEIA temps) entered into contracts with the District

⁴ EIA/SCE Program is an acronym for Education Impact Aid/State Compensatory Education.

⁵ QEIA is an acronym for Quality Education Investment Act.

to perform services in the QEIA program, a categorically funded program, not required by state or federal statute.

The District identified the contract for which the services were performed. Each of the QEIA temps has a contract with the District with specific effective and termination dates. Each contract states that these certificated employees were hired pursuant to Education Code section 44909 and that they were temporary employees. Once they were assigned 44909 contracts to serve in the QEIA program, the QEIA temps served only in their identified categorically funded assignments and no other. These employees were thus employed for the “entire or remaining term of the contract or project.”

The District’s Associate Administrator of Human Resources described the QEIA Program. It was a product of a settlement of a lawsuit by the California Teachers’ Association and the State of California that involved a “dispute about funding that should have come to education in prior years” that did not. The agreement was to create a mechanism by which those funds would be provided to schools that had test scores that were considered to be under achieving.

Funding for the QEIA program traditionally lasts for seven years. The District first received QEIA funds in the 2007 – 2008 school year. At that time, the District implemented the QEIA program and hired categorical temps. In addition, they hired probationary and permanent employees in this program. It has continued since the 2007 – 2008 school year. By letter, dated February 28, 2012, the District’s Superintendent was notified that one of its schools did not meet one or more of the QEIA program requirements in the 2010 – 2011 school year. As a consequence QEIA funding will terminate effective June 30, 2012. Termination of funding constitutes expiration of the QEIA program

Based on the foregoing, the District intends to release the QEIA temps.

16. The District considered all positively assured attrition in determining the actual number of final layoff notices to be delivered to its certificated employees.

17. Jeanette Liljestrom, the District’s executive secretary, Human Resources (Executive Secretary), was responsible for implementing the technical aspects of the layoff. She developed a seniority list for probationary or permanent certificated employees who received preliminary notices of layoff. It included, among other matters, the teacher’s name, seniority date, status, site, assignment, and credential(s), credential(s) subjects authorization and English Language Learner Authorization (if any).

The seniority date was based on the first date of paid service rendered in a probationary status.⁶

⁶ Education Code section 44845

18. The District's Executive Secretary used the seniority list to develop a proposed order of layoff. Then, she determined whether the least senior employees subject to the layoff held credentials in another area that would entitle them to "bump" into the position held by a more junior employee. In determining who would be laid off for each kind of service reduced, she counted the number of reductions and determined the impact on incumbent staff in inverse order of seniority. Then, the District's Executive Secretary checked the credentials of affected individuals and whether they could "bump" other employees, considering the District's "competency" criteria established by the Board in its Resolution.

19. Some employees named as Respondents have the same seniority date. In compliance with Education Code section 44955, subdivision (b), in order to determine the order of termination of employees with the same seniority date, the Board adopted "Resolution to Adopt Criteria for Resolving Ties in Seniority Related to Certificated Layoffs." According to the evidence in the record, the District properly applied the criteria to rank employees hired on the same date.

20. The services that the District 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.

21. The Board's reduction or elimination of particular kinds of services related to the welfare of the District and its pupils. The reduction or elimination of particular kinds of services was necessary to decrease the number of certificated employees of the District as determined by the Board.

22. No certificated employee junior to any Respondent has been retained to perform services that any Respondent was certificated and competent to render.

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 Education Code 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 vs. Board of Trustees* (1976) 64 Cal.App.3d 167, 178-179.)

3. 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 the pupils thereof.

4. Respondents Serban and Worth and the QEIA temps contend that their release as temporary employees is improper because the criteria in *Stockton*⁷ have not been satisfied, arguing that the EIA/SCE and QEIA programs have not been terminated; as such, they are entitled to be treated as probationary employees and therefore entitled to the due process protections of Education Code sections 44949 and 44955 prior to a separation from employment.

5. Education Code section 44909 states in pertinent part:

The governing board of any school district may employ . . . certificated employees in programs and projects to perform services conducted under contract with public or private agencies, or categorically funded projects which are not required by federal or state statutes. The terms and conditions under which such persons are employed shall be mutually agreed upon by the employee and the governing board and such agreement shall be reduced to writing . . . Service pursuant to this section shall not be included in computing the service required as a prerequisite to attainment of, or eligibility to, classification as a permanent employee unless . . . Such persons may be employed for periods which are less than a full school year and may be terminated at the expiration of the contract or specially funded project without regard to other requirements of this code respecting the termination of probationary or permanent employees other than Section 44918. Whenever any certificated employee in the regular educational program is assigned to a categorically funded project not required by federal or state statute and the district employs an additional credentialed person to replace that certificated employee, the replacement certificated employee shall be subject to the provisions of Section 44918. . .

6. As reflected in case law, categorically funded teachers are treated like temporary employees. (*Zalac v. Ferndale Unified School District* (2002) 98 Cal.App.4th 838, 840-841 [A kindergarten teacher's first two years of employment was as a temporary employee in a categorically funded program pursuant to Education Code section 44909].) In *Bakersfield Elementary Teachers Association v. Bakersfield City School District* (2006) 145 Cal.App.4th 1260, the Court of Appeal found that teachers in categorically funded positions "are treated in much the same way [as temporary employees] in that they may be dismissed without the formalities required for probationary and permanent employees in the event the program expires or is terminated, and their service does not count toward acquiring

⁷ *Stockton Teachers Ass'n CTA/NEA v. Stockton Unified Sch. Dist.* (2012) 2012 Cal.App.LEXIS 372.

permanent status (unless they are reemployed the following year in a probationary position).” However, the *Bakersfield* Court, citing *Zalac*, noted the purpose of Education Code section 44909 was “to prevent a person from acquiring probationary status solely through teaching in a categorically funded program. This permits the hiring of qualified persons for categorically funded programs of undetermined duration without incurring responsibility to grant tenured status based on such teaching services alone.” [Citation.] The section ‘was intended to give school districts flexibility in the operation of special educational programs to supplement their regular program and to relieve them from having a surplus of probationary or permanent teachers when project funds are terminated or cut back.’ [Citation.]” (*Bakersfield Elementary Teachers Association v. Bakersfield City School District*, *supra*, 145 Cal.App.4th 1260, 1286.) To characterize categorically funded Respondents as probationary employees would be contrary to that purpose. (See also *Haase v. San Diego Community College District* (1980) 113 Cal.App.3d 913 [for additional support through analysis of a certificated employee in a categorically funded position in a community college district not found to be a probationary employee].)

7. *Stockton Teachers Ass’n v. Stockton Unified Sch. Dist.* (2012) 2012 Cal.App. LEXIS 372 is the newest decision interpreting Section 44909. In this case, the Court held that, in order to release an employee as temporary under Education Code section 44909, a District must:

- a. Prove the employee was hired to perform services conducted under a contract with public or private agencies or categorically funded projects that are not required by federal or state statutes;
- b. Identify the particular contract or project expired;
- c. Establish when the particular contract or project expired; and
- d. Show that the employee was hired for the same or remaining term of the contract or project.

In this case, based on the evidence in this record (Findings 14 and 15), it was established that the District satisfied the *Stockton* criteria. Considering the evidence regarding the status of funding the EIA/SEC and QEIA programs, to hold otherwise would be contrary to the purpose of the statute (Section 44909), i.e. “to benefit school districts by allowing them to operate special programs outside their regularly funded programs, without having a surplus of probationary or permanent employees when such special programs expire.” (*Stockton Teachers Ass’n v. Stockton Unified Sch. Dist.* (2012) 2012 Cal.App. LEXIS 372 at 5 (citing *Zalac v. Bd. of Ferndale Unified Sch. Dist.* (2002) 98 Cal.App.4th 838, 845.)

8. The District proved the four elements of the *Stockton* case with regard to its EIA/SEC program. Therefore, the District properly released Respondents Serban and Worth as temporary employees when they released them from District employment.

9. The District proved the four elements of the *Stockton* case with regard to the QEIA program. Therefore, the District properly released Respondents Alicea Leroy, Marilynn Sue Asch, Michelle Clark-Cadwell, Tara Egipto, Travis Engstrand, Michael

French, Annika Goodin, Cleophus Harris Jr., Sophia Jacob, Jose Lucero, Erica Luster, Matthew McGlenn, Carma Sanchez and Matthew Udvarhelyi as temporary employees when they released them from District employment.

10. The District may dismiss Respondents Serban and Worth and the QEIA temps in the manner the law allows regarding temporary employees. It is noted that the District served these Respondents with the jurisdictional documents and provided them the opportunity to participate in the instant hearing. These Respondents participated in the hearing to the fullest extent possible, as if probationary or permanent employees. Had the administrative law judge concluded that categorically funded Respondents were probationary, they would have been entitled to the hearing that was had and in which they participated.

11. A senior teacher whose position is discontinued has the right to transfer to a continuing position that he/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 vs. Richmond Unified School District* (1975) 13 Cal.3d 469.)

12. The District has the discretion to determine whether teachers are certificated and competent to hold the position for which said teachers have been skipped and retained. (*King v. Berkeley Unified School District* (1979) 89 Cal.App.3d 1016.) Junior teachers may be given retention priority over senior teachers if the junior teachers possess superior skills or capabilities that their more senior counterparts lack. (*Poppers v. Tamalpais Union High School District* (1986) 184 Cal.App.3d 399; *Santa Clara Federation of Teachers, Local 2393 v. Governing Board of Santa Clara Unified School District* (1981) 116 Cal.App.3d 831).

13. The District established cause to not reemploy Respondents for the ensuing school year, and Respondents did not establish facts or sufficient legal argument to the contrary.

14. No employee with less seniority than any Respondent is being retained to perform a service that any Respondent is certificated and competent to render.

15. All arguments not addressed herein are not supported by the evidence and/or the law and therefore rejected.

ORDER

1. The layoff notices issued to Respondents Marguerite Rohmer, Bridgett Desonia and Jose Garcia are rescinded. The Accusation served upon Respondents Marguerite Rohmer, Bridgett Desonia and Jose Garcia is dismissed.

2. Except as provided in the foregoing paragraph of this Order, the Accusation served on Respondents listed on Exhibit “B” is sustained; notice shall be given to these

Respondents listed on Exhibit “B” before May 15, 2012, that their services will not be required for the 2012-2013 school year because of the reduction or discontinuance of particular kinds of services.

3. Notice shall be given in inverse order of seniority.

DATED: May 3, 2012

VALLERA J. JOHNSON
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings

GROSSMONT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

EXHIBIT “A”

Elizabeth Ayres
Kelsey Beeman
Lauren Boaz
Shawn Callen
Heidi Choi
Kellan Cobbs
Julie Cremata
Anthony Devine
Carolyn Diasparra
Melissa Drake
Carrin Edwards
Lindsey Engle
Michael Erickson
Michael Fleming
Karl Franz
Tamara Frazier
Michele Frens
Anthony Garcia
Jose Garcia
Amber Garrett

Leroy Alicea
Marilynn Sue Asch
Michelle Clark-Cadwell
Bridgett Desonia
Tara Egipto
Travis Engstrand
Michael Fleming

Marian Doherty
Laurie Hamilton
Malinda Henry
Denise Hernandez

Jonathan Geraci
Kathryn Gerstenberg
Caralyn Hamilton
Richard Hogue
Tania Jackson
Cody Jenkins
Brienne Jones
Louann Kirby
Holly Knudson
Cody Kuhlken
Kathleen Leonard
Douglas Martin
Larry Martinsen
Dustin Millsap
Gary Mowrey
Tracy Mueller
Daniel Neighbors
Michael Nguyen
Jordana Onstot
Alicia Owens

Michael French
Annika Goodin
Cleophus Harris Jr.
Sophia Jacoub
Louann Kirby
Jose Lucero
Erica Luster

Andrew Peifer
Susan G. Taylor
Renee Turchin
Mary Wilson

Stephanie Pagano
Gwenne Pagarigan
Michele Patten
Stephanie Picon
Barbra Ruggles
Anthony Santana
Sandra Saravia
Rebecca Short
Brian Smith
Robert Stirling
Guadalupe Sturgeon
Megan Tiffany
Natalie Vasquez
Oralia Ventura
Raymond Webb
Richard Wilkerson
Nicholas Williams
Amanda Wolfe
David Yang
Jean Zelt

Matthew McGlenn
Marguerite Rohmer
Carma Sanchez
Jennifer Serban
Matthew Udvarhelyi
Nicholas Williams
Ashley Worth

Lesley Kennedy
Marian Kubota
Rae Woolrich

GROSSMONT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

EXHIBIT “B”

Elizabeth Ayres
Kelsey Beeman
Lauren Boaz
Shawn Callen
Heidi Choi
Kellan Cobbs
Julie Cremata
Anthony Devine
Carolyn Diasparra
Melissa Drake
Carrin Edwards
Lindsey Engle
Michael Erickson
Michael Fleming
Karl Franz
Tamara Frazier
Michele Frens
Anthony Garcia
Jose Garcia
Amber Garrett

Marian Doherty
Laurie Hamilton
Malinda Henry
Denise Hernandez

Jonathan Geraci
Kathryn Gerstenberg
Caralyn Hamilton
Richard Hogue
Tania Jackson
Cody Jenkins
Brienne Jones
Louann Kirby
Holly Knudson
Cody Kuhlken
Kathleen Leonard
Douglas Martin
Larry Martinsen
Dustin Millsap
Gary Mowrey
Tracy Mueller
Daniel Neighbors
Michael Nguyen
Jordana Onstot
Alicia Owens

Andrew Peifer
Susan G. Taylor
Renee Turchin
Mary Wilson

Stephanie Pagano
Gwenne Pagarigan
Michele Patten
Stephanie Picon
Barbra Ruggles
Anthony Santana
Sandra Saravia
Rebecca Short
Brian Smith
Robert Stirling
Guadalupe Sturgeon
Megan Tiffany
Natalie Vasquez
Oralia Ventura
Raymond Webb
Richard Wilkerson
Nicholas Williams
Amanda Wolfe
David Yang
Jean Zelt

Lesley Kennedy
Marian Kubota
Rae Woolrich