

BEFORE THE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SAN BERNARDINO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Reduction in Force
Involving the Respondent Identified in
Exhibit A.

OAH No. 2010030940

PROPOSED DECISION

Mary Agnes Matyszewski, Administrative Law Judge, Office of Administrative Hearings, State of California, heard this matter on April 27, 2010, in San Bernardino, California.

Sherry Gordon and Todd Robbins, Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo, represented San Bernardino City Unified School District.

Elizabeth Garfield, Attorney at Law, represented the respondents identified in Appendix A.

Respondents David Davenport, Matthew Delano, Stephen Emrich, JoAnn Hammer, Lisa Harrison, Cassandra Loney, John Pepe, Cameron Ruffin, Lizette Sanz, and Wayne McGilvery represented themselves.

No appearance was made by or on behalf of respondents Brett Bakanec, Veronica Camargo, Erika Cordova, Elaine Duag, Jennifer Henao, Craig Lampert, Julia Macias, Kassy Mayor, Arlene McGee, Sarah Morales Alfonso, Thomas Muller, Jessica Pantoja, Angela Perez, Alicia Quintero-Rivera, Teresa Raef, Pedro Ramos, Kimberly Rodriguez, Martha Samaro, Amy Schmidt, Tara Schmidt, Kimberly Thissen, Anja Westerhaus, Paloma Gomez, Alicia Martinez, Christian Ponce, and Marcus Wilkerson who did not request a hearing.

Before the hearing the accusations served on Irene Awad-Shendi, Joseph Baragone, Meghan Barber, Cynthia Blumenthal, Rick Bowling, Richard Bravo, Jennifer Brink, Mary Chegroune, Mario Cruz, Luisa Curtis, Erik Drew, Mary Lou Farlender, Nanette Flores Bravo, Oleksandr Gahungu, Dorothy Green, Joanne Haberman, Ward T. Hildebrand, Megan Hopper, Marcia Japutra, Jeffrey Juhnke, Andrew Kubitza, Patricia Ledesma, Cassandra Loney, Robin McNeir, Ashley Mesko-Maggs, Tracy Monroe, Lakshmi Pillalamarri, Michael Quinlan, Emily Ratica, Michelle Rosales, Gail Russell, Julie Shingles, Natachia Sinkfield, Tyrone Slack, Theodore Stanton, Kristina Stiller, Jill Sullivan, Deborah Tarver, Shirley

Vasquez, Jean Weede, Caitlin Wright, Christian Wyser-Orpineda, were withdrawn and the precautionary accusations served on respondents Eugene Chaney, Dawn Farrington, Gregory Goodyear, Garth Moline, and Jerry Tivey were withdrawn and their layoff notices rescinded.

At the conclusion of the presentation of the evidence, respondents' attorney requested an opportunity to submit a written brief limited to the issue of the 39 respondents whose notices were withdrawn prior to the start of the hearing. That request was granted and a briefing schedule established. Thereafter, the matter was submitted on May 4, 2010.¹

FACTUAL FINDINGS

1. Harold Vollkommer made and filed the accusation in his official capacity as Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources, San Bernardino City Unified School District.
2. Respondents are identified in Appendix A, attached hereto and incorporated by this reference. All respondents are certificated employees of the district.
3. On March 2, 2010, the Board of Education of the San Bernardino City Unified School District (Board) adopted a resolution entitled Reduction of Particular Kinds of Certificated Services-A, which reduced particular kinds of services and directed the superintendent to give appropriate notices to certificated employees whose positions would be affected by the action. The resolution involved the reduction or elimination of 196 full time equivalent (FTE) positions.
4. In the resolution the Board "determined that due to a significant population of English language learners with specialized educational needs, a specific and compelling need exists to employ and retain certificated employees who have formal (not emergency) authorization to teach English Learner ("EL") students, as determined by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, and the special training and experience that comes" from having such an authorization.
5. The resolution specifically noted that the "failure to staff a classroom containing one or more EL students with a certificated employee possessing an appropriate EL authorization is 'misassignment' subject to sanction by the County Superintendent of Schools." The resolution referenced laws pertaining to EL students and noted that the district's needs and its students' needs "should not and cannot be adequately served by concentrating EL students in particular classrooms in such a manner as to lessen the need for certificated employees with EL authorizations."

¹ Respondents' closing brief was marked and received in evidence as Exhibit 38. The district's reply brief was marked and received in evidence as Exhibit 39. The points raised in those briefs were addressed throughout this decision.

6. The Board also established a bump analysis to determine which employees could bump into a position being held by a junior employee. The resolution defined “competency” pursuant to Education Code section 44955, subdivision (b), for the purposes of bumping as 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; and (3) an appropriate formal (not emergency) EL authorization, if required by the position to be assumed.”

7. The resolution authorized the superintendent to deviate from the seniority list, i.e. to “skip” more junior employees, if necessary, pursuant to Education Code section 44955(d)(1). The superintendent was directed to implement the resolution in a manner that was consistent with the district’s policies and its efforts to offer certain services to its students. There is no legal requirement mandating that skipping criteria be contained in a resolution. Employees who met any of the skipping criteria for some but not all of their assignment(s) were to be retained only for that portion of their assignment that required the skipping criteria.

8. In January 2009 the California Department of Education informed the district that it had failed to meet “Adequate Yearly Progress” and that it had failed to meet the “100 percent Highly Qualified Teacher requirement for three consecutive years as mandated by NCLB.” As a result of these failures, the district was placed into Level C of the Compliance, Monitoring, Interventions, and Sanctions Program for the 2008-2009 school year. The district skipped employees who were highly qualified under NCLB standards and employees who were authorized to teach EL students. The district skipped these teachers because approximately 17,000, or one third, of the district’s students are EL students. The district introduced the teacher qualifications it had adopted in 2007 to improve EL student achievement as required by NCLB.

9. On March 2, 2010, the district adopted “Resolution to Adopt Criteria for Resolving Ties in Seniority Related to Certificated Layoffs” which established tie-breaking criteria to determine the order of termination for those employees who shared the same seniority dates.

10. The master schedules for the schools for the 2010-2011 school year were not established on the date of the hearing.

11. On or before March 12, 2010,² written notice was given to certificated employees, including respondents, of the recommendation that their services would not be required for the 2010-11 school year. The reasons for the recommendation were set forth in these preliminary layoff notices. Thereafter, an accusation was served on each respondent who requested a hearing. Except for the notice issue specifically addressed in Findings of Fact No. 30 below, all prehearing jurisdictional requirements were met.

² The district introduced a sample of the notice sent to employees which was dated March 12, 2010.

12. Before issuing the preliminary layoff notices, the district took into account all positively assured attrition. The district must issue final layoff notices before May 15, and when it does so the district will take into account any additional attrition that has occurred. After that, further attrition will allow the district to rehire employees whose employment was terminated as a result of this reduction in force proceeding. An issue arose during the hearing regarding the vacancies created by attrition which has occurred since March 15, but the district was not required to consider those vacancies. (*San Jose Teachers Association v. Allen* (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 627.)

13. The layoffs will not reduce any of the district's educational offerings to levels below those levels required by law.

14. The district alleged that that it relied on its seniority list when making layoff decisions and that the district sent verification requests to employees before March 15 to verify the accuracy of the information on that seniority. The district received updated information until the day before the hearing, which allowed the district to rescind several notices.

The District's Skipping Criteria and Bumping Analysis

15. At issue in this proceeding was the district's use of an EL certificate to justify its retention of more junior employees over others with more seniority that did not possess an EL certificate. The evidence established the district's need for employees with EL certificates, especially in light of the State's non-compliance report issued to the district. The evidence established that the district had adopted a policy in 2007 in which the district advised teachers of the need for EL training and of its value to the district. The evidence established that the district sent letters in late summer 2009 to all employees who were not EL certified, advising them to obtain EL certification because such certification was most likely going to be used as a skipping criteria. The district allowed teachers to submit proof of having obtained EL certification right up until the day before the hearing, even going so far as accepting proof of EL certifications issued by the local university the Saturday before the hearing so that those employees who completed the EL certification training on that day would not have to drive to the district's offices to submit proof. The district went "above and beyond" the call of duty to advise employees of the importance of the EL certification and it provided them with ample opportunity to obtain the certification. The evidence did not establish that the district's EL certification criteria were arbitrary or capricious. (*San Jose Teachers Association v. Allen* (1983) 144 Cal. App. 3d 627, 637.)

16. Education Code section 44955, subdivisions (b) and (c), sets forth a general rule that requires the district to retain senior employees over more junior employees and to retain permanent employees over temporary employees. Any exception to this general rule must be based on statute. For employees hired on the same date, Education Code section 44955, subdivision (d) provides:

“(d) Notwithstanding subdivision (b), a school district may 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.”

17. Under subdivision (d)(1), a district may skip a junior teacher being retained for specified reasons. (*Bledsoe v. Biggs Unified School District* (2008) 170 Cal. App. 4th 127, 131.) Junior teachers may be given retention priority over senior teachers only 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.)

18. 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.)

19. Although the district’s use of EL certification as a skipping criteria was not arbitrary or capricious, the way in which the district implemented its use in this proceeding was arbitrary and capricious. A preponderance of the evidence established that when the district compiled its layoff list, the district did not permit employees to move between the various types of schools. Even if a middle schoolteacher were certificated and competent to bump a junior high school teacher, the district did not permit that to occur. Assistant Superintendent Vollkommer testified that the district did not “move between schools.” The district’s actions were contrary to the Education Code. Other than the employment of ROP and adult education teachers, which was not at issue here, there is nothing in the Education Codes that restricts skipping and bumping to the type of school where an employee teaches. For example, if a middle school teacher is certificated and competent, he or she can bump a more junior high school teacher.

20. Layoff notices should be rescinded in those cases in which a notice was served upon more senior respondent who was certificated and competent to hold a position being retained by a more junior employee on the basis that the more junior teacher taught at a

different type of school³, and the accusations improperly served upon those respondents should be dismissed.

21. Respondents Ana Serrano-Gomez, Angela Shih, Amanda Diaz, and Jessie Romero testified that they hold the requisite competence, certification and seniority to bump a more junior teacher who is currently teaching at a different school. It is recommended that district review its personnel files to determine if these individuals are entitled by their seniority and credentials to bump a more junior employee.

22. Respondents Matthew Riesland, Nadine Eastwood, Steve Ryser, Yvonne Magdaleno, Lori Maxwell, Linda Gordon, Ty Stockham, Adrian Eddington, Randall Jensen, Randall Murray, John Arient, Paula Bougie, John Rezendes-Herrick, David Daniels and Eric Abrams completed their CLAD certification at the University of Redlands class the Saturday before the hearing, but none of them had their notices rescinded; the district offered no explanation for this omission. Since the district withdrew the notices and accusations filed against all other teachers who completed that Saturday class, fairness dictates that the notices and accusations filed against these respondents be rescinded, as well, especially if these respondents have more seniority than other teachers who are being retained.

23. Respondent Shawndee Hatfield testified that the district's bumping list was incorrect because she is NCLB compliant. Based upon this testimony and the evidence in support thereof, the district revised its bumping list and withdrew the accusation and rescinded the notice that was issued to Hatfield. This amendment in the seniority list resulted in respondent MarLan Parker moving from the precautionary layoff list to the final layoff list proposed by the district.

24. Respondents Eric Abrams and Paula Bougie testified that they have the requisite EL certification and they could not understand why their colleagues with less seniority had their notices rescinded while theirs remained in place. The district explained in its closing argument that Abrams and Bougie were on the precautionary layoff list only, but the district offered no explanation for the reason their colleagues' notices were rescinded and Abrams' and Bougie's were not. It is recommended the district review Abrams' and Bougie's personnel files, correct them to reflect their current certifications, and then determine if these individuals have sufficient seniority to retain their employment.

25. Respondent Gina Younglove testified that she received her CLAD certification in December 2009 and that employees with less seniority were being retained. It is recommended that the district review Younglove's personnel file, correct it to reflect her current certification, and then determine if she has sufficient seniority to retain her employment, especially in light of the fact that the district rescinded the layoff notices of individuals who had EL certification.

³ Thus, a certificated and competent elementary school teacher can bump a middle school or high school teacher; a certificated and competent middle school teacher can bump an elementary school or high school teacher; and a certificated and competent high school teacher can bump an elementary school or middle school teacher.

26. Respondent JoAnne Hammer introduced documentation to support her testimony that she has a CLAD certification and not an SDAIE certificate, as was recorded in the district's seniority list. It is recommended the district review her personnel file, correct it to reflect her current certification, and determine if she has sufficient security to retain her employment.

27. Several employees testified about the reasons they had not yet obtained their EL certification. Marie de Bello explained that her degree did not require her to take a foreign language, which is a prerequisite to obtaining her EL certification. Dita Lehrack, explained that she was scheduled to take the EL courses in the summer of 2009, but her husband was diagnosed with terminal cancer and she cared for him instead. Lehrack is currently scheduled to complete her EL certification coursework in May. Jennifer Noel testified that over the years when she tried to take the EL courses offered by the district, she was told that she did not qualify for them for one reason or another. However, nothing prevented Noel from obtaining the certification from a non-district-sponsored source. The explanations offered by these three respondents were insufficient in light of the district's needs.

Substitute Teacher Issues

28. Respondent Jessie Romero disputed his seniority date of August 21, 2009, arguing that he should be given credit for previous substitute teaching experience within the district. Education Code section 44918, subdivision (a), provides that any employee classified as a substitute or temporary employee who serves during one school year for at least 75 percent of the number of days of the school year shall be deemed to have served one year as a probationary employee if he or she is employed as a probationary employee the following year. Romero testified that in the past he has worked more than 75 percent of the school year, but not in the school year immediately before his employment as a middle school teacher. Romero is being paid at a "Level III" salary level because of his prior experience in the district. Although the district chose to pay Romero at a higher rate because of this experience, nothing in the Education Code allows him to have his seniority date amended since he did not work 75 percent of the school days during the school year before he was employed on a full-time basis.

29. Respondents Linaya Silva and Victoria Dandridge disputed their seniority dates because they had worked more than 75 percent in the previous school year as substitute teachers. It is recommended that in light of Education Code section 44918, subdivision (a), the district review their personnel files and determine if their seniority dates should be adjusted based upon their prior substitute teacher experience, as well as determine if they have sufficient seniority based upon their prior substitute teaching to retain their employment.

Service Issue

30. Respondent Craig Lampert was previously employed by the district and he returned to employment with the district in 2009 after living out of state for seven years. When re-employed he provided the district with his new residence address and received his paychecks

at that address. A copy of his pay stub corroborated his testimony. However, for whatever reason and no valid reason was offered at hearing, Lampert's notice was served at his previous address. Lampert was unaware of the notice until a colleague advised him that his name was on the layoff list. The district argued that since he appeared at this hearing, notice was sufficient. However, without proper service on Lampert, he cannot be a party to these proceedings and this administrative law court lacks jurisdiction to proceed on the district's case filed against him.

Credential Issues

31. Respondent Pamela Bruce disputed the district's seniority list which indicated that she had a Preliminary Single Subject Science credential. Bruce submitted transcripts which indicated she had "cleared" that credential by taking courses in March 2009 and April 2010. It is recommended the district review Bruce's personnel file and update it accordingly. However, the district is entitled to consider those credentials currently held when it issues its preliminary layoff notices and Bruce's credential was not "cleared" until after the March 15 notice deadline. Accordingly, she was properly served with a notice and accusation.

32. Respondent Angela Shih pointed out that she has a clear credential, which was reflected on the seniority list, but the district's Bump Analysis listed her as having only a preliminary credential. The district admitted that the Bump Analysis was incorrect, but that this error did not affect her status. It is recommended the district review Shih's personnel file and the bump analysis to ensure that her notice was proper.

33. Respondent Michelle de Puzo testified that the seniority list incorrectly identified her as having an intern credential when she possesses a preliminary credential. de Puzo received her CLAD on March 19, 2010, which makes her highly qualified under NCLB. de Puzo also disputed her August 21, 2009, start date, testifying that her correct start date should be August 11, 2009, the date her principal required her to attend mandatory training for which she was paid. She introduced e-mails and documents corroborating her claim. The preponderance of the evidence established that de Puzo was required to attend the mandatory training and that she reasonably relied on the statements made by her principal and attended the training under the reasonable belief that her attendance was required. She forwent her summer vacation in order to attend this orientation. In its closing argument, the district stated that it had identified a vacancy that de Puzo was entitled to occupy and the district withdrew its accusation and rescinded the notice filed against de Puzo.

34. Respondent Cynthia Castillo testified that her credential was incorrectly listed on the seniority list. She obtained her preliminary credential in December 2009, but she is still listed as only having an intern credential. It is recommended the district review Castillo's personnel file, make the necessary correction, and then determine if she has sufficient seniority to permit her to retain her employment.

Other Issues

35. Respondent Laura Wheeler testified that other English teachers with lower seniority dates received precautionary layoff notices whereas she had received a layoff notice despite her seniority. Wheeler teaches the REACH program which makes her “highly qualified.” It is recommended the district review Wheeler’s personnel file and determine if she has sufficient seniority and competency to permit her to retain her employment, especially in light of Findings of Fact Nos. 15-20, inclusive.

36. Respondent Bonnie Warren inquired if she was eligible for a different seniority date because of her prior work experience in the district. Warren worked between 2002 and 2006 as an intern, teaching in the same class during the 2005-2006 school year. Warren left her employment when she could not pass her CSET examination. After passing the CSET examination in the summer of 2006, Warren was re-employed by the district during the 2006-2007 school year as an Opportunity Teacher at the high school with an intern credential. She separated from employment on September 2, 2008, when her intern credential lapsed. She obtained her clear credential on December 8, 2008, and she was re-employed by the district as a high school teacher. Education Code section 44464 expressly provides that interns do not have the rights provided by Education Code sections 44948 and 44949. Nothing in the Education Code permits the district to “tack on” additional time for those years during which Warren worked as an intern. Her seniority date was correctly determined by the district.

37. Respondent Diana Mojic-Mastranzo, who holds a BCLAD, could not understand why she was on the regular layoff list when employee # 2555, who holds a CLAD, was on the precautionary layoff list. The district offered no explanation for this. In light of the findings in Findings of Fact Nos. 15-20, it is recommended the district review Mjoic-Mastranzo’s personnel file and determines if she has sufficient seniority to retain her employment.

38. Respondent Monica Lopez-Alonso, whose credential cleared in 2009, inquired as to why employee numbers 2539 and 2528, who have less seniority, were being retained when she was being laid off. It is recommended that the district review Lopez-Alonso’s personnel file, make any necessary corrections to reflect her correct credential, and then determine if she has sufficient seniority to retain her employment.

Precautionary Layoff Issues

39. The district issued precautionary layoff notices to ensure that it could reduce its force in sufficient numbers as ordered by the Board. There was nothing improper in the district taking this precaution. Given the recommendations noted above and below, at this juncture none of the precautionary layoff notices can be rescinded until such time as the district complies with those recommendations. Some of the recommendations may result in employees who initially received a precautionary layoff notice being placed on the district’s

final layoff notice list; others may have their notices rescinded after the recommended actions contained in this order are completed.

LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

1. Jurisdiction for this proceeding exists pursuant to sections 44949 and 44955, and all notices and other requirements of those sections have been provided as required.

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* (1976) 64 Cal.App.3d 167.)

4. Because of the reduction of particular kinds of services, cause exists pursuant to Education Code section 44955 to give notice to respondents that their services will not be required for the 2010-2011 school year. The cause relates solely to the welfare of the schools and the pupils thereof within the meaning of Education Code section 44949. The district has identified the certificated employees who are providing the particular kinds of services that the Governing Board directed be reduced or discontinued. It is recommended that the Governing Board give respondents notice before May 15, 2010, that their services will not be required by the District for the school year 2010-11.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the governing board give notice to the respondents whose names are set forth below except for those respondents identified above in the Findings of Fact Nos. 20-26, 29, 30, 32-35, 37, and 38, inclusive, that their employment will be terminated at the close of the current school year and that their services will not be needed for the 2010-2011 school year.

DATED: _____

MARY AGNES MATYSZEWSKI
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings

Appendix A

RESPONDENTS

The following certificated personnel received a layoff notice:

| | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 Adams, Keisha L | 36 Carmargo, Veronica |
| 2 Agha, Farah | 37 Carson, Wendi |
| 3 Alas-Negri, Marisela | 38 Castillo, Cynthia |
| 4 Alba, Maribel | 39 Ceja, Elida |
| 5 Amador, Martha | 40 Chavez, Patricia |
| 6 Anderson, Kristin | 41 |
| 7 Applegate, Valerie | 42 Chen, Susan |
| 8 Arreola, Fiorella A | 43 Concepcion, Marissa |
| 9 Arroyo, Nancy | 44 Cooney, Melody |
| 10 Atencio, Callie | 45 Cooper, John D |
| 11 | 46 Cordova, Erika |
| Bagnell, Annette | Crockett, Joelle |
| 12 Christine | 47 Imauni |
| 13 Bakanec, Brett Adam | 48 |
| 14 | 49 |
| 15 | 50 Davenport, David |
| 16 Barbu, Diana | 51 |
| 17 Beuler, Joyella Jane | 52 Dean, Cassandra |
| 18 Black, Clinton | 53 Dean, Kristen M |
| 19 Blacksher, Francine | 54 Delano, Matthew |
| 20 Blacksher, Kristina | 55 Demarco, Ana |
| 21 | 56 Diaz, Amanda |
| 22 Bogarin, Alexis R | 57 Dorame, Eric |
| 23 Boren, Alba | 58 Downing, Stephanie |
| Bougetz, Jaimie | |
| 24 Elizabeth | 59 |
| 25 | 60 Duag, Elaine |
| 26 Bracken, Michelle | 61 Duran, Samuel |
| 27 | 62 Eck, Barbara |
| 28 | 63 Elliott, Lindsay |
| 29 Brown, Eboni | 64 Esquibel, Malissa |
| 30 Brown, Nicole | 65 |
| 31 Brown, Norma | 66 Fields, Mary B |
| 32 Cachu, Laura | 67 |
| Cals Southern, | |
| 33 Jennifer | 68 Florez, Marisa |
| 34 Camacho, Lisa | 69 |
| Campbell, Kimberly | |
| 35 Leanne | 70 Garcia, Grisel |
| Garcia, Helen | 106 Magdaleno, Yvonne C. |

| | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|-----|------------------------|
| 71 | | 107 | Manjarrez, Amanda |
| 72 | Girasek, Berenise | 108 | Mao, Elisa |
| 73 | Goebel, Kristen | 109 | Marshall, Renita |
| 74 | Grajeda, Marie | 110 | Martin, Marrina R |
| 75 | | 111 | Mayor, Kassy |
| 76 | Guillen, Karla | 112 | McGee, Arlene |
| 77 | Gutierrez, Mayra | 113 | McNair, Lisa Renee |
| 78 | Guzman, Cynthia | 114 | |
| 79 | | 115 | Meaca, Marisol |
| 80 | Hammer, JoAnn C. | 116 | Hyson |
| 81 | Harrison, Lisa Marie | | Mojica-Mastranzo, |
| 82 | | 117 | Diana |
| 83 | Henao, Jennifer | 118 | |
| 84 | Hidalgo, Monica Ann | 119 | Mooney, Eric James |
| 85 | | | Morales Alfonso, Sarah |
| 86 | Hodges, Rosario | 120 | Mary |
| | Hudson-Cousins, | 121 | Moreno, Denise |
| 87 | Shakirah Nar | 122 | Moss, Robert |
| 88 | Hunter, Marcia | 123 | Muller, Thomas |
| 89 | Jackson, Talena Hill | 124 | Murguia, Anna |
| 90 | | 125 | Ortega, Paulette |
| 91 | Jimenez-Garcia, Maria | 126 | Pantoja, Jessica |
| 92 | Johns-King, Vanessa | 127 | Parrish, Janet |
| 93 | | 128 | Parker, MarLan |
| 94 | Kane, Sheena | 129 | Pepe, John D |
| 95 | | 130 | Perez, Angela I |
| 96 | Kuld, Gregory | 131 | Perez, Jeanette Monica |
| 97 | Lampert, Craig L | 132 | Perez, Sarah |
| 98 | | 133 | Peterson, Jessica L |
| 99 | Lehrack, Dita J | 134 | |
| 100 | Lingenfelter, Tina | 135 | Pinon, Enriqueta |
| 101 | | 136 | Ponsler, Shawn |
| 102 | Lopez, Elizabeth | 137 | Prato, Patricia |
| | | | Quezada, Rosalinda |
| 103 | Luna, Felicia | 138 | Vera |
| 104 | Lyons, Jessica Lynn | 139 | |
| | | | Quintero-Rivera, |
| 105 | Macias, Julia | 140 | Alicia |

| | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|-----|----------------------|
| 141 | Raef, Teresa | 176 | Torres, Angela |
| 142 | Ramirez, Melissa Yong | 177 | |
| 143 | Ramos, Pedro | 178 | Verduzco, Georgina |
| 144 | | 179 | Warren, Bonnie |
| 145 | Reyes, Nancy V | 180 | |
| | Robles, Rebecca | | |
| 146 | Alexandra | 181 | Westerhaus, Anja |
| 147 | Rodriguez III, Santos | 182 | Wheeler, Laura |
| 148 | Rodriguez, Kimberly | 183 | Willemse, Brian |
| 149 | Romero, Jesse | 184 | Wilson, Danielle |
| 150 | Rosales, Crystal | 185 | Wirik, Jodi |
| 151 | | 186 | Womack, Jacqueline A |
| 152 | Ruffin, Cameron | 187 | Wong, Jessica |
| 153 | | 188 | |
| 154 | Saldana, Catherine | 189 | |
| 155 | Samaro, Martha G | 190 | Yates, Jennifer |
| 156 | Sanz, Lizette | 191 | Younglove, Gina |
| 157 | Sargent, Kimbre | | |
| 158 | Sassaman, Sandra | | |
| 159 | Schmidt, Amy | | |
| 160 | Schmidt, Tara Nicole | | |
| 161 | | | |
| 162 | Silva, Lanaya Marie | | |
| 163 | Simental-Gladin, Maribel | | |
| 164 | Singer, Trimonisha | | |
| 165 | | | |
| 166 | | | |
| 167 | Sorrell, LaTonya | | |
| 168 | Stallings, Amber | | |
| 169 | | | |
| 170 | | | |
| 171 | | | |
| 172 | | | |
| 173 | Thissen, Kimberly Anne | | |
| 174 | Tonn, Sierra Diane | | |
| 175 | Tornero, Jessica Christine | | |

The following certificated personnel received a precautionary layoff notice:

| | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 Abell, Megan | Martinez-Guzman, |
| 2 Abrams, Eric S | 41 Cecilia C |
| 3 Anderson, Joey K | 42 Maxwell, Laurie H |
| 4 Arient, John G | 43 Mc Gilvery, Wayne S |
| 5 Awunganyi, John | 44 |
| 6 Back, Tiffany Moree | 45 Murray, Randall M |
| 7 Benitez, Ana Beatris | 46 Noel, Jennifer L |
| 8 Besheer, Rebecca Marie | 47 Nolasco, Jesus |
| 9 Bonds, Diane C | 48 Ochoa, Mayra |
| 10 Bougie-Thomas, Paula J | 49 Ortega, Anna Marie |
| 11 Brown-Taylor, Nadine | 51 Phillips, Ramona Rae |
| 12 Bruce, Pamela Sue | 52 Ponce, Christine |
| 13 | 53 Reynolds, Charles E |
| 14 Chiang, Krystal | 54 Reynolds, Kira Diane |
| | Rezendes-Herrick, John |
| 15 Condreay, Christina | 55 M |
| 16 Daniels, David A | 56 Riesland, Matthew A |
| 17 Danridge, Victoria | 57 Roberts, Stephen M |
| 18 Debello, Marie S | 58 Rodriguez, Claudia |
| 19 Eastwood, Nadine | 59 Romero, Sara Victoria |
| 20 Eddington, Adrian | 60 Roundy, Robin |
| 21 Emrich, Stephen J | 61 Ryser, Steven J |
| 22 | 62 Salazar, Mayra |
| 23 Gomez, Paloma | 63 Schlagel, Lacie |
| 24 | 64 Scoggin, Kelly |
| | Serrano-Gomez, |
| 25 Gordon, Linda M | 65 Natividad |
| 26 Gueringer, Ronnie J | 66 Sherman, Karyl |
| 27 Hart, Cassandra | 67 Shih, Angela |
| 28 Hendrickson, Matthew | 68 Smith, Christal |
| | Stephens, Eileen |
| 29 Hickey, Saira | 69 Catherine |
| 30 Hildebrand, Ward T | 70 Stockham, Ty D |
| 31 Hoffman, Sarah | 71 Thach, Hue Thi |
| 32 Horta, Naomi | 72 |
| 33 Jensen, Randal A | 73 Torres, Oscar |
| 34 Li, Vy | 74 Urenda, Beatriz |
| 35 Lopez-Alonso, Monica | 75 Wilkerson, Marcus |
| 36 Lovett, Wikitoria | 76 Williams, Christine |
| 37 Luna, Peter | 77 Zapata, Norma Angelica |
| 38 Madrigal, Anacelia | 78 Zavala, Agustin |
| 39 Maenpaa, Kelley | |
| 40 Martinez, Alicia | |