

BEFORE THE
BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE PALM SPRINGS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

OAH No. 2011030917

Respondents listed in Appendices A and B.

PROPOSED DECISION

Donald P. Cole, Administrative Law Judge, Office of Administrative Hearings, State of California, heard this matter in Palm Springs, California, on April 6, 2011.

William A. Diedrich and Mark W. Thompson, Atkinson, Andelson, Loya, Ruud & Romo, Attorneys at Law, represented the Palm Springs Unified School District.

Jon Y. Vanderpool, Tosdal, Smith, Steiner & Wax, Attorneys at Law, represented the respondents listed in Appendix A.

The matter was submitted on April 6, 2011.

FACTUAL FINDINGS

1. Mauricio Arellano, Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources, Palm Springs Unified School District, made and filed the accusation dated March 11, 2011, in his official capacity as the designee of district superintendent Dr. Lorri McCune.

2. Respondents¹ are certificated district employees.

3. On March 8, 2011, in accordance with Education Code sections 44949 and 44955, the superintendent notified the Board of Education of the Palm Springs Unified School District in writing of her recommendation to reduce or discontinue particular kinds of services for the upcoming school year. The superintendent stated the reasons for the recommendation.

4. On March 8, 2011, the board adopted Resolution No. 2010/2011-59, 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 2011-2012 school year were the following full time equivalent (FTE) positions:

<u>Particular Kind of Service</u>	<u>Full-Time Equivalent</u>
Elementary (K-6) Classroom Teachers	50
ARRA Intervention Teachers	8
Counselors	4
High School Dean	1
High School English Teacher	1
Middle School English Teacher	2
Secondary Social Science Teachers	2
Middle School Science Teachers	2
Middle School Math Teachers	2
Middle School Choir Teachers	1.4
Middle School Theater Teacher	1
Middle School Art Teachers	2
Read 180 Teacher	1
High School Computer Teacher	0.6
Middle School Computer Teacher	1
Psychologists	2
Alternative Education Opportunity Teacher	1
After School Independent Study Teacher	0.8

¹ The district initially identified 84 certificated employees for layoff (though there were 85 names, it appears that one employee, Russell Eves, was inadvertently named twice). Eight employees (Michelle Baker, Megan Gross, Curtis Hough, Syreeta Hunter, Lori Moore, Kaitlyn Stockdale, Carole Weed, and Lynn Woodley) did not request a hearing. The district subsequently dismissed several accusations. By the conclusion of the hearing, there remained 74 such respondents; they are listed in Appendix A. The district also served 17 employees with precautionary layoff notices in case the district's proposed layoff list was not upheld in its entirety. These employees are listed in Appendix B, except that one of the employees initially served with a precautionary layoff notice (Amanda Bond) was later designated by the district for actual layoff via the bumping process. Bond is therefore listed in Appendix A and not in Appendix B.

The proposed reductions totaled 82.8 FTE positions.

5. The board further determined in Resolution No. 2010/2011-59 that “competency,” as described in Education Code section 44955, subdivision (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); (4) with regard to bumping into High School Theatre, High School Band, or High School Chorus positions, special training and experience necessary to serve in said positions and at least one (1) full year of experience in the previous five years serving in the positions; (5) with regard to bumping an employee who possesses a National Board Certification, possession of a National Board Certification; (6) with regard to bumping an employee assigned to Cielo Vista Charter Elementary School who has completed ProjectLearn Academy Training, special training and experience in project-based learning, as evidenced by completion of ProjectLearn Academy Training; and (7) with regard to bumping into a high school position, one full year of experience within the last five years serving at the high school level.”

A number of issues relating to bumping were raised at the hearing. These are considered below.

6. The board further determined in Resolution No. 2010/2011-59 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: teachers possessing the special training and experience to teach High School Theatre classes; teachers possessing the special training and experience to teach High School Band and/or Chorus classes; teachers possessing a National Board Certification and who therefore possess the special training and experience associated therewith; and teachers assigned to Cielo Vista Charter Elementary School who possess special training and experience in project-based learning, as evidenced by completion of ProjectLearn Academy Training.

The first two skipping criteria played no role in this proceeding, i.e., the district did not in fact skip any employees on the basis of either of these criteria. The district skipped one employee on the basis of the third criterion, and skipped a number of employees based on the fourth criterion. The propriety of those skips is considered below.

7. The board directed the superintendent or her designee to determine which employees’ services would not be required for the 2011-2012 school year as a result of the reduction of the foregoing particular kinds of services. The board further directed the superintendent or her 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, 2011, 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.

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. 2010/2011-59 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 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 of which it was aware at the time it issued preliminary layoff notices, in determining the actual number of necessary layoff notices to be delivered to its employees.

Skipping Criterion Three: National Board Certification

14. The district’s assistant superintendent for human resources, Mauricio Arellano, testified that National Board Certification is a program offered to create a “master” level of teacher. Obtaining national board certification is a very intense process, including the teacher’s self-reflection, the reflection of other teachers, filming, critiquing, and school work reports. One of the district’s schools, Julius Corsini Elementary School, has adopted the certification program. The purpose of this action was to help pull the school out of a program improvement plan. In fact, the school is no longer on an improvement plan, and the school’s participation in the certification program was a major reason for this positive outcome. Arellano believes that if Corsini lost any of its teachers who achieved certification, it would have a negative impact on the school.

15. With regard to national board certification, the district demonstrated a specific need for personnel to teach a specific course or course of study. Though apparently one employee was skipped by the district on the basis of national board certification, that individual was not identified at the hearing. Further, it was not asserted that any particular respondent is to be laid off as a result of the retention of and despite having greater seniority than the skipped employee. Accordingly, it cannot be concluded that the district improperly implemented the third skipping criterion.

Skipping Criterion Four: Cielo Vista Charter Elementary School

16. The district's Cielo Vista Charter Elementary School is in its inaugural year. Since it is a "dependent" charter school, the district retains flexibility with regard to curriculum and budget. The school is an open enrollment institution; interested students apply for admission. The school uses a different curriculum than the rest of the district's schools, one that involves "project-based learning." All Cielo Vista teachers are trained to teach a variety of educational standards within the context of a single project. The standards to be incorporated in a single project may include such subjects as science, art, music, language arts, and math standards, for example. Some Cielo Vista projects are school-wide, some are grade level-wide, and some are limited to individuals. For school-wide projects, teachers all work together on the projects' implementation, i.e., students work on a single project from kindergarten through sixth grade.

Cielo Vista has sent all of its teachers to an intense, two-day training program administered by ProjectLearn, a service entity. All current Cielo Vista teachers have completed the training. The school also sends staff to monthly on-going training. The school also works with its teachers in a peer coaching program that takes place at monthly staff meetings.

Cielo Vista principal Lynda Lake testified that if a teacher were to be reassigned to Cielo Vista without having had the foregoing training, it would adversely impact the entire program. She explained that two Cielo Vista teachers were hired after the beginning of the present school year – about two months before the administrative hearing. They took the intensive training at an additional cost (\$1,000) to the district. But even after taking that training, the two teachers still had to be brought up to speed with regard to discussions and planning that had occurred at monthly staff meetings. Having to "catch up" the two teachers mid-year was a "hardship." Lake added that if teachers from other district schools were reassigned to Cielo Vista next year, the school's program would be affected.

Lake testified that she believes it is important for Cielo Vista teachers to believe in the project-based learning philosophy of the school. She added that she does not believe that every teacher is a good fit for every school. By implication, then, it was her view that if several teachers were transferred from other district schools to Cielo Vista as a result of this lay-off proceeding, they might not be a good fit.

Lake testified that if her junior teachers were not skipped pursuant to the board's resolution, it would affect three of the school's 28 teachers, i.e., three teachers would be subject to displacement by more senior district teachers currently assigned to other schools.

17. Pursuant to a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the district and the Palm Springs Teachers Association, Cielo Vista teachers do not have access to certain kinds of leave that are available to other teachers, e.g., child rearing leave, study leave, opportunity leave.

18. Maritza Castro has a clear elementary (i.e., multiple subject) credential and an ELL certificate. She has a seniority date of August 29, 2007. She teaches fifth grade in a self-contained classroom.

Castro testified that she has had exposure to project-based learning training. During the 2006-07 school year, she worked at a community day school in Covina, where she received two intensive trainings (two six-hour days), as well as an additional hour of training per month throughout that school year, provided by Cal Poly Pomona. The training was provided through her superintendent, using materials produced by ProjectLearn.

Castro testified that she subscribes to the project-based educational concepts used at Cielo Vista. She believes she is qualified to teach there. She believes anyone can do design-based learning. She herself did so at the day school in Covina.

19. Based on the evidence presented at the hearing, the district demonstrated a specific need for personnel to teach a specific course or course of study in connection with Cielo Vista's project-based learning curriculum, and that the certificated employees to be skipped has special training and experience necessary to teach that course or course of study which others with more seniority do not possess. The evidence established that the district's implementation of the fourth skipping criterion was neither arbitrary nor capricious, but instead constituted a reasonable exercise of the district's discretion.

Lake's testimony established that the project-based learning program is a valuable and effective pedagogical tool. Further, she testified that reassigning teachers to Cielo Vista who have not already had the intensive ProjectLearn training would be disruptive to the program. This testimony was supported by the school's experience when two teachers were reassigned to the school during the course of the current academic year. While the extent of such disruption may be expected to be less at the *outset* of an academic year than it was *during the course* of a year in progress, one cannot confidently infer that disruption would be eliminated. Lake's testimony that it is important to have teachers who embrace the project-based learning philosophy is also significant.

Bumping Criterion Six: ProjectLearn Academy Training

20. The findings immediately above relating to the fourth skipping criterion apply as well to the sixth bumping criterion. The district's decision was neither arbitrary nor capricious, but instead constituted a reasonable exercise of the district's discretion.

This result is unaffected by the testimony of Castro. Though she has had some project-based learning training, and though that training used ProjectLearn materials, she could not state that the training she received through another school district was the equivalent of the ProjectLearn training received by Cielo Vista employees. Certainly it could be reasonably argued that her training should be considered sufficient to permit her to bump more junior Cielo Vista employees. But, it is not inherently unreasonable, arbitrary or capricious for the district to require senior employees to have the *same* training as Cielo Vista teachers receive before they can be permitted to displace the latter.

Accordingly, Castro was not competent to bump any junior Cielo Vista teacher. As no evidence was presented that any other district teacher had the ProjectLearn Academy training, it was not established that any other such teacher was competent to bump any Cielo Vista teachers.

Bumping Criterion Seven: One year of Experience in Previous Five for High School Positions

21. Ramona Mueller has a seniority date of August 27, 2008, and presently teaches middle school math. She has a single subject math credential. When she applied for employment with the district, she was hoping to secure a high school assignment, but the only opening was in a middle school position.

Mueller testified that she did not think there was necessarily a difference between teaching middle school and high school math. She believes she is capable of teaching at the high school level and has been waiting for an opportunity to do just that. She does not believe her lack of actual high school teaching experience lessens her ability to teach high school students. Mueller thus believes she should be permitted to displace high school math teachers even though she does not have a year of high school teaching experience.

22. Francisco Lopez has a seniority date of August 27, 2008. He presently teaches middle school math. He has a single subject math credential. He taught in another district for seven to eight years before commencing his employment with the district. Prior to his teaching career, Lopez worked for TRW Aerospace as a manager of the space technology group, which built space craft and satellites. He has both a bachelor's and a master's degree in electronics. He draws on his TRW experience during his teaching.

Lopez testified that he has taught algebra 1 the past two years during the summer school session at Palm Springs High School. His students were high school students. The summer sessions were six weeks long, five hours per day, five days per week. The classes he taught were the equivalent of a one-year algebra class. He has thus taught the equivalent of two full one-year algebra classes. He has also tutored algebra, geometry, trigonometry, and calculus.

Lopez testified that he disagrees with the bumping criterion requiring a year of prior experience at the high school level in order to bump into a high school position. He questions drawing a distinction between middle school and high school students, when the teacher has a single subject credential. He believes that math for grades seven through 10 is essentially the same. He does not perceive an actual or substantial difference in the psychological profiles of middle school and high school students; even if there is one, he does not believe it would make a difference.

23. Beth Brian has a seniority date of August 29, 2007, and has a multiple subject credential and several supplementary authorizations or certificates. She had about eight years teaching experience before her employment with the district. She currently teaches in an ARRA-intervention assignment at the middle school level.

Brian taught high school students for two summers (2008, 2009) at the district's Cathedral City High School. She believes she should be permitted to bump into some high school positions, even though she does not have a year of teaching experience at the high school level. She reasoned that since she was considered capable of teaching at the high school level during the summer, she should be considered capable of doing so during the regular school year. Further, she was transferred to her current (ARRA) position involuntarily and quite recently, i.e., January 2011. Brian did not identify any specific high school teachers that she felt she should be permitted to displace.

24. The district's Arellano testified that the competency criterion seven was justified because of the greater in-depth knowledge a teacher must have to teach high school students. In addition, middle school students are going through certain stages of life change, whereas high school students are at a different stage, e.g., looking at change of life decision relating to college.

The district's Riccio testified that high school math teachers do not typically teach only algebra, but also teach upper level math courses. He noted that neither Mueller nor Lopez has taught at the high school level for a full year within the past five years.

Brian Murray, the district's director of secondary curriculum and instruction, testified that high school summer school is a remedial program for credit recovery purposes to enable students to secure credit for classes required for graduation. The 24-day summer program does not equate to a full year (180-day) of instruction. For example, the summer curriculum is greatly compacted.

Murray testified that he was unable to identify a specific skill that a high school math teacher has that a middle school teacher would not have.

25. As with the ProjectLearn competency criterion, the evidence concerning the one-year-in-five criterion is mixed. It was, however, sufficient to establish that the district's competency criterion number seven was neither arbitrary nor capricious, but instead constituted a reasonable exercise of the board's discretion.² Neither *Alexander* nor *Duax*, relied on by respondents, affects this finding.

Other Bumping Issues

26. Tarra Bercegeay has a seniority date of August 26, 2010, and teaches digital video production at the high school level. She has a preliminary three-year technology

² That Brian was involuntarily transferred to her current position only recently does not affect this analysis. The district retains the right to deploy its teachers in those positions it deems best. The layoff statute does not affect that right. No evidence was presented to suggest that Brian's transfer to her current position was brought about for the specific purpose of providing the district with a means to lay her off or that her transfer was otherwise improperly motivated.

education (art, media and entertainment) waiver. Bercegeay teaches six classes in beginning, intermediate, and advanced cinema, television production, and media, and her students host a ten-minute news broadcast throughout the day.

Bercegeay was not initially slated for layoff, but she is being bumped by Shari Pate, a more senior employee who currently teaches computers and AVID at the high school level and who holds a clear industrial technology credential and a computer concepts supplementary authorization. Bercegeay testified that she does not believe Pate's credential necessarily qualifies her to do all that respondent herself does. Bercegeay believes that a great deal of experience is needed to teach what she teaches, and that she herself has the necessary experience.

The district's Riccio testified that Pate's credential permits her to teach Bercegeay's classes and that Pate's other qualifications make her competent to bump Bercegeay. Bercegeay's view is understood to be essentially that Pate is not as qualified as she is to teach her classes. Whether or not that is true, the evidence established that Pate is certificated and competent to bump Bercegeay pursuant to the district's competency criteria.

27. Cecile Hall has a seniority date of August 26, 2010, and has a single subject English credential. Prior to her teaching career, she had 22 years experience as an editor in the film industry. She currently teaches in the Palm Springs High School Arts Institute program. She teaches four arts English classes (three of which are honors classes). These classes are more than mere English classes – Hall integrates all aspects of culture into these classes. She also teaches a western humanities (arts and culture) class, a class she herself designed, and which encompasses art, philosophy, music, and dance. In addition, all five of her classes have a project-based curriculum.

Hall is being bumped by Terry Meisenburg, who currently serves as a school counselor, and has a clear school counseling and a preliminary single subject English credential.

Hall testified that she did not believe Meisenburg should be able to displace her, because she (Hall) does not teach “simply English.”

The district's Riccio testified that Hall's students receive English credit for her courses. Further, a teacher with a single subject English credential is authorized to teach those courses. Meisenburg has a preliminary English credential, and also meets the other competency criteria to teach Hall's classes.

Hall's qualifications and experience are quite impressive. Nonetheless, whether or not she is more qualified to teach her classes than is Meisenburg, it was established that Meisenburg is certificated and competent to bump Hall.

Other Issues

28. Christine Miramontes has a seniority date of August 29, 2007. She teaches third grade at a distract elementary school. Miramontes testified that she has had a two-year training program administered by WestEd in standards-based objectives training designed to give teachers a certain style of instructional modeling. The training is based on state standards and involves high expectations for student achievement. Her principal desires the school to have high achievement, and all teachers at the school have had at least one year of the special training; all teachers who have been at the school for two years have had both years of the training. Essentially, it is the principal's vision that all teachers undergo this training.

Miramontes testified that there were about seven teachers at her school who are slated for lay off. The layoffs have posed difficulties for her school. For example, the school has had many motivated, high-quality teachers, but many have left. When new teachers are brought in, it takes time to instill in new staff the same kind of motivation. Some of the new staff who have come to the school have not had the previous training program.

The district's Murray testified that the WestEd program is not unique to the school where Miramontes teaches.

It is inferred that Miramontes believes teachers at her school should be designated for skipping. However, whether or not the district *could* have skipped them, it was not established that the district was *required* to, nor was it established, for example, that the district's failure to skip teachers at Miramontes' school was arbitrary and capricious when compared with the district's decision to skip teachers at Cielo Vista who had received ProjectLearn training.

29. Christine Mulligan testified that she believed the district incorrectly determined her seniority date. She conceded, however, that even if the district had determined her seniority date in the manner she believed to be correct, she would still be properly slated for layoff. Accordingly, no determination as to Mulligan's seniority date need be made here.

Ultimate Finding

30. No certificated employee junior to any respondent was retained to perform any services which 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 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. Pursuant to section 44995, 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.) In fact, the district has an obligation under section 44955 to determine whether any permanent employee whose employment is to be terminated in an economic layoff possesses the seniority and qualifications which would entitle him/her to be assigned to another position. (*Bledsoe v. Biggs Unified School Dist.*, *supra*. at 136-137.)

4. The decision to reduce or discontinue a particular kind of service is not tied in with any statistical computation. It is within the governing authority’s discretion to determine the amount by which a particular kind of service will be reduced or discontinued as long as the district does not reduce a service below the level required by law. (*San Jose Teachers Assn. v. Allen* (1983) 144 Cal.App.3d 627, 635-636.) A school district has wide discretion in setting its budget and a layoff decision will be upheld unless it was fraudulent or so palpably unreasonable and arbitrary as to indicate an abuse of discretion as a matter of law. (*California Sch. Employees Assn. v. Pasadena Unified Sch. Dist.* (1977) 71 Cal.App.3d 318, 322.)

School districts have broad discretion in defining positions within the district and establishing requirements for employment. This discretion encompasses determining the training and experience necessary for particular positions. Similarly, school districts have the discretion to determine particular kinds of services that will be eliminated, even though a service continues to be performed or provided in a different manner by the district. (*Hildebrandt v. St. Helena Unified School Dist.* (2009) 172 Cal.App.4th 334, 343.) Districts also retain discretion to determine standards of competency for purposes of teacher layoffs, and those standards will be upheld as long as they are reasonable. (*Duax v. Kern Community College District* (1987) 196 Cal.App.3d 555, 565.)³

5. 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

³ *Duax* involved the layoff of community college teachers pursuant to Education Code section 97743, but is applicable here by analogy.

identified the certificated employees providing the particular kinds of services that the Board be directed be reduced or discontinued. It is recommended that the board give respondents notice before May 15, 2011, that their services are no longer required by the district.

ADVISORY DETERMINATION

The following advisory determination is made:

1. The accusations served on the respondents identified in Appendix A are sustained. Notice may be given to such respondents before May 15, 2011, that their services will not be required because of the reduction or discontinuation of particular services as indicated.

2. The accusations served on the respondents identified in Appendix B are not sustained. Notice may not be given to such respondents that their services will not be required because of the reduction or discontinuation of particular kinds of services.

DATED: May 2, 2011

DONALD P. COLE
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings

Appendix A⁴

1. Abraham Aparicio
2. Tarra Bercegeay (0.6 FTE)
3. Amanda Bond
4. Beth Brian
5. Joseph Bryan
6. Andrew Buchanan
7. Jennifer Cameron
8. Maritza Castro
9. Amanda Clem
10. Deborah Collier
11. Elba Cortez
12. Cheri D'Amicio
13. Russell Eves
14. Ursula Fabiano
15. Daniel Faddis
16. Tricia Feffer
17. Krista Fleischner
18. Amber Goscoigne
19. Kristen Goerzen
20. Tatyana Goldshteyn
21. Lindsay Goodwin
22. Desira Grandmain
23. Cecile Hall
24. Rebecca Heard
25. Amber Hernandez
26. Shelby Holton
27. Monica Horn
28. Allyson Huntsman
29. Clint James
30. Rachel Johnson
31. Casey Kistler
32. Amy Kudlac
33. Brandy Lee
34. Heidi Lee
35. James Leon
36. Amy Long
37. Francisco Lopez
38. Sabrina Lopez
39. Ryan Ludwin
40. Kai Lyles
41. Eduardo Martinez

⁴ Where the lay off of a respondent is less than a full-time-equivalent position, the applicable fraction of a full-time equivalent position is indicated in parentheses opposite the individual's name.

42. Pamela Mathis
43. Kim McClinton
44. Sharla McCullough
45. Norman McKee
46. Christina Miramontes
47. Amber Moser
48. Ramona Mueller
49. Christine Mulligan
50. Maria Munoz
51. Leigh-Ann Nisco
52. Sandra Nuno
53. Mayra Orozco
54. Caroline Paz
55. Veronica Pena-Silva
56. Brenda Perez-Valenzuela
57. Maria Pimentel-Jaimes
58. Demesia Pinon
59. Scott Rhoton
60. Maria Rivas
61. Elizabeth Robinson
62. Brandi Rosen
63. Rebecca Sandles
64. Erin Schroer
65. Jessica Simpson
66. Shannon Smith
67. Nancy Smith
68. Kenneth Stagg
69. Katharine Surdin
70. Chelsey Traylor
71. Michael Verhasselt
72. Robyn Walters
73. Angela Whittaker
74. Jason Yasuda

Appendix B

1. Gail Bobro
2. Staci Bond
3. David Catanzarite
4. Mary Cleveland
5. Heather Clutter
6. Genovefa Griffis
7. Ashley Jackson
8. Naureen Jahangir
9. Tara La Beaf
10. Katie Lambert
11. Fides May Le Roy
12. Thomas McMorris
13. Jessica Parent
14. Juanita Perezchica
15. Doris Rodriguez
16. Kristen Silvey
17. Karen Wright