*Revised to add resolution for initial announcement (Tab 2)

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES
Governing Board of the Los Angeles Unified School District

SPECIAL MEETING REVISED ORDER OF BUSINESS
333 South Beaudry Avenue, Board Room
208 Magnolia Avenue, Gardena, CA 90247
9945 Laurel Canyon Blvd., Pacoima, CA 91331
10:00 a.m., Thursday, May 21, 2026

Roll Call

Superintendent's Report

Draft 2026-2027 Fiscal Stabilization Plan

Public Comment

Providing Public Comment
The Board of Education encourages public comment on the items for action on this Special Board Meeting agenda. Any individual wishing to address the Board must register to speak using the Speaker Sign Up website: https://boardmeeting.lausd.net/speakers, and indicate whether comments will be provided over the phone or in person. Registration will open 24 hours before the meeting. Each action item will allow for **ten (10)** speakers. There is **NO GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT** taken at special board meetings.

Each speaker will be allowed a single opportunity to provide comments to the Board, and shall be given two minutes for their remarks. Speakers signed up to speak on an agenda item must constrain their remarks specifically to the item or items on the agenda or may be ruled out of order.

Public comment can be made in-person or by telephone, and members of the public must sign up on-line for either method, as described above. Members of the public can only make remote public comment by calling 1-888-475-4499 (Toll Free) and entering the Meeting ID: **879 7060 8197**.

Speakers who do not register online to provide comments may use the following alternative methods to provide comments to Board Members:

- Email all Board Members at boardmembers@lausd.net;
- Mail comments via US Mail to 333 S. Beaudry Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90017; and
- Leave a voicemail message at 213-443-4472, or fax 213-241-8953. Communications received by 5 p.m. the day before the meeting will be distributed to all Board Members.

Speakers who have registered to provide public comments over the phone need to follow these instructions:

1. Call 1-888-475-4499 (Toll Free) and enter Meeting ID: **879 7060 8197** at the beginning of the meeting.
2. Press #, and then # again when prompted for the Participant ID.
3. Remain on hold until it is your turn to speak.
4. Call in from the same phone number entered on the Speaker Sign Up website. If you call from a

private or blocked phone number, we will be unable to identify you.
5. When you receive the signal that your phone has been removed from hold and or unmuted, please press *6 (Star 6) to be brought into the meeting.

Please contact the Board Secretariat at 213-241-7002 if you have any questions.

The Office of the Inspector General would like to remind you that they investigate the misuse of LAUSD funds and resources as well as retaliation for reporting any misconduct. Anyone can make a report via the OIG hotline on their website (https://www.lausd.org/oig), by telephone at 213-241-7778, or by emailing inspector.general@lausd.net. Reports are confidential and you can remain anonymous if you wish.

Attending the Meeting
Please note there are three ways members of the public may watch or listen this Regular Board Meeting: (1) online (Granicus stream or join the zoom webinar) (2) by telephone by calling 1-888-475-4499 (Toll Free) and entering the Meeting ID: **879 7060 8197**, or (3) in person.

New Business for Action

1. Board of Education Report no. 466-25/26
Associate Superintendent Talent and Labor Relations
Classified Reduction in Force: Adoption of Administrative Law Judge Proposed Decision and Authorization for Final Notices

Board Member Resolution for Initial Announcement

2. Ms. Ortiz Franklin- Protecting High-Need Schools During Fiscal Instability (Res-063-25/26) (For Action June 12, 2026)

Whereas, The Los Angeles Unified School District is committed to ensuring all students graduate ready to thrive in college, career and life, which requires equity in action, including an equitable distribution of resources, stability of staffing and resources, especially in highest-need communities;

Whereas, Based on the collective advocacy of community, the Governing Board of the Los Angeles Unified School District created the Student Equity Needs Index (SENI) through the 2014 “Equity Is Justice” resolution and updated it through the 2018 “Equity Is Justice 2.0” and 2021 “Equity Is Justice 2021” resolutions to better address the academic, community, and pandemic-related concentration of need;

Whereas, In 2020, the Board established the Black Student Achievement Plan (BSAP) to address historic inequities in educational experiences and outcomes for our Black students through targeted academic, socio-emotional and culturally responsive supports;

Whereas, In August 2021, the Board adopted the “Equity in Action” resolution to ensure equity is considered in all Board decisions and requires the annual budget process to include a comprehensive analysis of investments and publicize allocation of dollars spent equitably;

Whereas, In June 2025 the Board adopted a Fiscal Stabilization Plan to address $1.6 billion deficit estimated for 2027-2028, cutting unspent funds carried over and reducing SENI, resulting in disproportionate reductions in budget cuts to SENI high and highest need schools;

Whereas, The Board adopted the "Budgeting based on Equity and Student Need" June 2025 resolution, requiring the District to maintain sufficient staffing at school sites, center students' needs, prioritize equity and recognize the value of all employees through public transparency and to complete an equity impact analysis of budget reductions;

Whereas, Schools budgets are fundamentally based on student enrollment which has steadily declined for decades and is further being reduced in predominantly immigrant neighborhoods because of genuine fear of federal attacks on our immigrant communities;

Whereas, The District has achieved remarkable academic progress among all student groups during the 2024-2025 school year, demonstrating the effectiveness of equity-based investments and staffing stability; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Governing Board of the Los Angeles Unified School District commits to upholding the principle of equity in school-site staffing; and, be it finally

Resolved, That the District shall ensure mutual consent and shall not force-place any staff at SENI High and Highest need schools and BSAP Group 1 schools.

Adjournment

Return to Order of Business

TAB 1

Los Angeles Unified School District
333 South Beaudry Ave,
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Board of Education Report

File #: Rep-466-25/26, **Version:** 1 **Agenda Date:** 5/21/2026
In Control: Associate Superintendent Talent & Labor Relations

Central Office and Centrally-Funded Classified Reduction in Force: Adoption of Administrative Law Judge Proposed Decision and Authorization for Final Notices
Associate Superintendent Talent and Labor Relations

Brief Description:
(Central Office and Centrally-Funded Classified Reduction in Force: Adoption of Administrative Law Judge Proposed Decision and Authorization for Final Notices) Recommends approval, adoption and authorization to finalize and implement previously identified classified staffing reductions for the 2025-2026 school year. The actions are driven by ongoing fiscal and operational considerations, including lack of work, lack of funds, and the expiration of specially funded programs). The report also seeks adoption of the Administrative Law Judge's Proposed Decision affirming the District's compliance with applicable legal and procedural requirements

Action Proposed:
The Board of Education (Board) take the following actions driven by ongoing fiscal and operational considerations, including lack of work, lack of funds, and the expiration of specially funded programs, to support the District's fiscal stability and implementation of its Fiscal Stabilization Plan for the 2026-27 school year:

1. Determine that it remains necessary to eliminate and reduce certain central office and centrally-funded classified positions, and to implement related reductions in hours and reductions in basis, as identified in Board Report No. 314-25/26, Attachment A (attached), adopted by the Board on February 17, 2026, which reflects the classified position closures, reductions in hours, and reductions in basis previously authorized due to lack of work, lack of funds, and/or expiration of a specially funded program, effective at the end of the 2025-2026 school year.

2. Adopt the attached Proposed Decision issued by Office of Administrative Hearings, Administrative Law Judge Eric Sawyer in OAH Case No. 2026030754, attached as Attachment B, as the District's decision in the 2025-2026 classified reduction in force matter.

3. Find, consistent with the Proposed Decision, that the District met its burden of establishing a preponderance of the evidence that cause exists for the reduction or elimination of certain central office and centrally-funded classified services due to lack of work and/or lack of funds, that the reductions are related to the welfare of the schools and pupils, that the District satisfied the applicable notice and jurisdictional requirements, and that the layoff determinations complied with applicable seniority requirements.

4. Authorize the Personnel Commission and/or Office of the General Counsel, as appropriate, to issue final layoff notices, notices related to reductions in hours or basis, notices related to placement in lower classifications, rescission notices, and any other required notices or implementation actions to affected

classified employees, consistent with the Proposed Decision, applicable law, and Personnel Commission rules. This authorization includes rescissions identified during the hearing process and any additional rescission notices necessary to ensure the classified reduction in force is implemented in accordance with the Proposed Decision, applicable law and Personnel Commission rules.

Background:
The District continues to engage in deficit spending, caused primarily by the continued and significant annual decrease in student enrollment combined with the ending of one-time funds.

Collective advocacy efforts helped achieve additional investments for K-12 education in the Governor's proposed 2026-27 Budget May Revision, including a higher Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA), additional investments for special education, and a higher one-time discretionary block grant, among other proposals. While the additional proposed revenue improves the District's financial outlook, it does not fully resolve the District's long-term fiscal imbalance and the need to implement the current Fiscal Stabilization Plan, or the requirement to submit a new one.

In accordance with Education Code Sections 45117, 45298, and 45308, on February 17, 2026, the Board approved Board Report No. 314-25/26, authorizing the Personnel Commission to issue March 15 notices to affected classified employees with the least seniority in impacted classifications. Board Report No. 314-25/26 authorized a classified reduction in force involving central office and centrally-funded classified positions, including the elimination of 657 positions, reduction in hours of 52 positions, and reductions in basis for 22 positions, for a total reduction affecting 731 classified positions due to lack of work, lack of funds, and/or expiration of specially funded programs. The notices informed affected classified employees that they may be subject to layoff effective June 30, 2026, as a result of the reduction or elimination of the classified positions and services identified in Attachment A.

From March 9, 2026, through March 14, 2026, the District issued written notices to 763 classified employees informing them that their services may not be required, or may be reduced, for the ensuing 2026-2027 school year, and advising them of their hearing, displacement, and reemployment rights. Although the Board approved reductions affecting 731 classified positions, additional notices were issued because classified employees may affect other employees through placement or bumping rights. These rights may allow an employee whose position is eliminated to move into a lower classification that the employee previously held, based on seniority. The bumping process can create a chain reaction when one employee's move affects another employee's position. As a result, the District issued notices to all employees who could be affected. Of the affected classified employees, 76 initially requested a hearing, and 36 timely submitted notices of participation in the hearing. Two late Notices of Participation were allowed by the Administrative Law Judge and subsequently withdrawn.

The hearing was held before an Administrative Law Judge through the Office of Administrative Hearings. The Administrative Law Judge was required to prepare a Proposed Decision containing findings of fact and a determination regarding whether cause exists for the central office and centrally-funded classified layoffs. The hearing was originally scheduled to begin on April 3, 2026, but was continued to April 27, 2026, upon motion of the District. Accordingly, the dates prescribed in Education Code section 45117, subdivision (c)(3)(A), were extended for a period of time equal to the length of the continuance. As a result, the District must serve final layoff notices no later than June 5, 2026, in accordance with Education Code section 45117.

The Administrative Law Judge issued the attached Proposed Decision on May 8, 2026. The Proposed Decision affirmed the District's Statement of Reduction in Force in its entirety. The Administrative Law Judge found that the District is operating under significant deficit spending projected to continue over the next two years unless reconciled; that the reductions are an important part of the District's Fiscal Stabilization Plan; that the District proved cause for the central office and centrally-funded classified reductions by a preponderance of the evidence, that the reductions are related to the welfare of the schools and pupils; that the District met the applicable notice and jurisdictional requirements; that the District properly applied seniority rules under the Education Code; and that final notice may be given to employees that their services will not be required, or will be reduced for the ensuing 2026-2027 school year.

By adopting the Proposed Decision, the Board will also authorize implementation of the rescissions identified during the hearing process and reflected in the Proposed Decision. In addition, the District may identify additional employees whose layoff notices should be rescinded based on further review of staffing, seniority, placement, displacement, attrition, or other implementation factors. Any such rescissions would be made to ensure that final layoff notices are issued where appropriate and consistent with the Proposed Decision, applicable law, and Personnel Commission rules.

Accordingly, the Board is asked to adopt the Proposed Decision as issued and authorize the District to take all actions necessary to implement the classified reduction in force in a manner consistent with the Proposed Decision, applicable Education Code requirements, and Personnel Commission rules. The authorization includes issuance of final layoff notices, notices of reduction in hours or basis, notices related to placement in lower classifications, and any other required notices necessary to implement the classified reduction in force, and account for rescissions identified during the hearing process or through further review.

The IT Support Technician classification is being addressed separately from this Board action because any restoration of those positions remains pending ratification of the tentative agreement between SEIU and the District. If the tentative agreement is ratified and further action is required, the District will take appropriate action, including restoration notices, as appropriate.

Expected Outcomes:
The Board will approve this request to adopt the Administrative Law Judge's Proposed Decision and authorize the Personnel Commission and/or Office of the General Counsel, as appropriate, to issue final layoff notices to affected permanent classified employees, effective June 30, 2026, in compliance with Education Code Sections 45117, 45298, and 45308.

The Board will authorize the issuance of final layoff notices, notices related to reductions in hours or basis, placement in lower classifications, rescission notices, and any other required implementation notices to affected classified employees, consistent with the Proposed Decision, applicable law, and Personnel Commission rules.

The Board will approve implementation of the central office and centrally-funded classified reductions previously authorized in Board Report No. 314-25/26 and identified in Attachment A, including position closures, reductions in hours, and reductions in basis, and authorize the Personnel Commission and/or Office of the General Counsel, as appropriate, to implement the classified reduction in force consistent with the Proposed Decision.

Board Options and Consequences:
An Office of Administrative Hearings Administrative Law Judge has prepared the attached Proposed Decision, containing findings of fact and a determination as to whether cause exists for the classified layoffs and whether

the District complied with applicable notice, jurisdictional, and seniority requirements. The Proposed Decision concludes that the District met its burden, that cause exists for the reduction or elimination of classified services described in Board Report No. 314-25/26, and that final layoff notices may be issued.

The Board must now make the final determination as to the sufficiency of the cause and disposition for the central office and centrally-funded classified reduction in force. Adoption of the Proposed Decision will authorize the District to proceed with final layoff notices, notices related to reductions in hours or basis, placement in lower classifications, rescission notices, and any other required implementation notices to affected classified employees, consistent with the Proposed Decision, applicable law, and Personnel Commission rules, as applicable.

If authorization is granted, it is anticipated that employees‘ rights to employment in other classes and the use of vacancies generated by annual attrition will result in a significant difference between the number of authorized reductions and the number of employees being released from District service.

If authorization is not granted for the classified reduction in force, the District will not be able to fully implement the elimination, reduction, or unfunding of classified positions previously identified and will need to continue to pay the salary and benefits costs associated with those classified positions, estimated at approximately $90 million per year. Moreover, it may impact the District's ability to meet its financial obligations and lead to financial insolvency and County or State oversight.

Policy Implications:
The District must comply with the Education Code and applicable law in order to implement layoffs, reduction in hours, reduction in basis, placement in lower classifications, rescissions, reemployment rights, and other related employment actions affecting classified personnel for the following school year. Approval of this Board Report authorizes the District to proceed with the reduction in force in compliance with applicable law, including the issuance of required notices to classified employees who may be subject to layoff, reduction in hours, reduction in basis, placement in lower classifications, rescission, reemployment rights, or other related employment actions, as applicable.

The Proposed Decision is relevant to the policy implications because it addresses the statutory requirements governing classified layoffs, including the District's obligation to establish cause, demonstrate that the reduction is related to the welfare of the schools and pupils, provide required notices, and implement layoffs in seniority order. Accordingly, approval of the Board Report authorizes the District to proceed only in compliance with those legal requirements.

Budget Impact:
Approval of this Board Report supports implementation of the District's Fiscal Stabilization Plan by authorizing the District to proceed with the central office and centrally-funded classified reduction in force previously approved (Board Report No. 314-25/26), including position closures, reductions in hours, and reductions in basis. The cost of those positions is approximately $90 million, implemented as part of the Fiscal Stabilization Plan. This also represents the potential cost of not approving this proposal. Even with approval, available reserves are already being fully utilized, and further reductions will be necessary based on the District's multi-year projections. The District is already required to submit a new Fiscal Stabilization Plan in June 2026 to the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE).

Failure to authorize the issuance of final layoff notices, rescission notices, and any other required notices necessary to implement the central office and centrally-funded classified reduction in force may result in substantially lower budgetary savings under the previous Fiscal Stabilization Plan, lower General Fund ending balances, and reduced ability to implement position reductions needed to address the District's projected deficits. Without approval, the District may be required to continue funding classified positions identified for closure, reduction in hours, or reduction in basis, which may increase projected expenditures and adversely affect the District's ability to meet its financial obligations.

Student Impact:
The proposed classified staffing reductions are intended to preserve the District's overall fiscal stability and prioritize resources that directly support school sites and classroom instruction. Because the affected positions are primarily central office and centrally-funded positions, the District anticipates minimizing direct impacts on students and school-based services.

However, the reductions may result in some indirect operational impacts, including:

- Reduced administrative or centralized support capacity;
- Longer response times for certain district-level services and functions;
- Potential delays in processing, coordination, and/or program support previously provided by affected staff; and
- Reduced support for programs funded through expired or discontinued special funding sources.

The District determined that the reductions are necessary due to lack of work, lack of funds, and/or expiration of specially funded programs, and that the actions are related to the welfare of schools and students. The reductions are intended to align staffing with available resources while maintaining essential educational services and minimizing disruption to student learning and school operations.

Equity Impact:

Component	Score	Score Rationale
Recognition	**4**	Actively recognizes and addresses past inequities by providing additional consideration for student needs by implementing a reduction in force focused on central office and centrally-funded positions.
Resource Prioritization	**3**	A reduction in force focused primarily on central office and centrally-funded positions mitigates effects on school services and supports for schools.
Results	**3**	Program continuity based on students and school-based needs will be prioritized.
TOTAL	**10**	

Issues and Analysis:
Classified employees who are laid off because of lack of work or lack of funds will be placed on a District reemployment list by classification for a period of 39 months from the date of separation. During this period, they shall have preference over new applicants and shall be offered reemployment in order of seniority within their classification, in accordance with Education Code Sections 45298 and 45308.

Classified employees who take a voluntary demotion or voluntary reduction in assigned time in lieu of layoff shall retain applicable reemployment rights under Education Code Section 45298, Personnel Commission rules, and applicable collective bargaining agreements.

While the Governor and the Legislature continue to negotiate the final state budget over the next month, Los Angeles Unified will continue to advocate alongside our labor partners, community-based organizations, parents and others, for the release of the Governor's proposed $3.9 billion withholding in school funding and the allocation of the proposed $5 billion discretionary block grant in a manner that is more equitable instead of distributing the funds as currently proposed on a per-pupil basis.

Additionally, the District and Personnel Commission will continue to work toward minimizing the impacts of notices issued to employees through placement of employees in vacancies created as a result of annual attrition (retirements/resignations/separations). Additionally, a career workshop will be held in June to assist impacted employees with resume, application and interview skills. Information about all District job openings in areas of need will continue to be sent to all classified employees. We expect that through this work, the final number of employees released from District service and placed on a reemployment list will be significantly smaller than the number of notices approved and issued.

Attachments:
Attachment A - Classified Position Closures, Reductions in Hours, and Reductions in Basis

Attachment B - Proposed Decision

Linked Material:
Reference under Action proposed, background, expected outcomes, budget impact, board options and consequences in Board Report No.314-25/26 <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1O4Yvsa04932eZr-njEHX3xJT8wJcK80K/view?usp=sharing> Staffing and Resource Alignment: Central Office and Centrally-Funded Position Closures, March 15 Notices to Certificated and Classified Contract Management Employees and Administrative and Supervisory Credentialed Employees, and Authorization to Issue Reduction in Force Notices to Employees adopted on February 17, 2026.

Submitted:
05/19/26

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

ANDRES E. CHAIT
Acting Superintendent

APPROVED & PRESENTED BY:

KRISTEN K. MURPHY
Associate Superintendent
Talent and Labor Relations

REVIEWED BY:

DEVORA NAVERA REED
General Counsel

✓ Approved as to form.

APPROVED & PRESENTED BY:

FRANCISCO SERRATO
Chief Human Resources Officer
HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION

REVIEWED BY:

KURT E. JOHN
Deputy Chief Financial Officer

✓ Approved as to budget impact statement.

APPROVED & PRESENTED BY:

DAVID GRECO
Director
Personnel Commission Office

Central Office and Centrally-Funded Positions Closures

ATTACHMENT A

Job Title	Total
Accounting Technician II	2
Administrative Aide	4
Administrative Assistant	3
Administrative Intern I	1
Administrative Secretary I	1
Administrative Secretary I (C)	1
Area Bus Supervisor	5
Area Operations Supervisor	6
Assignment Technician	11
Assistant Administratve Analyst	2
Assistant Area Bus Supervisor	25
Assistant Environmental Safety Officer	1
Assistant Garage Supervisor	3
Assistant Realty Agent	2
Assistant Transportation Services Mgr	1
Assoc Computer Appl Spst	3
Budget Policy Analyst	1
Bus Dispatcher	2
Bus Park Attendant	11
Charter Schools Opers Coord	1
Chief Clerk	1
Chief Of School Culture, Climate, & Safe	1
Class 'B' Comm Truck Drvr	3
Communication Support Assistant	1
Comp Applications Specialist	2
Coordinator Of Legislative Advocacy	1
Credentials & Contract Specialist	5
Customer Service Representative	1
Data Analyst School Police	1
Data Base Specialist	1
Dep Controller	1
Driver-Trainer (Bus-Truck)	2
Driver-Trainer (Truck)	2
Educational Research Analyst	1
Emergency Management & Business Cont Mgr	1
Fleet-Parts Purchaser	1
Gardener	23
Grant & Funding Specialist	1
Head Accountant	1
Health Site Support Aide	7
Insurance Technician	1
Interpreter Aide - Spanish Lang	1
Inventory Control Analyst	3
Investigator (SSIT)	1
IT Customer Supp Rep	29
IT Solution Technician	2

Central Office and Centrally-Funded Positions Closures

Job Title	Total
IT Support Technician	220
IT Trainer I	1
It Trainer II	4
Labor Relations Administrator	1
Legal Secretary (C)	4
Library Media Clerk	1
Logistics Supervisor	1
Mail Clerk	3
Multimedia Designer	1
Office Technician	91
Office Technician (C)	2
Parent Education Supp Assistant (Span Lang)	21
Parent Education Support Assistant	12
Payroll Distribution Assistant	1
Payroll Specialist II	1
Payroll Specialist III	1
Pest Management Technician	6
Principal Administrative Analyst	3
Program & Policy Dev Advsr, Budget	1
Program & Policy Dev Coordinator	1
Program And Policy Dev Advisor	1
Property Management Assistant	1
Pupil Service & Att Aide -Span Lang	1
Pupil Services & Attendance Aide	8
Purchasing Services Manager	2
Records And Archive Technician	1
Salary Credits Assistant	1
Sap Enterprise Portal Specialist	1
Sap Functional Analyst(Bn, Bw, Security)	2
Secretary & (Restricted)	1
Selection Technician	1
Senior Advisor To The Superintendent	1
Senior Office Technician	7
Senior Office Technician (C)	3
Spec Ed Fiscal Analyst	1
Sr Accounting Analyst	1
Sr Administrative Analyst	2
Sr Administrative Assistant	1
Sr Advisor, Office Of Communications	1
Sr Assignment Technician	1
Sr Contract Administration Mgr	2
Sr Financial Analyst	3
Sr Mail Clerk	1
Sr Marketing Representative	1
Sr Parent Community Facilitator	3
Sr Parent Education Support Assistant	2

Job Title	Total
Sr Payroll Specialist (C)	2
Sr Procurement Customer Service Supervis	1
Sr Programmer Analyst Sap	1
Sr Programmer Analyst, Oracle	2
Sr Secretary	3
Sr Technical Project Mgr	1
Staff Assistant To Board Members Iv	1
Stock Clerk	5
Strategic Operations Administrator	1
Student & Family Res Navigator	19
Student & Family Resource Ambassador	2
Supervising Assignment Tech	1
Supervising Insurance Technician	1
Supervising Investigator	1
Supervising Personnel Clerk	1
Toolkeeper	1
Translator (Spanish Language)	2
Transportation Router	2
Transportation Services Mgr	1
Truck Driver Helper	1
Workers Comp Claims Proc Spec	1
Workers Comp Claims Proc Spvr	1
Total	**657**

Central Office and Centrally-Funded Positions with Hours Reductions

Job Title	Job	Reduction in Hours	Total Positions Impacted
Area Out-Of-School Pgm Sp	29208480	3.75 to 1	1
		3.75 to 2	3
		3.75 to 2.5	1
		4 to 2	6
		4 to 3.75	2
		4.5 to 3.75	3
		5 to 3.75	3
Area Out-Of-School Pgm Sp Total			**19**
Heavy Bus Driver	22305826		1
		6 to 4	2
		6 to 5	1
		8 to 4	1
		8 to 5	1
Heavy Bus Driver Total			6
Light Bus Driver	**22305861**	**6 to 4**	**1**
		6 to 4.5	1
Light Bus Driver Total			2
Sr Out-Of-School Pgm Spvr	29208482	3.75 to 1	1
Sr Out-Of-School Pgm Spvr Total			1
Trvlg Out-Of-School Pgm Spvr	29208481	3.75 to 1	2
		3.75 to 2	**7**
		3.75 to 3	1
		3.75 to 3.28	1
		3.75 to 3.5	**1**
		4 to 3.75	12
Trvlg Out-Of-School Pgm Spvr Total			**24**
Total			**52**

Central Office and Centrally-Funded Positions with Reduced Basis

ATTACHMENT A

Classification	Job Title	Job	Reduction in Basis	Total Positions Impacted
Classified	Assistant Outdoor Educ Center Mgr	22104574	A to E	3
Classified	Naturalist	22104595	A to B	17
Classified	Volunteer Program Assistant	24102326	A to B	2
Classified Total	**Total**			**22**

BEFORE THE
BOARD OF EDUCATION
LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

In the Matter of the District Statement of Reduction in Force Against:

CERTAIN CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES OF THE LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,

Respondents.

OAH No. 2026030754

PROPOSED DECISION

Eric Sawyer, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), Office of Administrative Hearings, State of California, heard this matter on April 27, 28, and 30, 2026, in Los Angeles, California.

Marcos F. Hernandez and Hannah L. Hoonanian, Associate General Counsel, represented the Los Angeles Unified School District (District).

Respondents are the 38 classified employees of the District who requested a hearing to challenge the District's proposed reduction in force, and thereafter timely filed notices to participate in the hearing, or were deemed to have done so.

Christopher Lee, Attorney, represented respondent Jennifer Valdivia.

James Kidd, Assistant Director of Union-Employer Relations, SEIU Local 99, represented respondents Kathleen Nunez, Yesenia Barajas, Ashley Pedraza Barrelas, Julia Gonzalez Chaves, Reyna Portillo, Esmerelda Vasquez, and Byran Novoa.

The following respondents appeared at the hearing and represented themselves: Genee Farr, Fatima Abutouk, Brian Diaz, Chris Mercado, Laura Moreno Palacios, Stephanie Ramirez, and Robert Sarkis Grekorian.

The record closed and the matter was submitted for decision at the conclusion of the hearing.

The hearing of this matter originally was scheduled to begin on April 3, 2026, but was continued to April 27, 2026, upon motion of the District. Accordingly, the dates prescribed in Education Code section 45117, subdivision (c)(3)(A), have been extended for a period of time equal to the length of the continuance.

SUMMARY

District proposes to lay off or reduce services of 731 classified positions due to lack of funds or work. Specifically, District is operating under massive deficit spending in the hundreds of millions of dollars, projected to continue over the next two school years unless reconciled. District met its burden of establishing by a preponderance of the evidence that its proposed layoffs are related to the welfare of its schools and pupils, and that implementation of the layoffs followed the rules of seniority established by the Education Code. While a few individual respondents challenged their seniority dates or eligibility to bump into positions in other classifications, those challenges were not convincing. Therefore, the District Statement of Reduction in Force is affirmed in its entirety.

FACTUAL FINDINGS

Parties and Jurisdiction

1. Respondents are permanent, classified employees of District.

2. On February 17, 2026, District's Board of Education (Board) adopted Board Report Number 314-25/26, in which the Board determined it was necessary to, among other actions, reduce at the end of the 2025-2026 school year certain central office and centrally-funded classified positions as a result of lack of work or lack of funds. (Testimony [Test.] of Dr. Kristen K. Murphy; Ex. 7.)

3. From March 9, 2026, through March 14, 2026, 763 District classified employees (Exs. 34, 35), including respondents, received written notice informing them that it had been recommended that notice be given to them that their services would not be required, or would be reduced, for the ensuing 2026-2027 school year, stating the reasons therefore, and advising them of their hearing, displacement, and reemployment rights (Layoff Notice). (Test. of Dr. Murphy, Maria Underwood; Ex. 32.)

4. In response to the Layoff Notices, 76 District classified employees, including respondents, filed a Request for Hearing to challenge District's proposed action. (Test. of Dr. Murphy; Ex. 12.)

5. On April 8, 2026, Kristen K. Murphy, Ed.D., the District's Associate Superintendent of Talent and Labor Relations, filed the District Statement of Reduction in Force in her official capacity. (Test. of Dr. Murphy, Underwood; Ex. 33.) On the same date, the District served all those who filed a Request for Hearing, including respondents, with a Notice of District Statement of Reduction in Force; the District Statement of Reduction in Force; a blank Notice of Participation form; and copies of

pertinent provisions of the Government and Education Codes (RIF Packet). (Test. of Dr. Murphy, Underwood; Ex. 33.)

6. In response to the RIF Packet, 36 respondents timely submitted a Notice of Participation. (Test. of Underwood; Ex. 13.)

7. On the first day of hearing, the ALJ excused late Notices of Participation filed by respondents Paulina Barberena and Yolany Guzman, and allowed them to participate in the hearing over District objection. Thereafter, those two respondents withdrew their Notices of Participation and left the hearing.

8. District timely served notice of the hearing of this matter on respondents. (Test. of Dr. Murphy; Ex. 33, p. A675.)

9. During the hearing, District announced on the record the following respondents had withdrawn their Notices of Participation: Ruben Alarcon, Yesenia Barajas, Ashley Pedraza Barrales, Steve Boyle, Carrie Delisle, Brian Diaz, Derek Henderson, Ling Ho, Maryam Kakar, Dorian Lopez, Joel Martinez, Chris Mercado, Laura Moreno Palacios, and Balasubramanian Sivaramakrishnan. (Ex. 69.)

10. During the hearing, District announced on the record that Layoff Notices had been rescinded for the following respondents: Georgina Canales, David Castaneda, Maria Campos Hernandez, Tahzin Khan, Dani Martinez, Selena Mucha, Bryan Novoa, Reyna Portillo, Stephanie Ramirez, and William Salguero. (Ex. 68.)

The Board's Reduction of Classified Positions

11. District's Chief Financial Officer, Saman Bravo-Karimi, explained in his testimony District's current financial woes, which are projected to persist over the following two school years. Specifically, District continues to engage in deficit

spending, which has been caused by the significant decrease in student enrollment over the past several years, combined with the ending of one-time funding related to the COVID pandemic. While revenues have decreased, expenditures have not been reduced proportionately. Thus, last school year District actually operated at a deficit. (Test. of Bravo-Karimi; Exs. 7-9.)

12. As of District's First Interim Financial Report made in December 2025, the projected deficits were $877 million and $443 million for 2026-2027 and 2027-2028 school years, respectively. These deficits equate to 14 percent and 7 percent of District's Unrestricted General Fund projected expenditures and other financing uses. These are dangerously high deficit levels for a public education institution, and signal a significant structural imbalance, not a temporary dip. (Test. of Bravo-Karimi; Exs. 7-9.)

13. District's use of one-time ending funds to offset its deficit spending has drawn concern from the Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE), which oversees public school districts within Los Angeles County. For example, in its letter approving District's Local Control Accountability Plan and Adopted Budget for fiscal year 2025-2026, LACOE commented, "we remain concerned about the District's projected trend of deficit spending and its impact on the District's fiscal stability." In its 2025-2026 First Interim letter to District, LACOE "acknowledge[d] the District's commitment to addressing its structural deficit, [but] we remain concerned about the continued trend of significant deficit spending and its adverse effect on the District's ability to meet its financial obligations and reserve requirements in future years." (Test. of Bravo-Karimi; Exs. 7-9.)

14. In order to reverse the projected deficit spending over the following two school years, several high ranking District officers recommended to the Board that it authorize the layoff of approximately 2,600 contract management employees and

certificated administrators, as well as the reduction of 731 central office and centrally-funded classified positions as follows: eliminating 657 positions, reducing the hours of 52 positions, and reducing the basis of 22 positions. These reductions of central office and centrally-funded positions are intended to minimize immediate disruption to schools and classrooms. (Test. of Bravo-Karimi, Dr. Murphy; Exs 8-9.)

15. The above-described reductions are an important part of a fiscal stabilization plan District created and shared with LACOE in order to address the systemic deficits, and reduce the possibility of LACOE placing a fiscal consultant with District, or District becoming insolvent and being taken over by the State of California. (Test. of Bravo-Karimi; Exs. 7-9.)

16. On February 17, 2026, the Board adopted Board Report Number 314-25/26, entitled "Staffing and Resource Alignment: Central Office and Centrally-Funded Position Closures, March 15 Notices to Certificated and Classified Contract Management Employees and Administrative and Supervisory Credentialed Employees, and Authorization to Issue Reduction in Force Notices to Employees" (Board Report), in which the Board accepted the above-described recommendations, including the reduction of 731 classified positions. (Test. of Bravo-Karimi, Dr. Murphy; Exs. 7-9.)

17. In the Board Report, the Board also determined that seniority would be determined pursuant to Education Code section 45308, and it authorized District's Personnel Commission to implement all subsequent layoff proceedings. (Test. of Bravo-Karimi, Dr. Murphy; Exs. 7-9.)

Implementation of Layoffs

18. District gives its classified employees seniority dates based on their first day of work in regular status, which is as a probationary, permanent, or restricted

employee, but not in a temporary position or as a substitute. (Test. of Underwood.) This is consistent with the Education Code. (Legal Conclusion 2.)

19. District is a merit system school district, in which all classified employees must pass an examination and demonstrate they are qualified for the positions they seek. These measures are intended to prevent nepotism and cronyism. The merit system is governed by Education Code sections 45240 through 45320, which require, in part, that a school district utilize a personnel commission to oversee recruitment, hiring, promotions, and professional development of its classified employees. The District's Personnel Commission does not report to the Board, but rather is overseen by three independent commissioners. (Test. of David Greco.)

20. At hearing, Maria Underwood, the Personnel Commission's Assistant Director-- Personnel, explained how the Personnel Commission implemented the proposed classified layoffs. First, the Personnel Commission created seniority lists for each classification that was identified for layoffs in the Board Report. Tie-breaking criteria were developed for employees in the same classification who had the same seniority date. In order of priority, the tie-breaking criteria are seniority in class, seniority with District (number of days), score on eligibility examination, and employee number (lower number is greater seniority). (Test. of Underwood.)

21. Next, the Personnel Commission created "placement tools" for each impacted classification, listing the employees by seniority, and showing the effects of bumping in the various classifications. To create the placement tools, the Personnel Commission determined how many positions in each classification were subject to layoff, and selected the corresponding number of least senior employee(s) for reduction. Any employee subject to layoff in one classification with enough seniority in any other classification based on prior work experience with District was allowed to

bump into a position in the other classification held by a less senior employee. An employee bumping into one classification from another is listed on the placement tools as "Bump In," and an employee bumped out of the classification, and therefore subject to layoff, is listed as "Bump Out." (Test. of Underwood; also see, e.g., Ex. 41.)

22. The placement tools were created by one team, and then audited and verified for accuracy by another team. It was established by a preponderance of the evidence that the various placement tools in evidence are accurate. (Test. of Underwood; Exs. 36-50, 53-54, 56-57.)

23. After initial layoff decisions were made, District continued to take into account all positively assured attrition due to resignation, retirement, or non-reemployment of other classified employees, in order to re-assign vacant positions to more senior eligible classified employees subject to layoff. (Test. of Dr. Murphy.)

24. Based on the above, it was established by a preponderance of the evidence that respondents were properly identified for layoff to account for the reduction in force. District has not retained any permanent or probationary classified employee having less seniority than respondents to render a service in respondents' respective classes. The District has not retained any short-term employee to render a service that any respondent is qualified to render. (Test. of Dr. Murphy, Underwood; Exs. 12-13, 32-57.)

Challenges by Individual Respondents

JULIA GONZALEZ CHAVES

25. Respondent Gonzalez Chaves is a Health Site Support Aid (HSSA). Her assigned seniority date is November 16, 2021, which was her first date of service in

regular status in that position. Respondent Gonzalez Chaves is the fourth most senior HSSA among all eight employed by District. However, seven of the eight HSSA positions are being eliminated, which subjects respondent Gonzalez Chaves to layoff. (Test. of Underwood; Exs. 48-49.)

26. Respondent Gonzalez Chaves contends her seniority date should be earlier, i.e., April 8, 2021, when she was hired as a substitute HSSA. (Exs. BB-1, BB-2.) Respondent Gonzalez Chaves relies, in part, on an earlier version of a seniority list for this classification which showed her as the most senior employee, based on her date of hire as a substitute employee. Ms. Underwood convincingly testified that seniority list was in error because a classified employee cannot accrue seniority for service as a substitute. Therefore, the seniority list and placement tool for this classification were corrected to show respondent Gonzalez Chaves's proper seniority date of November 16, 2021. (Test. of Underwood.)

27. Respondent Gonzalez Chaves complains District failed to advise her she was a substitute employee when she first was hired. Ms. Underwood convincingly testified that when any classified employee is offered employment by the Personnel Commission, they are advised whether they will be hired in substitute, temporary, restricted, probationary, or permanent status. In support, District presented an April 7, 2021 letter from the Personnel Commission to respondent Gonzalez Chaves clearly advising her she had been hired in a temporary position. (Ex. 51.) It also is clear from respondent Gonzalez Chaves's first paystub from District, issued in April 2021, that she received no credit for vacation or "half-pay illness," or contributions for healthcare insurance, all obvious indications she was not given regular status when initially hired. (Exs. BB-1, BB-2.)

28. Based on the above, respondent Gonzalez Chaves is subject to layoff.

Esmeralda Vasquez

29. Respondent Vasquez also is an HSSA. Her assigned seniority date is December 12, 2021, which was her first date of service in regular status in that position. Respondent Vasquez is the fifth most senior HSSA among all eight employed by District. Because seven of the eight HSSA positions are being eliminated, respondent Vasquez is subject to layoff. (Test. of Underwood; Exs. 48-49.)

30. Respondent Vasquez contends her earlier work experience for District in another classification could entitle her to bump into another position. Respondent Vasquez initially was hired by District in October 2018. (Test. of respondent Vasquez; Exs. P-1, P-2, P-3, P-4.) However, her application for that position, as well as her initial paystubs from District, clearly show that was a temporary position. As discussed above, service performed in temporary or substitute assignments does not establish a seniority date. Therefore, this earlier work experience does not make respondent Vasquez eligible to bump into another classification.

31. Respondent Vasquez complains District failed to advise her she was not a permanent employee when she was first hired. For the same reasons explained above regarding respondent Gonzalez Chaves, this testimony was not convincing. Even if true, it would not change the accuracy of her seniority date.

32. Based on the above, respondent Vasquez is subject to layoff.

Jennifer Valdivia

33. Respondent Valdivia is a Public Information Officer (PIO) II, with an assigned seniority date of February 25, 2025. (Exs. 40, 66.) District does not seek to

reduce or eliminate any position in either the PIO I or II classification. (Test. of Underwood; Ex. 7.)

34. However, District is eliminating the one position in the Strategic Information Officer classification. The effected employee, Samuel Gilstrap, has a seniority date of November 30, 2016, and is qualified to bump into the PIO II classification. (Test. of Underwood.) Respondent Valdivia is the most junior employee in the PIO II classification, given her assigned seniority date. District determined she is ineligible to bump into the PIO I classification because the one PIO I currently employed has a seniority date before respondent Valdivia was hired by District. Therefore, respondent Valdivia is subject to layoff. (Test. of Underwood; Exs. 38-41.)

35. Respondent Valdivia contends her seniority date should be earlier. This is because after respondent Valdivia was initially hired by District as a PIO I in July 2023, she began assuming more complex duties undertaken by a PIO II. Respondent Valdivia was not clear in her testimony regarding the conditions underlying her initial hiring by District, e.g., whether initially she was hired as a temporary employee. However, the placement tool for the PIO I classification shows respondent Valdivia has a seniority date in that position of November 16, 2023, indicating her first date of employment in that position in regular status. (Ex. 39.)

36. Because she was fulfilling higher level duties, respondent Valdivia successfully appealed to the Personnel Commission for a reclassification to the PIO II position. Respondent Valdivia testified she was advised that her reclassification could not be effective earlier than September 2024, which is when she would have enough experience to qualify for the position, but that she was fulfilling the higher duties on and after July 31, 2023. (Test. of Valdivia.)

37. If given a new seniority date of July 31, 2023, respondent Valdivia would no longer be the most junior employee in the PIO II classification. Instead, two other employees in that classification with a January 16, 2024 seniority date would be more junior. (Test. of Valdivia; Exs. 38-41). Respondent Valdivia testified she trained both of those two other employees when they were hired in 2024. Neither of those two other employees were given a Layoff Notice and therefore they are not subject to layoff.

38. David Greco, Personnel Director of the Personnel Commission, disagrees with respondent Valdivia's contention. Mr. Greco testified that a reclassification relates to the position in question, not the employee holding the position. If the Personnel Commission decides to reclassify a position, the involved supervisor can either accept the position in question being reclassified or remove the higher-level duties so the position remains unchanged. If reclassification occurs, the employee in question must still be qualified to hold the new position, take a competitive examination and receive a score within the top three ranks, and otherwise be eligible to be hired in the new position. If the incumbent in a reclassified position does poorly on the examination and does not score within the top three ranks, the incumbent is "unreachable" and cannot be hired into the new position. (Test. of Greco.)

39. For an incumbent employee who continues to serve in a position after it is reclassified, the assigned seniority date is the first day of service after the employee is selected from the examination list. (Test. of Greco, Underwood.) Mr. Greco testified it is improper, and would be "an end run around the merit system," if an employee who is reclassified receives a seniority date before the Personnel Commission completes its formal process.

40. Respondent Valdivia was given a PIO II seniority date of February 25, 2025, because that is when she first worked in the reclassified position after the Personnel Commission selected her from the examination list. (Exs. 40-41, 66.)

41. As explained below, respondent Valdivia failed to meet her burden of establishing by a preponderance of the evidence that she is entitled to a seniority date on or earlier than January 16, 2024, which she would need to avoid layoff.

42. First, it is unclear when respondent Valdivia began working in regular status. This is because respondent Valdivia was hired as a PIO I in July 2023, but has a November 2023 seniority date for the PIO I position. Any service rendered in that position before she attained regular status would not qualify for seniority, regardless of the duties she performed. Thus, it cannot be concluded that July 31, 2023, is an appropriate seniority date.

43. Second, respondent Valdivia admits District informed her she was not qualified to be hired into a PIO II position until September 2024. The guiding principle of a merit system is to ensure those being hired are qualified to hold the position. Simply fulfilling some duties of another classification does not necessarily mean the employee in question is otherwise qualified to hold the position. Here, the date upon which respondent Valdivia was qualified to hold the PIO II position is not clear.

44. Finally, it is not clear when the involved supervisor agreed to accept the reclassification of respondent Valdivia's position from PIO I to PIO II. It is legally dubious to credit an employee with seniority for service in a position before that position was properly classified to a higher level. As Mr. Greco testified, doing so would be inconsistent with the purpose of the merit system.

45. Based on the above, respondent Valdivia is subject to layoff.

Fatima Abutouk

46. Respondent Abutouk is a Student and Family Resource Navigator (SFRN). Her assigned seniority date is January 9, 2023, which was her first date of service in regular status in that position. The Board is eliminating 19 SFRN positions. Respondent Abutouk shares the same seniority date with four other employees, but the tie-breaking criteria ranked her first among the five. Nonetheless, respondent Abutouk is among the 16 most junior SFRNs employed by District, and therefore she is subject to layoff. (Test. of Underwood; Exs. 56-57.)

47. Respondent Abutouk contends her seniority date should be when she signed her contract for the position, which was December 26, 2022. (Test. of Abutouk; Ex. L-1, p. L6.) However, respondent Abutouk was not scheduled to start her assignment until January 9, 2023, and she did not render service in that position until January 10, 2023. As discussed above, a seniority date is established on the first date of service in regular status. Even if her seniority date was December 26, 2022, respondent Abutouk still would be among the 19 most junior SFRNs and thus still subject to layoff. (Test. of Underwood.)

48. Respondent Abutouk testified she should not be laid off because she is the only fluent speaker of Arabic in her region of the District, and because she handles the highest level of phone call inquiries. However, these are not relevant concerns for determining relative seniority among classified employees pursuant to the Education Code. Respondent Abutouk also contends she should be bumped into another classification due to her prior work experience for District in a temporary assignment. As discussed above, seniority does not accrue from work in a temporary assignment.

49. Based on the above, respondent Abutouk is subject to layoff.

KATHLEEN NUNEZ

50. Respondent Nunez is a Pupil Services and Attendance Aide. Eight of those positions are being eliminated. (Test. of Underwood; Ex. 7, p. A499.) Respondent Nunez has a seniority date in that classification of October 19, 2023, which renders her the third most junior employee and therefore subject to layoff. Upon review of her personnel file, the Personnel Commission determined respondent Nunez was not eligible to bump into another position. (Test. of Underwood; Exs. 53, 54.)

51. According to documents submitted by respondent Nunez, initially she was hired by District as a substitute Office Technician effective November 15, 2021, and later was assigned to "Lexington Ave PC" as an Office Technician effective March 18, 2022. (Ex. FF-1) Respondent Nunez contends she should be able to bump into an Office Technician position given her earlier work experience in that classification.

52. Respondent Nunez's work experience as a substitute Office Technician does not qualify her for a seniority date in that classification. District determined respondent Nunez did not have enough seniority to bump into another position, and the evidence respondent Nunez presented does not establish by a preponderance that she is able to bump into another classification.

53. Based on the above, respondent Nunez is subject to layoff.

CLAUDIA RENTERIA

54. Respondent Renteria uploaded one exhibit in Case Center (the digital repository of exhibits used for the hearing), but failed to appear at hearing, testify, or otherwise explain the relevance of the document. Therefore, the exhibit was disregarded. Respondent Renteria is subject to layoff.

LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

Governing Law

1. Classified employees are subject to layoff for lack of work or lack of funds. (Ed. Code, § 45308, subd. (a).)

2. The order of layoff shall be determined by seniority. The employee who has the least seniority in the class subject to layoff is to be laid off first. (Ed. Code, § 45308, subd. (a).) Any service performed before entering into probationary or permanent status, except service in restricted positions, does not qualify for purposes of establishing seniority. (*Id.*, subd. (d).) This means service performed in a substitute or temporary position does not count in determining a classified employee's seniority. Reemployment shall be in order of seniority. (*Id.*, subd. (a).)

3. Cause for layoff is established if the employing school district demonstrates it has complied with the above-described seniority requirements. (Ed. Code, § 45117, subd. (c)(3)(B).) However, a classified employee shall not be laid off if a short-term employee is retained to render a service that the classified employee is qualified to render. (*Id.*, subd. (f)(1).)

4. The above provisions apply in the same manner to any school district that has adopted the merit system. (Ed. Code, § 45117, subd. (j).)

5. Education Code section 45117, subdivision (a), provides that, no later than March 15, and before a classified employee is given notice by the governing board of a school district that the employee's services will not be required for the following school year due to lack of work or funds, the employee shall be given written notice that "it has been recommended that the notice be given to the employee,

stating the reasons that the employee's services will not be required for the ensuing year, and informing the employee of the employee's displacement rights, if any, and reemployment rights."

6. Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c), provides a District Statement of Reduction in Force (District RIF Statement) shall be served personally or by registered mail. The employing school district must include with the District RIF Statement a Notice of Participation form which, when returned to the school district, acknowledges service of the District RIF Statement and indicates the employee intends to participate in a hearing. (Gov. Code, § 11505, subd. (a).) In addition, the school district is required to provide a statement to the subject classified employees informing them of their rights to inspect documents, be represented by counsel, and learn of witnesses. (Gov. Code, § 11505, subd. (b).)

Burden and Standard of Proof

7. The burden is on the District to demonstrate that: (1) cause exists for the reduction or elimination of classified services based upon a lack of work and/or lack of funds; and (2) the cause is related to the welfare of the schools and the pupils. (Ed. Code, § 45117, subds. (a)(1), (c)(3)(A).)

8. As no other law or statute requires otherwise, the standard of proof in this case is the preponderance of the evidence. (Evid. Code, § 115.) A preponderance means evidence that has more convincing force than that opposed to it. (*People ex rel. Brown v. Tri-Union Seafoods, LLC* (2009) 171 Cal.App.4th 1549, 1567.)

Cause for Layoff

9. District demonstrated certain classified services need to be reduced or eliminated due to lack of work or lack of funds. The Board's decision to reduce or discontinue the identified services because of the lack of work or funds is consistent with student welfare and the welfare of the schools within the meaning of Education Code section 45117. (Factual Finding 1-17; Legal Conclusions 1-8.)

10. District met all notice and jurisdictional requirements set forth in Education Code section 45117 and Government Code section 11505. The District sent Layoff Notices to respondents before March 15, 2025, stating it has been recommended that notice of layoff be given to them, explaining the reasons their services would not be required for the ensuing school year, and informing them of their displacement and reemployment rights. Thereafter, the RIF packet was properly served by regular and certified mail and contained the appropriate information. (Factual Findings 1-17; Legal Conclusions 1-8.)

11. District proved its layoff decisions comport with the seniority requirements of the Education Code. District has not retained any permanent or probationary classified employee having less seniority than respondents to render a service in respondents' respective classes. District has not retained any short-term employee to render a service that any respondent is qualified to render. (Factual Findings 1-54; Legal Conclusions 1-8.)

///

///

///

Disposition

12. Based on the above, District met its burden of establishing by a preponderance of the evidence that cause exists for the reduction or elimination of classified services described in the Board Report, and that it may proceed with giving final layoffs notices to respondents. (Factual Findings 1-54; Legal Conclusions 1-11.)

ORDER

Final notice may be given to respondents that their services will not be required, or their services will be reduced, for the ensuing 2026-2027 school year.

DATE: 05/08/2026

Eric C. Sawyer (May 8, 2026 13:36:07 PDT)

ERIC SAWYER

Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings

Return to Order of Business

TAB 2

Los Angeles Unified School District

333 South Beaudry Ave,
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Board of Education Report

File #: Res-063-25/26, **Version:** 1 **Agenda Date:** 5/21/2026
In Control: Board of Education

Ms. Ortiz Franklin- Protecting High-Need Schools During Fiscal Instability (Res-063-25/26) (For Action June 12, 2026)

Whereas, The Los Angeles Unified School District is committed to ensuring all students graduate ready to thrive in college, career and life, which requires equity in action, including an equitable distribution of resources, stability of staffing and resources, especially in highest-need communities;

Whereas, Based on the collective advocacy of community, the Governing Board of the Los Angeles Unified School District created the Student Equity Needs Index (SENI) through the 2014 "Equity Is Justice" resolution and updated it through the 2018 "Equity Is Justice 2.0" and 2021 "Equity Is Justice 2021" resolutions to better address the academic, community, and pandemic-related concentration of need;

Whereas, In 2020, the Board established the Black Student Achievement Plan (BSAP) to address historic inequities in educational experiences and outcomes for our Black students through targeted academic, socio-emotional and culturally responsive supports;

Whereas, In August 2021, the Board adopted the "Equity in Action" resolution to ensure equity is considered in all Board decisions and requires the annual budget process to include a comprehensive analysis of investments and publicize allocation of dollars spent equitably;

Whereas, In June 2025 the Board adopted a Fiscal Stabilization Plan to address $1.6 billion deficit estimated for 2027-2028, cutting unspent funds carried over and reducing SENI, resulting in disproportionate reductions in budget cuts to SENI high and highest need schools;

Whereas, The Board adopted the "Budgeting based on Equity and Student Need" June 2025 resolution, requiring the District to maintain sufficient staffing at school sites, center students' needs, prioritize equity and recognize the value of all employees through public transparency and to complete an equity impact analysis of budget reductions;

Whereas, Schools budgets are fundamentally based on student enrollment which has steadily declined for decades and is further being reduced in predominantly immigrant neighborhoods because of genuine fear of federal attacks on our immigrant communities;

Whereas, The District has achieved remarkable academic progress among all student groups during the 2024-2025 school year, demonstrating the effectiveness of equity-based investments and staffing stability; now, therefore, be it

<u>Resolved</u>, That the Governing Board of the Los Angeles Unified School District commits to upholding the principle of equity in school-site staffing; and, be it finally

Resolved, That the District shall ensure mutual consent and shall not force-place any staff at SENI High and Highest need schools and BSAP Group 1 schools.