

No.

---

**In the Supreme Court of the United States**

DANIELLE HOWARD MARTINEZ; D. P., A MINOR, BY HIS  
GUARDIAN AD LITEM ERICA WEDLOW; K. P., A MINOR, BY  
HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM BRITTANY WILLIAMS; T. W., A  
MINOR, BY HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM DAHL JOHNSON; P. C.,  
A MINOR, BY HER GUARDIAN AD LITEM RAVEN CAMPBELL;  
LASHONDA HUBBARD; AMBER WOOD,

*Petitioners,*

v.

GAVIN NEWSOM, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS GOVERNOR  
OF CALIFORNIA; STATE OF CALIFORNIA; TONY THURMOND,  
IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF  
PUBLIC EDUCATION AND DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION;  
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION; STATE BOARD  
OF EDUCATION; ET AL.,

*Respondents.*

---

**On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United  
States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit**

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

---

MAXWELL V. PRITT  
*Counsel of Record*  
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP  
44 Montgomery Street  
41st Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
(415) 293-6800  
mpritt@bsflp.com

*Counsel for Petitioners*

---

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Congress enacted the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (“IDEA”) to ensure students with disabilities like Petitioners are not excluded from public education. 20 U.S.C. § 1400(d). The IDEA makes state educational agencies (“SEAs”) like the California Department of Education (“CDE”) responsible for general supervision of local educational agencies (“LEAs”) to ensure students with disabilities receive a free appropriate public education (“FAPE”). After the Governor of California closed schools in response to the outbreak of COVID-19, the CDE instructed LEAs that they were *not* required to reassess student’s preexisting accommodations in the new remote learning context. It then decided not to correct for ongoing FAPE deprivations across the state. In its decision below, the Ninth Circuit affirmed dismissal of Petitioners’ requests for declaratory and injunctive relief against the CDE and that agency’s executive officer, holding that the eventual return to in-person instruction mooted those claims. That decision contravenes this Court’s settled precedent that intervening events will *not* moot a case so long as “the parties have a concrete interest, however small, in the outcome of the litigation.” *Chafin v. Chafin*, 568 U.S. 165, 172 (2013). And “a meritorious claim will not be rejected for want of a prayer for appropriate relief.” *Holt Civic Club v. City of Tuscaloosa*, 439 U.S. 60, 66 (1978).

The questions presented in this petition are:

1. Whether Petitioners’ claims that the CDE Defendants violated federal law by (i)

effectively waiving LEAs' compliance with the IDEA after forced school closures and (ii) failing to correct for students' resulting FAPE deprivations presents a concrete controversy that could be addressed by a judicial declaration of the CDE's obligations under the IDEA.

2. Whether an injunction directing the CDE Defendants to order LEAs to reevaluate Petitioners' IEPs and settlement agreements to account for the months when accommodations were not provided, and to order compensatory education to account for the regression and loss of learning Petitioners suffered, could provide effective relief sufficient to survive the mootness inquiry.
3. Whether a cause of action can be dismissed as moot where some relief remains available, regardless of whether Petitioners requested that specific relief in their complaint.

## LIST OF ALL PARTIES

<b>PETITIONERS</b>	
1.	DANIELLE HOWARD MARTINEZ
2.	D. P., A MINOR, BY HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM ERICA WEDLOW
3.	K. P., A MINOR, BY HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM BRITTANY WILLIAMS
4.	T. W., A MINOR, BY HIS GUARDIAN AD LITEM DAHL JOHNSON
5.	P. C., A MINOR, BY HER GUARDIAN AD LITEM RAVEN CAMPBELL
6.	LASHONDA HUBBARD
7.	AMBER WOOD
<b>RESPONDENTS<sup>1</sup></b>	
1.	GAVIN NEWSOM, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA
2.	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
3.	TONY THURMOND, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC

---

<sup>1</sup> Governor Newsom settled Petitioners' claims, as did Respondents State of California, State Board of Education, State Public Health Officer and Department of Public Health Director, California Health and Human Services Agency, and California Department of Public Health. Those parties were dismissed accordingly.

	EDUCATION AND DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION
4.	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
5.	STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
6.	SONIA ANGELL, IN HER OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS THE STATE PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICER AND DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH DIRECTOR <sup>2</sup>
7.	CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY
8.	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH
9.	THE LIST OF CALIFORNIA PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND STATE-RUN SCHOOLS NAMED AS DEFENDANTS IN PETITIONERS' COMPLAINT STARTS ON PAGE 33 OF THIS PETITION. <sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Sonia Angell was initially named as a defendant in the district court but was later replaced by her successor at the time of the parties' settlement, Erica Pan. Tomás Aragón has since replaced Dr. Pan as the current State Public Health Officer.

<sup>3</sup> Many of these parties had not yet been served when the district court dismissed Petitioners' complaint, and thus they have never appeared. The Ninth Circuit directed Petitioners' claims against them be dismissed regardless. *See* App. 26 at fn. 5.

## **RELATED PROCEEDINGS**

There are no proceedings directly related to this petition.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

QUESTIONS PRESENTED.....	i
LIST OF ALL PARTIES.....	iii
RELATED PROCEEDINGS .....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	vi
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	ix
I. PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI .....	1
II. OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
III. JURISDICTION.....	1
IV. STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....	2
V. STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	2
A. Introduction.....	2
B. Legal Background .....	4
C. Factual Background.....	7
D. Procedural Background .....	13
VI. REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT .....	16
A. This Court’s Review Is Warranted to Address the Ninth Circuit’s Departure from Settled Precedent on Justiciability, Which Cut Short Judicial Review of the CDE Defendants’ Decision to Waive IEP Requirements Essential to the Provision of a FAPE.....	16

1.	The court of appeals erred in treating as moot Petitioners' request for declaratory relief when a ruling that the CDE Defendants violated the IDEA could still remedy Petitioners' ongoing injuries.....	16
2.	The court of appeals departed from clear mandates to consider whether alternative relief is available in ordering Petitioners' claims dismissed despite available remedies.....	20
B.	Supervisory review is further warranted where the Court's holding on mootness cut short a critical inquiry into whether the CDE Defendants violated the IDEA by waiving the statute's provisions statewide.....	26
C.	This Court's review can also avert the far-reaching consequences the Ninth Circuit's precedential decision could have on litigants seeking declaratory and injunctive relief to protect other rights. ....	28
VII.	CONCLUSION AND PRAYER FOR RELIEF .....	31

APPENDIX

Appendix A	Opinion in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (August 24, 2022).....App. 1
Appendix B	Order Granting Motion to Dismiss in the United States District Court, Central District of California (November 24, 2020).....App. 32
Appendix C	Order Denying Rehearing in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (October 14, 2022).....App. 55
Appendix D	Statutory Provisions Involved.....App. 57
	20 U.S.C. § 1400.....App. 57
	20 U.S.C. § 1401.....App. 65
	20 U.S.C. § 1407.....App. 79
	20 U.S.C. § 1412.....App. 80
	20 U.S.C. § 1414.....App. 123
	20 U.S.C. § 1415.....App. 156

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES****CASES**

<i>Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Slater</i> , 528 U.S. 216 (2000) .....	29
<i>Brach v. Newsom</i> , 38 F.4th 6 (9th Cir. 2022) .....	17, 18
<i>Chafin v. Chafin</i> , 568 U.S. 165 (2013) .....	16, 19
<i>Church of Scientology of California v. United States</i> , 506 U.S. 9 (1992) .....	19, 25
<i>Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Exp.-Imp. Bank of the U.S.</i> , 894 F.3d 1005 (9th Cir. 2018) .....	16
<i>D.M. v. New Jersey Dep't of Educ.</i> , 801 F.3d 205 (3d Cir. 2015) .....	6
<i>Forest Guardians v. Johanns</i> , 450 F.3d 455 (9th Cir. 2006) .....	19, 20
<i>G. ex rel. Ssgt RG v. Fort Bragg Dependent Sch.</i> , 324 F.3d 240 (4th Cir. 2003) .....	7, 24, 25
<i>Garcia v. Lawn</i> , 805 F.2d 1400 (9th Cir. 1986) .....	25
<i>Handberry v. Thompson</i> , 446 F.3d 335 (2d Cir. 2006) .....	6
<i>Hoeft v. Tucson Unified Sch. Dist.</i> , 967 F.2d 1298 (9th Cir. 1992) .....	6, 27
<i>Holt Civic Club v. Tuscaloosa</i> , 439 U.S. 60 (1978) .....	21

<i>Honig v. Doe</i> , 484 U.S. 305 (1988).....	6
<i>Illinois Physicians Union v. Miller</i> , 675 F.2d 151 (7th Cir. 1982).....	21, 22
<i>J.G. by Mrs. G. v. Bd. of Educ. of Rochester City Sch. Dist.</i> , 830 F.2d 444 (2d Cir. 1987) .....	27
<i>Jet Inv., Inc. v. Dep't of Army</i> , 84 F.3d 1137 (9th Cir. 1996).....	21
<i>Kerr Ctr. Parents Ass'n v. Charles</i> , 897 F.2d 1463 (9th Cir. 1990).....	26
<i>Knox v. Serv. Emps. Int'l Union, Loc.</i> , 1000, 567 U.S. 298 (2012) .....	16
<i>Maine Sch. Admin. Dist. No. 35 v. Mr. R.</i> , 321 F.3d 9 (1st Cir. 2003) .....	7, 25
<i>Martinez v. Newsom</i> , 46 F.4th 965 (9th Cir. 2022) .....	1
<i>Michael P. v. Dep't of Educ.</i> , 656 F.3d 1057 (9th Cir. 2011).....	26
<i>Nw. Env't Def. Ctr. v. Gordon</i> , 849 F.2d 1241 (9th Cir. 1988).....	18, 25, 30, 31
<i>Parents of Student W. v. Puyallup Sch. Dist., No. 3</i> , 31 F.3d 1489 (9th Cir. 1994).....	24
<i>Park ex rel. Park v. Anaheim Union High Sch. Dist.</i> , 464 F.3d 1025 (9th Cir. 2006).....	24
<i>School Committee of Town of Burlington</i> , Mass., 471 U.S. 359 (1985) .....	5, 24, 26

<i>State of California Dep't of Soc. Servs. v. Thompson,</i> 321 F.3d 835 (9th Cir. 2003).....	22
<i>United States v. Marin,</i> 651 F.2d 24 (1st Cir. 1981) .....	21
<i>W. Dist. Council of Lumber Prod. &amp; Indus. Workers v. Louisiana Pac. Corp.,</i> 892 F.2d 1412 (9th Cir. 1989).....	22
<i>Z Channel Ltd. v. Home Box Office, Inc.,</i> 931 F.2d 1338 (1991).....	21, 22

## STATUTES

20 U.S.C. § 1400(d) .....	5
20 U.S.C. § 1401(9) .....	5
20 U.S.C. § 1401(14) .....	5, 26
20 U.S.C. § 1407 .....	5
20 U.S.C. § 1412(a)(1)(A).....	5
20 U.S.C. § 1412(a)(11).....	5, 17, 26
20 U.S.C. § 1412(a)(12)(A).....	5, 17, 26
20 U.S.C. § 1414 .....	5, 26
20 U.S.C. § 1415 .....	5, 26
20 U.S.C. § 1415(a) .....	5, 17, 26
20 U.S.C. § 1415(b)(1).....	5, 17, 26
20 U.S.C. § 1415(i) .....	5
20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)(C).....	6, 7, 24

20 U.S.C. § 1415(l) .....	5
28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) .....	1
28 U.S.C. § 2202 .....	21
Cal. Educ. Code §§ 33302, 33303 .....	14
<b>RULES</b>	
Fed. R. Civ. P. 54 .....	4, 21
<b>OTHER AUTHORITIES</b>	
2020 Cal. Legis. Serv. Ch. 24 (S.B. 98) .....	9
Cal. Dep't of Educ., Special Education Guidance for COVID-19 (Apr. 9, 2020), <a href="https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/hn/specialedcovid19guidance.asp">https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/hn/specialedcovid19guidance.asp</a> .....	8, 23, 27
Cal. Dep't of Educ., Special Education Guidance for COVID-19 (Sep. 30, 2020), <a href="https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/hn/specialedcovid19guidance.asp">https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/hn/specialedcovid19guidance.asp</a> .....	10, 23, 27
Ricardo Cano and Elizabeth Aguilera, <i>Special-needs children still seek help after year adrift</i> , CalMatters (Jan. 12, 2022), <a href="https://calmatters.org/education/k-12-education/2021/03/california-special-needs-children-pandemic-regress-one-year-later/">https://calmatters.org/education/k-12-education/2021/03/california-special-needs-children-pandemic-regress-one-year-later/</a> .....	12
Heather Elliott, <i>The Functions of Standing</i> , 61 Stan. L. Rev. 459 (2008) .....	30
Melissa Gomez, <i>Remote learning is leaving disabled students behind</i> , Los Angeles Times (Dec. 13, 2021), <a href="https://www.pressreader.com/usa/los-angeles-times/20211213/281522229390801">https://www.pressreader.com/usa/los-angeles-times/20211213/281522229390801</a> .....	13

Vicki C. Jackson, <i>Standing and the Role of Federal Courts: Triple Error Decisions in Clapper v. Amnesty International USA and City of Los Angeles v. Lyons</i> , 23 Wm. & Mary Bill Rts. J. 127 (2014) .....	29, 30
Sonali Kohli, <i>Children with disabilities are regressing. How much is distance learning to blame?</i> , Los Angeles Times (Aug. 7, 2020, 5:00 AM), <a href="https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-08-07/covid-19-distance-learning-weakens-special-education">https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-08-07/covid-19-distance-learning-weakens-special-education</a> .....	12, 13
Zachary Pelchat, <i>Re: OCR Docket No. 09-21-5901</i> , U.S. Dep’t of Educ. Off. for C.R., at 1-2 (Apr. 28, 2022), <a href="https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/investigations/more/09215901-a.pdf">https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/investigations/more/09215901-a.pdf</a> .....	13
<i>Speak UP Parent Survey: Distance Learning ‘Devastating’ for LAUSD Students With Disabilities</i> , Speak UP (Oct. 21, 2020), <a href="https://speakupparents.org/speak-up-news-blog/2020/10/21/speak-up-parent-survey-distance-learning-devastating-for-lausd-students-with-disabilitiesnbsp">https://speakupparents.org/speak-up-news-blog/2020/10/21/speak-up-parent-survey-distance-learning-devastating-for-lausd-students-with-disabilitiesnbsp</a> .....	12
U.S. Dep’t of Educ., Part B Implementation of IDEA Provision of Services in the Current COVID-19 Environment Q&A Document (Sep. 28, 2020), <a href="https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/qa-provision-of-services-idea-part-b-09-28-2020.pdf">https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/qa-provision-of-services-idea-part-b-09-28-2020.pdf</a> .....	10

U.S. Dep't of Educ., Sec'y DeVos Recommended Waiver Authority, at 11 (Apr. 27, 2020), <a href="https://www2.ed.gov/documents/coronavirus/cares-waiver-report.pdf">https://www2.ed.gov/documents/coronavirus/cares-waiver-report.pdf</a> .....	9, 27
10 Wright & Miller § 2664 .....	22

## **I. PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

Danielle Martinez, Erica Wedlow, on behalf of minor D.P., Brittany Williams, on behalf of minor K.P., Dahl Johnson, on behalf of minor T.W., Raven Campbell, on behalf of minor P.C., Lashonda Hubbard, and Amber Wood (collectively, “Petitioners”) respectfully petition this Court for a writ of certiorari to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in this case.

## **II. OPINIONS BELOW**

The decision of the court of appeals (App. 1-31) is published at *Martinez v. Newsom*, 46 F.4th 965 (9th Cir. 2022). The court’s denial of rehearing or rehearing en banc (App. 55-56) is not published. The decision of the United States District Court for the Central District of California granting a motion to dismiss filed by the California Department of Education (the “CDE”), State Superintendent of Public Instruction for California, Tony Thurmond (with the CDE, collectively the “CDE Defendants”), and three state-run special education schools in California (App. 32-54) is not published but is available at 2020 WL 7786543.

## **III. JURISDICTION**

The court of appeals entered judgment on August 24, 2022 (App. 3) and denied Petitioners’ timely petition for rehearing on October 14, 2022 (App. 55-56). On December 20, 2022, Justice Kagan extended the time to file a petition for a writ of certiorari through February 13, 2023. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

#### **IV. STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED**

Relevant statutory provisions are reproduced in the petition appendix. (App. 57-194).

#### **V. STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

##### **A. Introduction**

Petitioners are students with disabilities who spent nearly a year deprived of services their parents and school districts agreed were necessary for them to access their education. Those services were all negotiated in the context of in-person education. Because Petitioners' IEPs were not reassessed after California closed its schools in response to the COVID-19 outbreak to determine how Petitioners could access their education through remote instruction, Petitioners have lost years of learning—including emotional, intellectual, and behavioral supports guaranteed to them under the IDEA and settlement agreements. Since returning to in-person instruction, Petitioners have faced disproportionate regression that has rendered services that once met their needs insufficient to ensure a FAPE. Their experiences are representative of the hundreds of thousands of students with disabilities across the state of California and throughout the country who are suffering consequences of months without IEP-mandated services and necessary accommodations to receive an education.

Throughout the remote instruction period, the California agency and executive officer entrusted with ensuring school districts met their statutory obligations to provide students a FAPE failed to do so.

When students were first sent home, the CDE Defendants told school districts they were *not* required to reassess IEPs and settlement agreements that were all drafted under an assumption of in-person instruction. After effectively waiving the IDEA's IEP requirements, and despite several months of students with disabilities not receiving the educational services they needed, the CDE Defendants have since failed to mandate remedial measures to address ongoing FAPE violations upon students' return to the classroom. The agency has pursued this course of action despite the U.S. Department of Education's ("DOE") determination that it would not waive IEP requirements during COVID-19 and a directive from the Governor of California to ensure children with disabilities were protected through this difficult period.

Petitioners sued the CDE and relevant state officials and school districts throughout California on behalf of a putative class of all students with disabilities in California. Petitioners asserted that the CDE Defendants repeatedly abrogated their responsibilities to ensure school districts complied with the IDEA, including in successive policy guidance. Petitioners sought a declaratory order that the CDE Defendants' failure to order districts to reassess students after school closures and their continuing refusal to mandate reassessments violates the IDEA. Petitioners also sought an injunction requiring the CDE Defendants to amend their guidance or allow an immediate return to in-person instruction. Because of the Ninth Circuit's erroneous holding on mootness, no court ever reached the merits

of Petitioner’s claims and determined whether the CDE Defendants must take corrective action to restore students’ FAPE rights.

Instead, the Ninth Circuit relieved the CDE Defendants of the heavy burden of proving Petitioners’ claims were moot by ignoring the ongoing injuries to Petitioners and the availability of meaningful relief to address those harms. This Court’s case law makes clear that a change in circumstances—here, the rescission of the Governor of California’s stay-at-home order—does not, and indeed cannot, moot a dispute over rights and obligations provided a court can still grant some effective relief. Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 54 and well-settled jurisprudence, that relief need not be identical to the relief a party requested in its original complaint. Petitioners and the CDE Defendants continue to dispute whether the CDE Defendants violated the IDEA in failing to mandate reassessments. An order resolving this dispute in Petitioners’ favor could remedy the devastating learning loss and severe regressions that the CDE Defendants did not require districts to address in the first instance. The Ninth Circuit also failed to consider that a court order requiring compensatory services, for example, could restore children’s FAPE rights. Instead, Petitioners and several hundred thousand other students with disabilities are left without recourse for their effective and ongoing exclusion from the classroom.

## **B. Legal Background**

This case raises crucial questions about an SEA’s obligations to students with disabilities under

the IDEA when school districts shut the classroom doors on them. Congress enacted the IDEA to ensure students like Petitioners are not excluded from public education or civic participation. 20 U.S.C. § 1400(d). The Act provides students with disabilities the right to a FAPE, including educational services that will provide them educational opportunities alongside their peers. *Id.*; 1401(9); 1412(a)(1)(A). The IEP is the “*modus operandi*” of these substantive protections. *School Committee of Town of Burlington, Mass.*, 471 U.S. 359, 368 (1985). It includes a comprehensive statement identifying the educational needs of and services for each child and front-and-back-end procedures to ensure its effectiveness. 20 U.S.C. §§ 1401(14); 1414; 1415.

The IDEA makes SEAs “responsible for general supervision” to ensure students with disabilities like Petitioners receive a FAPE, including through the IEP process. *Id.* at §§ 1412(a)(11), (a)(12)(A); 1415(a), (b)(1). It further directs SEAs to “support and facilitate” LEAs to “enable children with disabilities to meet” academic achievement standards. *Id.* at § 1407. The CDE serves as the SEA for the State of California, and thus is responsible for ensuring that approximately 800,000 students with disabilities receive a FAPE. ECF No. 1, at 88.<sup>4</sup>

The IDEA provides a process for parents, guardians, and students to enforce their rights in federal court. 20 U.S.C. §§ 1415(i), (l). While these litigants generally must first exhaust their claims

---

<sup>4</sup> “ECF No. [#]” refers to documents in docket No. 5:20-cv-01796-SVW-AFM (C.D. Cal.).

before the administrative agency, such exhaustion is excused in the Ninth Circuit when 1) “it is improbable that adequate relief can be obtained by pursuing administrative remedies,” 2) “it would be futile to use the due process procedures,” or 3) the plaintiff seeks structural reforms for a “policy or practice of generalized applicability.” *Hoeft v. Tucson Unified Sch. Dist.*, 967 F.2d 1298, 1303–04, 1309 (9th Cir. 1992); *see also Honig v. Doe*, 484 U.S. 305, 327 (1988) (“exhaustion should not be required in cases where such exhaustion would be futile either as a legal or practical matter”) (quoting 121 Cong. Rec. 37416 (1975) (remarks of Sen. Williams) (cleaned up)). Other circuits likewise have recognized that exhaustion may be excused when the alleged statutory violation raises issues outside the scope of the traditional administrative hearing process. *See, e.g., D.M. v. New Jersey Dep’t of Educ.*, 801 F.3d 205, 212 (3d Cir. 2015) (“Exhaustion is not required in very limited circumstances, such as where exhaustion is futile or inadequate, where the question presented is purely legal, where the administrative process cannot grant relief, or where exhaustion would work a severe or irreparable harm upon a litigant.”); *Handberry v. Thompson*, 446 F.3d 335, 344 (2d Cir. 2006) (excusing exhaustion where “individual administrative remedies would be insufficient to address the defendants’ failure to provide the service required by the IDEA to all relevant inmates,” because “administrative remedies [were] effectively unavailable”).

The IDEA also authorizes courts to award compensatory education. *See* 20 U.S.C.

§ 1415(i)(2)(C). “Compensatory education involves discretionary, prospective, and injunctive relief crafted by a court to remedy what might be termed an educational deficit created by an educational agency’s failure over a given period of time to provide a FAPE to a student.” *G. ex rel. Ssgt RG v. Fort Bragg Dependent Sch.*, 324 F.3d 240, 254 (4th Cir. 2003); *see also Maine Sch. Admin. Dist. No. 35 v. Mr. R.*, 321 F.3d 9, 18 (1st Cir. 2003) (“[A] child eligible for special education services under the IDEA may be entitled to further services, in compensation for past deprivations.”).

### C. Factual Background

Petitioners are the guardians ad litem of four minor students enrolled in California public school districts. Each student has significant disabilities and was declared eligible for special education services by his or her school district, and each was receiving services under an IEP or settlement agreement prior to March 2020. For example, T.W. received assistance from an aide to complete academic, behavioral, and functional tasks, and physical and occupational therapy to address mobility issues. ECF No. 1, at 58. D.P.’s IEP provided for academic and behavior support from a one-on-one aide to address developmental disabilities and develop communication skills. *Id.* at 54-55. D.P. also received occupational therapy services, including hand-over-hand assistance. *Id.* at 55. P.C.’s settlement agreement under the IDEA recognized that P.C. needs one-on-one assistance to make education accessible. *Id.* at 60. And, finally, pursuant to her IEP, K.P. is to receive constant

prompts and redirection to address an intellectual disability. *Id.* at 56-57.

On March 13, 2020, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Governor of California issued Executive Order N-26-20, requiring school districts to close their buildings physically and reassign students to remote learning. That Order directed the CDE to issue guidance to ensure students with disabilities continued to receive a FAPE, including as consistent with their IEPs. Instead, the CDE's initial guidance suggested compliance with obligations under existing IEPs was permissive, not mandatory.<sup>5</sup> The CDE's April 9, 2020 guidance transformed that earlier suggestion into an affirmative waiver of IEP requirements. The CDE instructed schools they did not need to conduct *any* reassessment to account for remote learning. In a question and answer format, the CDE told schools the following:

- 1. Must all Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) be amended to reflect the change to distance learning?** No, not all IEPs will need to be amended. . . in the CDE's view it is not necessary for an LEA to convene an IEP team meeting, or propose an IEP amendment without a team meeting, for every student, solely for the purpose of discussing the need to provide services away from school, because that change

---

<sup>5</sup> Cal. Dep't of Educ., Special Education Guidance for COVID-19 (Apr. 9, 2020), <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/hn/specialedcovid19guidance.asp>, filed in Ninth Circuit as CDE-SER 101.

must necessarily occur due to the COVID-19 pandemic.<sup>6</sup>

Soon thereafter, the federal DOE made clear that federal obligations remained in effect despite school closures, “most notably [the provision of] a free appropriate public education.”<sup>7</sup> The DOE reaffirmed that LEAs and SEAs “must provide education to *all* students, including children with disabilities,” and involve parents in decision-making.<sup>8</sup> The CDE did not amend its guidance to comply with his directive.

In July of 2020, the California legislature passed SB98, amending state law to require that any LEA that offered remote learning during the 2020-2021 academic year had to provide “[a]cademic and other supports designed to address the needs of pupils who are not performing at grade level, or need support in other areas, such as . . . pupils with exceptional needs.” 2020 Cal. Legis. Serv. Ch. 24 (S.B. 98).<sup>9</sup> It further required that remote learning must include “[s]pecial education, related services, and any other services required by a pupil’s individualized education program . . . with accommodations necessary to ensure that individualized education program can be executed in a distance learning environment.” *Id.* And it required that school districts evaluate whether

---

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*

<sup>7</sup> U.S. Dep’t of Educ., Sec’y DeVos Recommended Waiver Authority, at 11 (Apr. 27, 2020), <https://www2.ed.gov/documents/coronavirus/cares-waiver-report.pdf>.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* (emphasis in original).

<sup>9</sup> The text of this bill was filed with the Ninth Circuit as ER 25-34.

a student suffered regression, or learning loss, and, if so, address it. *Id.* The DOE sent a similar message in anticipation of the 2020-21 academic year, reiterating that state agencies like the CDE must ensure a FAPE for all students, regardless of educational setting.<sup>10</sup>

But the CDE's September 2020 Guidance continued to disregard these mandates. It continued not to direct LEAs to reassess what services were required to meet IEP goals, or to order compensatory education to address the months students were deprived of necessary supports.<sup>11</sup> There is no record evidence that the CDE ever updated its guidance to instruct school districts to conduct reassessments or to provide compensatory education to account for the many months of remote schooling when students with disabilities and their teachers were not given the resources to ensure a FAPE, and the regression students faced when they returned to the classroom far behind their IEP goals.

As a result of the CDE's directives, California's LEAs were left to choose for themselves whether to conduct reassessments or provide compensatory education to address the fact that existing IEPs were built around in-person instruction. After being sent home in March of 2020, none of Petitioners received

---

<sup>10</sup> U.S. Dep't of Educ., Part B Implementation of IDEA Provision of Services in the Current COVID-19 Environment Q&A Document (Sep. 28, 2020), <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/qa-provision-of-services-idea-part-b-09-28-2020.pdf>.

<sup>11</sup> See Cal. Dep't of Educ., Special Education Guidance for COVID-19 (Sep. 30, 2020), <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/he/hn/specialedcovid19guidance.asp>, filed in Ninth Circuit as CDE-SER 111-12.

the services to which they were entitled under their IEPs in more than a token form, if at all. *See, e.g.*, ECF No. 1, at 56-59, 61. For example, Petitioners could not receive *any* physical assistance, despite their IEPs and settlement including requirements such as physical therapy (*id.* at 58); assistance holding any item that requires a two-handed grasp, (*id.*); and hand-over-hand assistance (*id.* at 55-56). In addition, Petitioners no longer received the 1:1 support they needed. *See id.* at 60. None of Petitioners were contacted by their LEAs to determine their need for appropriate accommodations under the changed circumstances of remote education (*id.* at 56-58, 60), and no new accommodations were offered even as these students struggled and regressed (*id.* at 56-59, 61). As a result of being deprived of his IEP services, D.P. began “displaying regressive behaviors.” *Id.* at 55-56. Similarly, because “environmental reinforcements [were] unavailable during distance learning,” K.P. had “no progress made toward any of her IEP goals.” *Id.* at 56. And without the accommodations required under P.C.’s settlement agreement, remote learning quickly became “an ever-increasing impossibility as more time passe[d] and her work slip[ped] further and further behind.” *Id.* at 60.

The forced remote education coupled with the absence of adequate safeguards caused immense learning loss in students with disabilities across the state. In 2021, “[m]any parents report[ed] that their special-needs students ha[d] gone backward in development during the pandemic-isolating past year,” and “[m]any of those students — whose disabilities can range from autism to deafness, and

most of whom have gone more than a year without in-person services such as speech therapy — appear to have regressed physically and academically.”<sup>12</sup> According to a 2020 survey of more than 300 parents of students with disabilities in just the Los Angeles Unified school district (“LAUSD”),

Approximately 76% of parents said their children with disabilities cannot learn and progress their skills effectively via distance learning. 74% of the parents surveyed reported their students exhibiting regressive behaviors or loss of skills while learning from home. 36% of students with Individualized Education Programs are not receiving the full set of services that LAUSD agreed to deliver in their IEPs, and 57% of parents indicated that the services they were receiving were not being delivered in a format suitable to their children’s needs. More than 12% reported receiving no services since August.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Ricardo Cano and Elizabeth Aguilera, *Special-needs children still seek help after year adrift*, CalMatters (Jan. 12, 2022), <https://calmatters.org/education/k-12-education/2021/03/california-special-needs-children-pandemic-regress-one-year-later/>.

<sup>13</sup> *Speak UP Parent Survey: Distance Learning ‘Devastating’ for LAUSD Students With Disabilities*, Speak UP (Oct. 21, 2020), <a href="https://speakupparents.org/speak-up-news-blog/2020/10/21/speak-up-parent-survey-distance-learning-devastating-for-lausd-students-with-disabilitiesnbsp; see, e.g., Sonali Kohli, Children with disabilities are regressing. How much is distance learning to blame?, Los Angeles Times (Aug. 7, 2020,</a>

The DOE investigated LAUSD's response to the COVID-19 pandemic and found it "failed to provide a FAPE to qualified students with disabilities" during remote learning.<sup>14</sup> The DOE also concluded the CDE failed to "address the needs of *all* the students with disabilities in [LAUSD] who may be entitled to compensatory education."<sup>15</sup>

#### **D. Procedural Background**

Petitioner guardians sued in federal district court on behalf of themselves and their minor children, as well as a proposed class of all students with disabilities in California who have been denied the services and accommodations to which they are entitled under the IDEA, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. ECF No. 1. Respondents are the CDE, which oversees public education in the State of California; California State Superintendent of Public Instruction and Director of Education Tony

---

5:00 AM), <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2020-08-07/covid-19-distance-learning-weakens-special-education>; Melissa Gomez, *Remote learning is leaving disabled students behind*, Los Angeles Times (Dec. 13, 2021), <https://www.pressreader.com/usa/los-angeles-times/20211213/281522229390801> ("Gabriel needs an aide to help transcribe essays and sessions with an occupational therapist — he has not had one since campuses closed in March 2020.").

<sup>14</sup> Zachary Pelchat, *Re: OCR Docket No. 09-21-5901*, U.S. Dep't of Educ. Off. for C.R., at 1-2 (Apr. 28, 2022), <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/investigations/more/09215901-a.pdf> (finding LAUSD committed multiple violations of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973).

<sup>15</sup> *Id.* at 18-19 (emphasis in original).

Thurmond, who is the executive officer responsible for the CDE (*see* Cal. Educ. Code §§ 33302, 33303); and every school district and state-run special education school (the “Districts” or “District Defendants”) in California.<sup>16</sup> Petitioners alleged the CDE Defendants’ failure to require, and the Districts’ failure to implement, reassessments caused continuing violations of federal laws protecting students with disabilities and breached settlement agreements. ECF No. 1, at 56-61, 67.

Petitioners’ complaint detailed how the CDE’s policies and the subsequent lack of action by the District Defendants combined to cause material and procedural deprivations of Petitioners’ educational rights. Because their IEPs and settlement agreements were not amended, Petitioners could not participate in remote learning alongside peers without disabilities. *See id.* at 56-61. Petitioners detailed the consequences of being deprived FAPE rights, including “regressive behaviors” and “loss of a whole year’s worth of academic and functional skills.” *Id.* at 55-61. They emphasized that students who were

---

<sup>16</sup> A settlement was reached with several former defendants, including the State of California and its Governor. The settlement agreement called for the Governor to reiterate in a public announcement that the state’s COVID-19 emergency measures did *not* waive the IDEA, that school districts were required to continue providing the services required under students’ IEPs in the remote learning environment, and SB 98 required districts to determine what accommodations were necessary so IEP services could be delivered remotely. The CDE Defendants and Districts did not settle the claims against them and continued to refuse to mandate reassessments or otherwise ensure that students’ FAPE rights were protected with appropriate accommodations.

similarly deprived of necessary accommodations during months of remote education would return to the classroom far behind their non-disabled peers. *Id.* Petitioners sought injunctive and declaratory relief, and asked the court to order compensatory educational services for lost learning. *Id.* at 98-105.

The district court dismissed the case as to all defendants on the basis that Petitioners had not exhausted administrative remedies before filing suit. App. 39-49, 53. Before argument on appeal, the Ninth Circuit *sua sponte* ordered counsel for the parties to be prepared to address mootness and standing as to certain District Defendants.

In its opinion and order, issued August 24, 2022, the Ninth Circuit affirmed dismissal of Petitioners' claims. As to the CDE Defendants, the Ninth Circuit held that Petitioners' requests for declaratory and injunctive relief were moot, despite an ongoing controversy and the availability of *some* relief in the form of a declaratory judgment and injunction ordering compensatory education. App. 18-19. In addition, though not at issue in this petition, the court of appeals affirmed dismissal of the District Defendants, rejecting application of the juridical link doctrine to districts in which Petitioners were not enrolled in school, dismissing allegations that District Defendants had violated settlement agreements because the complaint did not explicitly say "breach of contract," and finding exhaustion was not excused as to those Districts that Petitioners attended. App. 13-16, 19-26. Petitioners timely filed a petition for rehearing or rehearing en banc, which was denied. App. 55-56.

## VI. REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

- A. **This Court’s Review Is Warranted to Address the Ninth Circuit’s Departure from Settled Precedent on Justiciability, Which Cut Short Judicial Review of the CDE Defendants’ Decision to Waive IEP Requirements Essential to the Provision of a FAPE.**
  - 1. **The court of appeals erred in treating as moot Petitioners’ request for declaratory relief when a ruling that the CDE Defendants violated the IDEA could still remedy Petitioners’ ongoing injuries.**

In holding that Petitioners’ request for declaratory relief was mooted by the return to the classroom, the Ninth Circuit contravened this Court’s settled precedent that intervening events will not—and cannot—moot a case so long as “the parties have a concrete interest, *however small*, in the outcome of the litigation.” *Chafin v. Chafin*, 568 U.S. 165, 172 (2013) (emphasis added). Only when intervening events render it “impossible for a court to grant any effectual relief whatever to the prevailing party” will a defendant meet their heavy burden of proving the case is moot. *Knox v. Serv. Emps. Int’l Union, Loc. 1000*, 567 U.S. 298, 307 (2012) (citations omitted); *see also Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Exp.-Imp. Bank of the U.S.*, 894 F.3d 1005, 1011 (9th Cir. 2018) (holding case justiciable because the record did not “establish

that relief is *impossible*” (emphasis in original and citations omitted). Yet the Ninth Circuit did not consider Petitioners’ continued interest in a judicial order finding their ongoing exclusion from federally guaranteed educational opportunities legally cognizable under the IDEA. Nor did it consider whether an order that the CDE Defendants breached their federal statutory obligations in failing to require reassessments (and continuing not to do so) could remedy Petitioners’ ongoing injuries.

The IDEA makes the CDE Defendants responsible for protecting Petitioners’ rights to a FAPE. As the SEA for the State of California, the CDE Defendants were “responsible for general supervision” to ensure students receive a FAPE, including through the IEP process. 20 U.S.C. §§ 1412(a)(11), (a)(12)(A); 1415(a), (b)(1). Beginning in March of 2020, the CDE told districts that they did *not* have to reassess students who were no longer receiving educational services in the setting their IEPs were designed around. ECF No. 1, at 49, 80-85. Petitioners detailed the consequences they bore from that decision, including “loss of a whole year’s worth of academic and functional skills.” *Id.* at 55-61. They further alleged that students who returned to in-person learning would demonstrate disproportionate regression, placing them out-of-step with their non-disabled peers and behind the goals set in their IEPs. *Id.* at 67.

The court of appeals ignored this statutory context in drawing a cursory comparison to a recent Ninth Circuit decision, *Brach v. Newsom*, 38 F.4th 6 (9th Cir. 2022). See App. 18-19. In that case,

appellants requested a declaratory order that school closures *per se* violated parents' constitutional rights to make educational decisions for their children. *Brach*, 38 F.4th at 10. In contrast to *Brach*'s insistence that parents be allowed an in-person option, Petitioners focused on issues surrounding the provision of FAPE to students with disabilities. They challenged the failure to mandate a reassessment of educational services provided under existing IEPs and settlement agreements to determine how students would receive a FAPE when schools first closed, and again when the next school year began. ECF No. 1, at 54-61, 84-87. They sought a declaratory order that would address the "continuing" denial of a FAPE as students spent several months without IEP-mandated services. *Id.* at 89. After schools reopened, they retained a concrete interest in determining whether the IDEA required the CDE Defendants to order reassessments or otherwise provide accommodations to meet their educational needs after waiving IEP requirements during remote learning.

In analogous circumstances, the Ninth Circuit has applied this Court's precedent to recognize a legally cognizable interest in disputing an agency's statutory obligations when the agency has already taken the challenged course of action—here not requiring reassessments or compensatory education at any point—and that decision is causing a petitioner continuing harm. *See Nw. Env't Def. Ctr. v. Gordon*, 849 F.2d 1241–1244 (9th Cir. 1988). For their part, the CDE Defendants have taken the position that their conduct beginning in March of 2020 through the present fulfills their statutorily mandated obligations.

*See, e.g.*, CDE Answering Br. at 37-38. Thus, there is “not the slightest doubt that there continues to exist between the parties that concrete adverseness which sharpens the presentation of issues” over what the law requires. *Chafin*, 568 U.S. at 173 (quotations omitted).

The court of appeals also failed to consider whether it could provide some effectual relief to Petitioners. App. 18. This Court’s jurisprudence makes clear that Petitioners’ request for declaratory relief remains justiciable so long as an order setting forth the CDE Defendants’ obligations could provide some relief. For example, in *Church of Scientology of California v. United States*, this Court recognized that even after petitioners had turned over documents pursuant to a district court order, they continued to have a possessory and privacy interest in those documents. 506 U.S. 9, 13 (1992). Though it was “too late to prevent, or to provide a fully satisfactory remedy for, the invasion of privacy that occurred when the IRS obtained the information on the tapes,” the court’s “power to effectuate a partial remedy by ordering the Government to destroy or return any and all copies it may have in its possession” was “sufficient to prevent th[e] case from being moot.” *Id.* Applying this precedent, the Ninth Circuit has affirmed that a court retains jurisdiction to issue a declaratory order on the lawfulness of an irreversible agency action “to help to remedy the effects of the agency’s statutory violations and to ensure that similar violations would not occur in the future,” even when the agency action moots a request for injunctive relief. *Forest*

*Guardians v. Johanns*, 450 F.3d 455, 462 (9th Cir. 2006).

Here, a determination that the IDEA required the CDE Defendants to order LEAs to reassess disabled students' IEPs during remote learning or determine what additional accommodations those students required after schools reopened could help restore Petitioners' FAPE rights. There is no indication from the record that the CDE Defendants ordered reassessments in the intervening months, or that the return to in-person education replaced the need for these reassessments and for appropriate compensatory education after a year deprived of mandated services. A declaration that the CDE Defendants violated the IDEA by proclaiming statutory obligations permissive and then failing to ensure necessary accommodations thus "would provide effective relief by . . . prohibiting it from continuing to violate the law." *Id.*

**2. The court of appeals departed from clear mandates to consider whether alternative relief is available in ordering Petitioners' claims dismissed despite available remedies.**

The Ninth Circuit contravened this Court's (and its own) precedent in defining the specific request for relief in Petitioner's complaint narrowly and in constraining its inquiry to the specific relief Petitioners sought in their complaint. *See* App. 17-18.

In construing Petitioners' injunctive request as limited to an order that Petitioners receive "in-person

instruction” (App. 17), the court of appeals misread the specific request, which sought an injunction for in-person instruction *or* reassessments for all students who were assigned to remote learning. ECF No. 1, at 89. That requested injunction, pleaded in the disjunctive, has not been rendered meaningless by a return to in-person instruction, and an order requiring reassessment could provide meaningful relief.

Regardless, this Court has long held that “a meritorious claim will not be rejected for want of a prayer for appropriate relief.” *Holt Civic Club v. Tuscaloosa*, 439 U.S. 60, 66 (1978). Instead, a court issuing a final judgment may “grant the relief to which each party is entitled, *even if the party has not demanded that relief in its pleadings.*” Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(c) (emphasis added). “[A]lthough the prayer for relief may be looked to for illumination when there is doubt as to the substantive theory under which a plaintiff is proceeding, its omissions are not in and of themselves a barrier to redress of a meritorious claim.” *Holt*, 439 U.S. at 66. The Declaratory Judgment Act also does not impose a stringent pleading requirement. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2202 (authorizing courts to grant all “necessary or proper relief”). Applying Rule 54(c), courts of appeals have affirmed that even “relief in damages is not foreclosed by plaintiff’s failure to ask for damages in prayer.” *Jet Inv., Inc. v. Dep’t of Army*, 84 F.3d 1137, 1143 (9th Cir. 1996) (citing *Z Channel Ltd. v. Home Box Office, Inc.*, 931 F.2d 1338, 1341 (1991); *see also United States v. Marin*, 651 F.2d 24, 30 (1st Cir. 1981) (affirming damages award where not expressly requested in complaint); *Illinois Physicians Union v. Miller*, 675

F.2d 151, 158 (7th Cir. 1982) (deducing from the text of the Declaratory Judgment Act and Rule 54 the “well-settled” principle that courts “may grant monetary relief in declaratory judgment proceedings, even without a specific request”); *accord*, 10 Wright & Miller § 2664.

Prior to its decision in this case, the Ninth Circuit had applied Rule 54 to affirm jurisdiction after changed circumstances rendered specific requests for relief ineffectual. So long as the parties retained a “personal stake in the outcome of the litigation,” and a favorable merits decision could entitle the plaintiff to some relief, the court had held that district courts retained jurisdiction to fashion appropriate remedies. *See W. Dist. Council of Lumber Prod. & Indus. Workers v. Louisiana Pac. Corp.*, 892 F.2d 1412, 1416–17 (9th Cir. 1989) (holding case was not moot because court could grant remedy of rescission even though plaintiff had not requested it, before finding remedy not warranted on the merits). In making that second assessment—whether a plaintiff pled a substantive theory for which relief may be granted on the merits—the court had recognized that the complaint should be “construed favorably.” *Z Channel Ltd. P’ship v. Home Box Off., Inc.*, 931 F.2d 1338, 1341 (9th Cir. 1991); *see also State of California Dep’t of Soc. Servs. v. Thompson*, 321 F.3d 835, 856–57 (9th Cir. 2003) (reversing order of dismissal on appeal brought only by intervenor in state suit against the DHHS Secretary and remanding for district court to determine appropriate relief for intervenor, who had not filed a separate pleading). Petitioners satisfied

both prongs here; the Ninth Circuit did not consider either.

First, Petitioners pled a substantive theory on which relief may be granted. Both Petitioners' request for declaratory relief and request for an injunction turned on Petitioners' claims that the CDE Defendants violated the IDEA by failing to ensure LEAs provided them and other similarly situated children with disabilities a FAPE. Petitioners alleged that the CDE instructed LEAs that they were not required to reassess students whose IEPs and settlement agreements were entered into under an assumption of in-person education, despite the CDE Defendants' statutory obligation to supervise LEA's statutory compliance with federal disability laws. ECF No. 1, at 49, 51-64, 67, 78-88; *see also* Cal. Dep't of Educ., Special Education Guidance for COVID-19, *supra* note 5 & 11. Petitioners alleged that, as a direct consequence of LEAs following the CDE's directives, they were deprived of a FAPE. If the district court agreed that the CDE breached its obligations under the IDEA, then Petitioners would be entitled to a remedy for that wrong.

Second, as addressed in Section VI(A)(1), *supra*, Petitioners maintain a personal stake in their dispute with the CDE Defendants over whether the CDE Defendants shirked their obligations under the IDEA in failing to require LEAs to take corrective action. The CDE Defendants have taken the position that the IDEA did not impose any obligation to order reassessments or otherwise provide additional accommodations. Construing the complaint favorably, Petitioners alleged that the CDE

Defendants' course of action deprived Petitioners of their right to a FAPE even after they returned to in-person instruction. ECF No. 1, at 67, 78-88. Moreover, Petitioners spent so much time without a FAPE that returning to school with unchanged IEPs that do not take into account regression in learning amounts to no relief at all.

Had the district court considered and agreed with Petitioners' substantive theory, it could have fashioned an appropriate remedy. Under the IDEA, a court is authorized to grant "such relief as the court determines is appropriate." 20 U.S.C. § 1415(i)(2)(C). This language demonstrates Congress' intent that courts exercise discretion to remedy IDEA violations, not that they can only grant the specific relief requested in a complaint. Indeed, this Court explained that "equitable considerations are relevant in fashioning relief." *Sch. Comm. of Town of Burlington Mass.*, 471 U.S. at 374. And the Ninth Circuit recognizes that one such equitable remedy is compensatory education. *See Parents of Student W. v. Puyallup Sch. Dist.*, No. 3, 31 F.3d 1489, 1496 (9th Cir. 1994) (stating there was "no question that the district court had the power to order compensatory education"); *Park ex rel. Park v. Anaheim Union High Sch. Dist.*, 464 F.3d 1025, 1033 (9th Cir. 2006) ("Compensatory education services can be awarded as appropriate equitable relief."). "Compensatory education involves discretionary, prospective, and injunctive relief crafted by a court to remedy what might be termed an educational deficit created by an educational agency's failure over a given period of time to provide a FAPE to a student." *G. ex rel. Ssgt*

*RG*, 324 F.3d at 254; *see also Me. Sch. Admin. Dist. No. 35*, 321 F.3d at 18 (“[A] child eligible for special education services under the IDEA may be entitled to further services, in compensation for past deprivations, even after his or her eligibility has expired.”). The district court thus could have addressed ongoing educational deficits by ordering the CDE Defendants to mandate compensatory services.

Such an order compensating Petitioners for lost education, or requiring robust assessments with certain procedural protections, could “undo the effects of conduct that was not prevented.” *Garcia v. Lawn*, 805 F.2d 1400, 1402 (9th Cir. 1986) (quotations omitted). It could ensure students receive services they need to recover from forced learning loss. That is all that is required to maintain jurisdiction; the remaining relief need not “return the parties to the *status quo ante*.” *Church of Scientology of California*, 506 U.S. at 12–13; *see also Nw. Env’t Def. Ctr. v. Gordon* 849 F.2d 1241, 1245 (9th Cir. 1988) (emphasizing plaintiffs were “not required, however, to have asked for the precise form of relief that the district court may ultimately grant” and case remained justiciable where damage could “still be repaired or mitigated”). Thus, this Court’s, the Ninth Circuit’s, and other courts of appeals’ jurisprudence should have foreclosed the decision below on mootness. At a minimum, the case should have been remanded to the district court to assess the merits of Petitioners’ claims against the CDE Defendants.

**B. Supervisory review is further warranted where the Court’s holding on mootness cut short a critical inquiry into whether the CDE Defendants violated the IDEA by waiving the statute’s provisions state-wide.**

Because the challenged agency action affected hundreds of thousands of students with disabilities throughout the State of California, it is particularly important to correct course on the threshold issue of justiciability. The IDEA’s statutory framework assigns SEAs like the CDE crucial responsibility in ensuring students with disabilities receive a FAPE. “The statute, regulations, and legislative history all make clear that the [SEA] . . . has the ultimate responsibility for assuring that all handicapped children have the right to a [FAPE].” *Kerr Ctr. Parents Ass’n v. Charles*, 897 F.2d 1463, 1470 (9th Cir. 1990); *see also Michael P. v. Dep’t of Educ.*, 656 F.3d 1057, 1067 (9th Cir. 2011) (IDEA requires SEA to issue state regulations consistent with federal ones). This responsibility includes ensuring students receive a FAPE, including through the IEP process. 20 U.S.C. §§ 1412(a)(11)–(12)(A); 1415(a), (b)(1). The IEP is the “*modus operandi*” of the IDEA’s substantive protections. *Sch. Comm. of Town of Burlington, Mass.*, 471 U.S. at 368; *see also* 20 U.S.C. §§ 1401(14); 1414; 1415. Prior to the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic and the start of remote learning in March of 2020, Petitioners and hundreds of thousands of other students across the state had entered into IEPs and settlement agreements with

their school districts under the IDEA and governing regulations. ECF No. 1, at 61.

As early as April of 2020, the DOE reaffirmed that federal statutory obligations remained in effect during the pandemic (“most notably [the provision of] a free appropriate public education”<sup>17</sup>), and therefore LEAs and SEAs were still required to “provide education to *all* students, including children with disabilities,” and involve parents in decision-making.<sup>18</sup> Yet, as addressed in Section V(C), *supra*, the CDE Defendants issued contradictory guidance. They first instructed LEAs that they did not need to conduct *any* reassessment to account for remote learning, even though all operative IEPs were created in the context of in-person learning.<sup>19</sup> They further chose *not* to direct LEAs to reassess what educational services were required to compensate for the lack of necessary supports and loss of learning from many months of remote education.<sup>20</sup> Because of the crucial function the IEP plays in ensuring students receive a FAPE, this de facto waiver of the IDEA’s IEP provisions for schools across the state implicates the “basic goals” of the IDEA “system wide.” *Hoeft*, 967 F.2d at 1305; *see also J.G. by Mrs. G. v. Bd. of Educ. of Rochester City Sch. Dist.*, 830 F.2d 444, 446 (2d Cir. 1987) (finding systemic deficiencies raised by challenge to district inaction, including failing to place

---

<sup>17</sup> U.S. Dep’t of Educ., Sec’y DeVos Recommended Waiver Authority, at 11, *supra* note 7.

<sup>18</sup> *Id.* (emphasis in original).

<sup>19</sup> Cal. Dep’t of Educ., Special Education Guidance for COVID-19, *supra* note 5.

<sup>20</sup> Cal. Dep’t of Educ., Special Education Guidance for COVID-19, *supra* note 11.

students in special education programs, provide equal opportunities, and develop IEPs with parents).

The widespread consequences of this systemic decision have become increasingly evident as disabled students suffer the foreseeable consequences of regressions after returning to the classroom. In California, 800,000 students relied on the CDE to protect their rights to a FAPE. ECF No. 1, at 77. Instead, the CDE Defendants permitted widespread deprivation of existing IEP accommodations without requiring districts to commit to new accommodations for students in the remote setting. For these hundreds of thousands of students who could no longer access educational opportunities, whether the IDEA requires the CDE to rectify this wrong, including with reassessments now and/or compensatory education, is of crucial importance. Correcting the Ninth Circuit's clearly erroneous holding on mootness could provide critical relief to these students and could provide further clarity to the CDE Defendants as to their obligations under the IDEA.

**C. This Court's review can also avert the far-reaching consequences the Ninth Circuit's precedential decision could have on litigants seeking declaratory and injunctive relief to protect other rights.**

The Ninth Circuit's erroneous opinion also should be corrected because it threatens far-reaching consequences for those who seek redress in federal courts. When individuals face imminent or actual harm, including from agency and other governmental

actors, they often turn to federal courts for declaratory or injunctive relief. While district courts may rule on their requests in short order, appealing adverse outcomes takes more time. By the time an appellate court rules on the case, the injury these individuals sought to prevent may have come to pass or may have changed with unfolding circumstances. As this case illustrates, it can be difficult for litigants to predict *ex ante* what relief will remedy their injury years into litigation.

As discussed above in Section VI(A)(2), *supra*, Rule 54 already grants district courts the authority to solve this problem. This Court's jurisprudence placing the "heavy burden" of proving that no effective relief can be granted on defendants devises an additional solution. *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Slater*, 528 U.S. 216, 222 (2000) (*per curiam*) (internal quotation marks omitted). Along with the Declaratory Judgment Act's permissive pleading standards, this legal framework strikes a balance between ensuring that the federal judiciary is addressing actual disputes between adverse parties, on the one hand, and on the other hand giving courts discretion to fashion a remedy that will redress an ongoing wrong in evolving circumstances. Litigants like Petitioners will continue to ask federal courts to protect and enforce their individual federal rights. By abdicating the ability to enforce those rights anytime the original request for relief no longer remedies the alleged violation, this new precedent threatens to diminish individual rights and corresponding judicial legitimacy. *See generally* Vicki C. Jackson, *Standing and the Role of Federal Courts: Triple Error Decisions*

*in Clapper v. Amnesty International USA and City of Los Angeles v. Lyons*, 23 Wm. & Mary Bill Rts. J. 127, 177 (2014) (“To the extent that justiciability decisions sweep broadly to close courthouse doors, and do not rest soundly on core principles, they can undermine both of these roles [of public access and fair response to minoritarian claims], and thus part of the political theory for their separation and independence from legislative and executive branches.”).

Where, as here, a state actor is alleged to have deprived state citizens of a federal statutory right, that diminution disrupts the balance between the state and federal government, as well as between individuals and the state. The Ninth Circuit’s opinion in this case may further affect the delicate balance of power between the respective branches of government in other cases. *See, e.g.*, Heather Elliott, *The Functions of Standing*, 61 Stan. L. Rev. 459, 500 (2008) (describing suits against executive agencies as serving “a separation-of-powers interest arguably as valid as the anticonscription function”). Take, for example, the Ninth Circuit’s rationale in *Northwest Environmental Defense Center*, which the court implicitly rejected here. 849 F.2d 1241. In that case, the plaintiffs sued various agencies for alleged violations of federal law and asked the district court to declare the agencies’ measures void and enjoin them from amending that year’s regulatory fishing schedule. While the year’s fishing season had ended by the time the case reached the court of appeals, the Ninth Circuit rejected the agency’s contention that the plaintiffs were required “to have asked for the precise form of relief that the district court may ultimately

grant.” *Id.* at 1244. Because the injury from the alleged unlawful agency action could “still be repaired or mitigated” though “obviously not by restoring the fish harvested” that year, the court of appeals retained jurisdiction to adjudicate the dispute. *Id.* at 1245. Returning to this standard will restore the balance the Ninth Circuit previously struck between the respective branches of government in future disputes with state actors.

## **VII. CONCLUSION AND PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

This case involves the immense regression and loss of learning suffered by Petitioners and approximately 800,000 other students with disabilities in the State of California as a result of the CDE Defendants’ continuing failure to order school districts across California to ensure those students receive a FAPE under the IDEA after being forced to obtain their education remotely and then transitioning back to in-person instruction. Absent review by this Court, Petitioners and hundreds of thousands of other students with disabilities will have no recourse to obtain the compensatory education necessary to restore a FAPE after being deprived of that right for years.

For the foregoing reasons, the Court should grant this petition for a writ of certiorari.

Date: February 13, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

MAXWELL V. PRITT  
*Counsel of Record*  
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP  
44 Montgomery Street  
41st Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
(415) 293-6800  
[mpritt@bsfllp.com](mailto:mpritt@bsfllp.com)  
*Counsel for Petitioners*

**LIST OF ALL PARTIES - CONTINUED**

9.	ALAMEDA COUNTY STUDENT EXCHANGE PROG.
10.	ALAMEDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
11.	ALBANY CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
12.	BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
13.	CALIFORNIA SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND (STATE SPECIAL SCHOOL)
14.	CALIFORNIA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF-FREMONT (STATE SPECIAL SCHOOL) <sup>21</sup>
15.	CASTRO VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
16.	DIAGNOSTIC CENTER, NORTHERN CALIFORNIA (STATE SPECIAL SCHOOL)
17.	DUBLIN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

---

<sup>21</sup> The California School for the Blind, the California School for the Deaf, and the Diagnostic Centers of California directly provide services to individual students under the administration of the CDE, and thus differ from the named District Defendants, which are LEAs.

18.	EMERY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
19.	FREMONT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
20.	HAYWARD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
21.	LIVERMORE VALLEY JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
22.	MOUNTAIN HOUSE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
23.	NEW HAVEN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
24.	NEWARK UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
25.	OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
26.	PIEDMONT CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
27.	PLEASANTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
28.	SAN LEANDRO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
29.	SAN LORENZO UNIFIED SCHOOL

	DISTRICT
30.	SBE - LATITUDE 37.8 HIGH SCHOOL
31.	SUNOL GLEN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
32.	ALPINE COUNTY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
33.	AMADOR COUNTY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
34.	BANGOR UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
35.	BIGGS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
36.	CHICO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
37.	DURHAM UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
38.	GOLDEN FEATHER UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
39.	GRIDLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
40.	MANZANITA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
41.	OROVILLE CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

42.	OROVILLE UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
43.	PALERMO UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
44.	PARADISE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
45.	PIONEER UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
46.	THERMALITO UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
47.	BRET HARTE UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
48.	CALAVERAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
49.	MARK TWAIN UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
50.	VALLECITO UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
51.	COLUSA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
52.	MAXWELL UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
53.	PIERCE JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL

	DISTRICT
54.	WILLIAMS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
55.	ACALANES UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
56.	ANTIOCH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
57.	BRENTWOOD UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
58.	BYRON UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
59.	CANYON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
60.	CONTRA COSTA SELPA SCHOOL DISTRICT
61.	JOHN SWETT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
62.	KNIGHTSEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
63.	LAFAYETTE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
64.	LIBERTY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

65.	MARTINEZ UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
66.	MORAGA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
67.	MT. DIABLO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
68.	OAKLEY UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
69.	ORINDA UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
70.	PITTSBURG UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
71.	SAN RAMON VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
72.	SBE - JOHN HENRY HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
73.	SBE - ROCKETSHIP FUTURO ACADEMY
74.	WALNUT CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
75.	WEST CONTRA COSTA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

76.	DEL NORTE COUNTY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
77.	BLACK OAK MINE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
78.	BUCKEYE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
79.	CAMINO UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
80.	EL DORADO UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
81.	GOLD OAK UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
82.	GOLD TRAIL UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
83.	INDIAN DIGGINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
84.	LAKE TAHOE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
85.	LATROBE SCHOOL DISTRICT
86.	MOTHER LODE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

87.	PIONEER UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
88.	PLACERVILLE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
89.	POLLOCK PINES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
90.	RESCUE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
91.	SILVER FORK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
92.	ALVINA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
93.	BIG CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
94.	BURREL UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
95.	CARUTHERS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
96.	CENTRAL UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
97.	CLAY JOINT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

98.	CLOVIS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
99.	COALINGA-HURON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
100.	DIAGNOSTIC CENTER, CENTRAL CALIFORNIA (STATE SPECIAL SCHOOL)
101.	FIREBAUGH-LAS DELTAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
102.	FOWLER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
103.	FRESNO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
104.	GOLDEN PLAINS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
105.	KERMAN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
106.	KINGS CANYON JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
107.	KINGSBURG ELEMENTARY CHARTER SCHOOL DISTRICT
108.	KINGSBURG JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
109.	LATON JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL

	DISTRICT
110.	MENDOTA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
111.	MONROE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
112.	ORANGE CENTER SCHOOL DISTRICT
113.	PACIFIC UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
114.	PARLIER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
115.	PINE RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
116.	RAISIN CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
117.	RIVERDALE JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
118.	SANGER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
119.	SELMA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
120.	SIERRA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
121.	WASHINGTON COLONY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

122.	WASHINGTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
123.	WEST PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
124.	WESTSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
125.	CAPAY JOINT UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
126.	HAMILTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
127.	LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
128.	ORLAND JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
129.	PLAZA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
130.	PRINCETON JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
131.	STONY CREEK JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
132.	WILLOWS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

133.	ARCATA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
134.	BIG LAGOON UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
135.	BLUE LAKE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
136.	BRIDGEVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
137.	CUDDEBACK UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
138.	CUTTEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
139.	EUREKA CITY SCHOOLS SCHOOL DISTRICT
140.	FERNDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
141.	FIELDBROOK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
142.	FORTUNA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
143.	FORTUNA UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

144.	FRESHWATER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
145.	GARFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
146.	GREEN POINT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
147.	HYDESVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
148.	JACOBY CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
149.	KLAMATH-TRINITY JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
150.	KNEELAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
151.	LOLETA UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
152.	MAPLE CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
153.	MATTOLE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
154.	MCKINLEYVILLE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

155.	NORTHERN HUMBOLDT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
156.	ORICK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
157.	PACIFIC UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
158.	PENINSULA UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
159.	RIO DELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
160.	SCOTIA UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
161.	SOUTH BAY UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
162.	SOUTHERN HUMBOLDT JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
163.	TRINIDAD UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
164.	BRAWLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
165.	BRAWLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

166.	CALEXICO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
167.	CALIPATRIA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
168.	CENTRAL UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
169.	EL CENTRO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
170.	HEBER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
171.	HOLTVILLE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
172.	IMPERIAL UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
173.	MAGNOLIA UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
174.	MCCABE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
175.	MEADOWS UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
176.	MULBERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

177.	SAN PASQUAL VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
178.	SEELEY UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
179.	WESTMORLAND UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
180.	BIG PINE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
181.	BISHOP UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
182.	DEATH VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
183.	INYO COUNTY CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION
184.	LONE PINE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
185.	OWENS VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
186.	ROUND VALLEY JOINT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
187.	ARVIN UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
188.	BAKERSFIELD CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

189.	BEARDSLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
190.	BELRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
191.	BLAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
192.	BUTTONWILLOW UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
193.	CALIENTE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
194.	DELANO JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
195.	DELANO UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
196.	DI GIORGIO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
197.	EDISON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
198.	EL TEJON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
199.	ELK HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

200.	FAIRFAX ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
201.	FRUITVALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
202.	GENERAL SHAFTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
203.	GREENFIELD UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
204.	KERN HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
205.	KERNVILLE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
206.	LAKESIDE UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
207.	LAMONT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
208.	LINNS VALLEY-POSO FLAT UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
209.	LOST HILLS UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
210.	MAPLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
211.	MARICOPA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

212.	MCFARLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
213.	MCKITTRICK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
214.	MIDWAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
215.	MOJAVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
216.	MUROC JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
217.	NORRIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
218.	PANAMA-BUENA VISTA UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
219.	POND UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
220.	RAND JOINT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
221.	RICHLAND UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
222.	RIO BRAVO GREELEY UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
223.	ROSEDALE UNION ELEMENTARY

SCHOOL DISTRICT	
224.	SEMITROPIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
225.	SIERRA SANDS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
226.	SOUTH FORK UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
227.	SOUTHERN KERN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
228.	STANDARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
229.	TAFT CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
230.	TAFT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
231.	TEHACHAPI UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
232.	VINELAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
233.	WASCO UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
234.	WASCO UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

235.	ARMONA UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
236.	CENTRAL UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
237.	CORCORAN JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
238.	HANFORD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
239.	HANFORD JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
240.	ISLAND UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
241.	KINGS RIVERHARDWICK UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
242.	KIT CARSON UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
243.	LAKESIDE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
244.	LEMOORE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
245.	LEMOORE UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

246.	PIONEER UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
247.	REEF-SUNSET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
248.	KELSEYVILLE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
249.	KONOCTI UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
250.	LAKEPORT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
251.	LUCERNE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
252.	MIDDLETOWN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
253.	UPPER LAKE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
254.	BIG VALLEY JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
255.	FORT SAGE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
256.	JANESVILLE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

257.	JOHNSTONVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
258.	LASSEN UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
259.	RAVENDALE-TERMO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
260.	RICHMOND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
261.	SHAFFER UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
262.	SUSANVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
263.	WESTWOOD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
264.	ABC UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
265.	ACTON-AGUA DULCE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
266.	ALHAMBRA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
267.	ANTELOPE VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
268.	ARCADIA UNIFIED SCHOOL

	DISTRICT
269.	AZUSA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
270.	BALDWIN PARK UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
271.	BASSETT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
272.	BELLFLOWER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
273.	BEVERLY HILLS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
274.	BONITA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
275.	BURBANK UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
276.	CASTAIC UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
277.	CENTINELA VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
278.	CHARTER OAK UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
279.	CLAREMONT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
280.	COMPTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

281.	COVINA-VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
282.	CULVER CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
283.	DIAGNOSTIC CENTER, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA (STATE SPECIAL SCHOOL)
284.	DOWNEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
285.	DUARTE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
286.	EAST WHITTIER CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
287.	EASTSIDE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
288.	EL MONTE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
289.	EL MONTE UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
290.	EL RANCHO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
291.	EL SEGUNDO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
292.	GARVEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

	DISTRICT
293.	GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
294.	GLENDORA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
295.	GORMAN JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT
296.	HACIENDA LA PUENTE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
297.	HAWTHORNE SCHOOL DISTRICT
298.	HERMOSA BEACH CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
299.	HUGHESELIZABETH LAKES UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
300.	INGLEWOOD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
301.	KEPPEL UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
302.	LA CANADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
303.	LANCASTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
304.	LAS VIRGENES UNIFIED SCHOOL

	DISTRICT
305.	LAWNDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
306.	LENNOX SCHOOL DISTRICT
307.	LITTLE LAKE CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
308.	LONG BEACH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
309.	LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
310.	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
311.	LOS NIETOS SCHOOL DISTRICT
312.	LOWELL JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT
313.	LYNWOOD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
314.	MANHATTAN BEACH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
315.	MONROVIA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
316.	MONTEBELLO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

317.	MOUNTAIN VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
318.	NEWHALL SCHOOL DISTRICT
319.	NORWALK-LA MIRADA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
320.	PALMDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
321.	PALOS VERDES PENINSULA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
322.	PARAMOUNT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
323.	PASADENA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
324.	POMONA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
325.	REDONDO BEACH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
326.	ROSEMEAD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
327.	ROWLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
328.	SAN GABRIEL UNIFIED SCHOOL

	DISTRICT
329.	SAN MARINO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
330.	SANTA MONICA-MALIBU UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
331.	SAUGUS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
332.	SBE - ACADEMIA AVANCE CHARTER
333.	SBE - CELERITY HIMALIA
334.	SBE - LOS ANGELES COLLEGE PREP ACADEMY
335.	SBE - NEW WEST CHARTER
336.	SBE - PREPA TEC LOS ANGELES HIGH
337.	SBE – THE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND ENTERPRISE
338.	SOUTH PASADENA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
339.	SOUTH WHITTIER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
340.	SULPHUR SPRINGS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT

341.	TEMPLE CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
342.	TORRANCE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
343.	VALLE LINDO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
344.	WALNUT VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
345.	WEST COVINA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
346.	WESTSIDE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
347.	WHITTIER CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
348.	WHITTIER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
349.	WILLIAM S. HART UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
350.	WILSONA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
351.	WISEBURN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

352.	ALVIEW-DAIRYLAND UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
353.	BASS LAKE JOINT UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
354.	CHAWANAKEE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
355.	CHOWCHILLA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
356.	CHOWCHILLA UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
357.	GOLDEN VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
358.	MADERA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
359.	RAYMOND-KNOWLES UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
360.	YOSEMITE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
361.	BOLINAS-STINSON UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
362.	KENTFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

363.	LAGUNA JOINT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
364.	LAGUNITAS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
365.	LARKSPUR-CORTE MADERA SCHOOL DISTRICT
366.	LINCOLN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
367.	MILL VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
368.	MILLER CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
369.	NICASIO SCHOOL DISTRICT
370.	NOVATO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
371.	REED UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
372.	ROSS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
373.	ROSS VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
374.	SAN RAFAEL CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

375.	SAN RAFAEL CITY HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
376.	SAUSALITO MARIN CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
377.	SBE - ROSS VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
378.	SHORELINE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
379.	TAMALPAIS UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
380.	MARIPOSA COUNTY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
381.	ANDERSON VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
382.	ARENA UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
383.	ARENA UNION ELEMENTARY/POINT ARENA JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
384.	FORT BRAGG UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
385.	LAYTONVILLE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

386.	LEGGETT VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
387.	MANCHESTER UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
388.	MENDOCINO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
389.	POINT ARENA JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
390.	POTTERVALLEY COMMUNITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
391.	ROUND VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
392.	UKIAH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
393.	WILLITS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
394.	ATWATER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
395.	BALLICO-CRESSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
396.	DELHI UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
397.	DOS PALOS ORO LOMA JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

398.	EL NIDO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
399.	GUSTINE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
400.	HILMAR UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
401.	LE GRAND UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
402.	LE GRAND UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
403.	LIVINGSTON UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
404.	LOS BANOS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
405.	MCSWAIN UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
406.	MERCED CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
407.	MERCED RIVER UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
408.	MERCED UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
409.	PLAINSBURG UNION ELEMENTARY

SCHOOL DISTRICT	
410.	PLANADA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
411.	SNELLING-MERCED FALLS UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
412.	WEAVER UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
413.	WINTON SCHOOL DISTRICT
414.	MODOC JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
415.	SURPRISE VALLEY JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
416.	TULELAKE BASIN JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
417.	EASTERN SIERRA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
418.	MAMMOTH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
419.	ALISAL UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
420.	BIG SUR UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
421.	BRADLEY UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

422.	CARMEL UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
423.	CHUALAR UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
424.	GONZALES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
425.	GRAVES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
426.	GREENFIELD UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
427.	KING CITY UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
428.	LAGUNITA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
429.	MISSION UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
430.	MONTEREY PENINSULA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
431.	NORTH MONTEREY COUNTY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
432.	PACIFIC GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
433.	SALINAS CITY ELEMENTARY

SCHOOL DISTRICT	
434.	SALINAS UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
435.	SAN ANTONIO UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
436.	SAN ARDO UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
437.	SAN LUCAS UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
438.	SANTA RITA UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
439.	SOLEDAD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
440.	SOUTH MONTEREY COUNTY JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
441.	SPRECKELS UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
442.	WASHINGTON UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
443.	CALISTOGA JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
444.	HOWELL MOUNTAIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

445.	NAPA VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
446.	POPE VALLEY UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
447.	SAINT HELENA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
448.	CHICAGO PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
449.	CLEAR CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
450.	GRASS VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
451.	NEVADA CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
452.	NEVADA JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
453.	PENN VALLEY UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
454.	PLEASANT RIDGE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
455.	TWIN RIDGES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

456.	UNION HILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
457.	ANAHEIM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
458.	ANAHEIM UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
459.	BREA-OLINDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
460.	BUENA PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
461.	CAPISTRANO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
462.	CENTRAL ORANGE COUNTY CTE PARTNERSHIP
463.	CENTRALIA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
464.	COLLEGE AND CAREER ADVANTAGE
465.	CYPRESS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
466.	FOUNTAIN VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
467.	FULLERTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

	DISTRICT
468.	FULLERTON JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
469.	GARDEN GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
470.	HUNTINGTON BEACH CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
471.	HUNTINGTON BEACH UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
472.	IRVINE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
473.	LA HABRA CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
474.	LAGUNA BEACH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
475.	LOS ALAMITOS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
476.	MAGNOLIA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
477.	NEWPORTMESA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
478.	OCEAN VIEW SCHOOL DISTRICT
479.	ORANGE UNIFIED SCHOOL

	DISTRICT
480.	PLACENTIA-YORBA LINDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
481.	SADDLEBACK VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
482.	SANTA ANA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
483.	SAVANNA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
484.	SBE - MAGNOLIA SCIENCE ACADEMY SANTA ANA
485.	TUSTIN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
486.	WESTMINSTER SCHOOL DISTRICT
487.	ACKERMAN CHARTER SCHOOL DISTRICT
488.	ALTA-DUTCH FLAT UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
489.	AUBURN UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
490.	COLFAX ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
491.	DRY CREEK JOINT ELEMENTARY

SCHOOL DISTRICT	
492.	EUREKA UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
493.	FORESTHILL UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
494.	LOOMIS UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
495.	NEWCASTLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
496.	PLACER HILLS UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
497.	PLACER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
498.	ROCKLIN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
499.	ROSEVILLE CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
500.	ROSEVILLE JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
501.	TAHOE-TRUCKEE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
502.	WESTERN PLACER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

503.	PLUMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
504.	ALVORD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
505.	BANNING UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
506.	BEAUMONT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
507.	CALIFORNIA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF-RIVERSIDE (STATE SPECIAL SCHOOL)
508.	COACHELLA VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
509.	CORONA-NORCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
510.	DESERT CENTER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
511.	DESERT SANDS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
512.	HEMET UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
513.	JURUPA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
514.	LAKE ELSINORE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

515.	MENIFEE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
516.	MORENO VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
517.	MURRIETA VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
518.	NUVIEW UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
519.	PALM SPRINGS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
520.	PALO VERDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
521.	PERRIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
522.	PERRIS UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
523.	RIVERSIDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
524.	ROMOLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
525.	SAN JACINTO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
526.	TEMECULA VALLEY UNIFIED

SCHOOL DISTRICT	
527.	VAL VERDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
528.	ARCOHE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
529.	CENTER JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
530.	ELK GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
531.	ELVERTA JOINT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
532.	FOLSOM-CORDOVA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
533.	GALT JOINT UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
534.	GALT JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
535.	NATOMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
536.	RIVER DELTA JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
537.	ROBLA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

538.	SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
539.	SAN JUAN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
540.	TWIN RIVERS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
541.	AROMAS - SAN JUAN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
542.	BITTERWATER-TULLY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
543.	CIENEGA UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
544.	HOLLISTER SCHOOL DISTRICT
545.	JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
546.	NORTH COUNTY JOINT UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
547.	PANOCHÉ ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
548.	SAN BENITO HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
549.	SOUTHSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

	DISTRICT
550.	TRES PINOS UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
551.	WILLOW GROVE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
552.	ADELANTO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
553.	ALTA LOMA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
554.	APPLE VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
555.	BAKER VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
556.	BARSTOW UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
557.	BEAR VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
558.	CENTRAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
559.	CHAFFEY JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
560.	CHINO VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

561.	COLTON JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
562.	CUCAMONGA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
563.	ETIWANDA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
564.	FONTANA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
565.	HELENDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
566.	HESPERIA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
567.	LUCERNE VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
568.	MORONGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
569.	MOUNTAIN VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
570.	MT. BALDY JOINT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
571.	NEEDLES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

572.	ONTARIO-MONTCLAIR SCHOOL DISTRICT
573.	ORO GRANDE SCHOOL DISTRICT
574.	REDLANDS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
575.	RIALTO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
576.	RIM OF THE WORLD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
577.	SAN BERNARDINO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
578.	SILVER VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
579.	SNOWLINE JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
580.	TRONA JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
581.	UPLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
582.	VICTOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
583.	VICTOR VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

584.	YUCAIPA CALIMESA JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
585.	ALPINE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
586.	BONSALL UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
587.	BORREGO SPRINGS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
588.	CAJON VALLEY UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
589.	CARDIFF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
590.	CARLSBAD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
591.	CHULA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
592.	CORONADO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
593.	DEHESA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
594.	DEL MAR UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

595.	ENCINITAS UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
596.	ESCONDIDO UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
597.	ESCONDIDO UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
598.	FALLBROOK UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
599.	FALLBROOK UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
600.	GROSSMONT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
601.	JAMUL-DULZURA UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
602.	JULIAN UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
603.	JULIAN UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
604.	LA MESA-SPRING VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT
605.	LAKESIDE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

606.	LEMON GROVE SCHOOL DISTRICT
607.	MOUNTAIN EMPIRE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
608.	NATIONAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
609.	OCEANSIDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
610.	POWAY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
611.	RAMONA CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
612.	RANCHO SANTA FE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
613.	SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
614.	SAN DIEGUITO UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
615.	SAN MARCOS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
616.	SAN PASQUAL UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
617.	SAN YSIDRO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

618.	SANTEE SCHOOL DISTRICT
619.	SBC – HIGH TECH HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
620.	SBE - AUDEO CHARTER II SCHOOL DISTRICT
621.	SBE – BAYPOINT PREPARATORY ACADEMY SAN DIEGO
622.	SBE – COLLEGE PREPARATORY MIDDLE
623.	SBE - GROSSMONT SECONDARY
624.	SBE - SWEETWATER SECONDARY
625.	SBE - VISTA SPRINGS CHARTER
626.	SOLANA BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
627.	SOUTH BAY UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
628.	SPENCER VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
629.	SWEETWATER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
630.	VALLECITOS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

	DISTRICT
631.	VALLEY CENTER-PAUMA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
632.	VISTA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
633.	WARNER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
634.	SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
635.	SBE - KIPP BAYVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
636.	SBE - THE NEW SCHOOL OF SAN FRANCISCO SCHOOL DISTRICT
637.	BANTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
638.	ESCALON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
639.	JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
640.	LAMMERSVILLE JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
641.	LINCOLN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

642.	LINDEN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
643.	LODI UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
644.	MANTECA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
645.	NEW HOPE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
646.	NEW JERUSALEM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
647.	OAK VIEW UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
648.	RIPON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
649.	STOCKTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
650.	TRACY JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
651.	ATASCADERO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
652.	CAYUCOS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
653.	COAST UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
654.	LUCIA MAR UNIFIED SCHOOL

	DISTRICT
655.	PASO ROBLES JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
656.	PLEASANT VALLEY JOINT UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
657.	SAN LUIS COASTAL UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
658.	SAN MIGUEL JOINT UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
659.	SHANDON JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
660.	TEMPLETON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
661.	BAYSHORE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
662.	BELMONT-REDWOOD SHORES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
663.	BRISBANE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
664.	BURLINGAME ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
665.	CABRILLO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

666.	HILLSBOROUGH CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
667.	JEFFERSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
668.	JEFFERSON UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
669.	LA HONDA-PESCADERO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
670.	LAS LOMITAS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
671.	MENLO PARK CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
672.	MILLBRAE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
673.	PACIFICA SCHOOL DISTRICT
674.	PORTOLA VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
675.	RAVENSWOOD CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
676.	REDWOOD CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
677.	SAN BRUNO PARK ELEMENTARY

SCHOOL DISTRICT	
678.	SAN CARLOS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
679.	SAN MATEO UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
680.	SAN MATEO-FOSTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
681.	SEQUOIA UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
682.	SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
683.	WOODSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
684.	BALLARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
685.	BLOCHMAN UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
686.	BUELLTON UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
687.	CARPINTERIA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
688.	COLD SPRING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

689.	COLLEGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
690.	CUYAMA JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
691.	GOLETA UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
692.	GUADALUPE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
693.	HOPE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
694.	LOMPOC UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
695.	LOS OLIVOS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
696.	MONTECITO UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
697.	ORCUTT UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
698.	SANTA BARBARA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
699.	SANTA MARIA JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

700.	SANTA MARIA-BONITA SCHOOL DISTRICT
701.	SANTA YNEZ VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
702.	SBE - OLIVE GROVE CHARTER – BUELLTON
703.	SBE - OLIVE GROVE CHARTER – LOMPOC
704.	SBE – OLIVE GROVE CHARTER - ORCUTT/SANTA MARIA
705.	SBE - OLIVE GROVE CHARTER – SANTA BARBARA
706.	SOLVANG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
707.	VISTA DEL MAR UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
708.	ALUM ROCK UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
709.	BERRYESSA UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
710.	CAMBRIAN SCHOOL DISTRICT
711.	CAMPBELL UNION SCHOOL

	DISTRICT
712.	CAMPBELL UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
713.	CUPERTINO UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
714.	EAST SIDE UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
715.	EVERGREEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
716.	FRANKLINMCKINLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
717.	FREMONT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
718.	GILROY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
719.	LAKESIDE JOINT SCHOOL DISTRICT
720.	LOMA PRIETA JOINT UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
721.	LOS ALTOS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
722.	LOS GATOS UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
723.	LOS GATOS - SARATOGA UNION

	HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
724.	LUTHER BURBANK SCHOOL DISTRICT
725.	METRO EDUCATION SCHOOL DISTRICT
726.	METROPOLITAN EDUCATION SCHOOL DISTRICT
727.	MILPITAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
728.	MORELAND SCHOOL DISTRICT
729.	MORGAN HILL UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
730.	MOUNT PLEASANT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
731.	MOUNTAIN VIEW WHISMAN SCHOOL DISTRICT
732.	MOUNTAIN VIEW-LOS ALTOS UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
733.	OAK GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
734.	ORCHARD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

735.	PALO ALTO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
736.	SAN JOSE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
737.	SANTA CLARA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
738.	SARATOGA UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
739.	SBE - KIPP NAVIGATE COLLEGE PREP
740.	SBE – PERSEVERANCE PREPARATORY
741.	SUNNYVALE SCHOOL DISTRICT
742.	UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
743.	BONNY DOON UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
744.	HAPPY VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
745.	LIVE OAK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
746.	MOUNTAIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

	DISTRICT
747.	NORTH SANTA CRUZ COUNTY SELPA SCHOOL DISTRICT
748.	PACIFIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
749.	PAJARO VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
750.	SAN LORENZO VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
751.	SANTA CRUZ CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
752.	SANTA CRUZ CITY ELEMENTARY/HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
753.	SANTA CRUZ CITY HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
754.	SBE - WATSONVILLE PREP SCHOOL DISTRICT
755.	SCOTTS VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
756.	SOQUEL UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
757.	ANDERSON UNION HIGH SCHOOL

	DISTRICT
758.	BELLA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
759.	ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
760.	CASCADE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
761.	CASTLE ROCK UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
762.	COLUMBIA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
763.	COTTONWOOD UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
764.	ENTERPRISE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
765.	FALL RIVER JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
766.	FRENCH GULCH-WHISKEYTOWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
767.	GATEWAY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
768.	GRANT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

769.	HAPPY VALLEY UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
770.	IGO, ONO, PLATINA UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
771.	INDIAN SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
772.	JUNCTION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
773.	MILLVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
774.	UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
775.	MOUNTAIN VALLEY SPECIAL EDUCATION JPA
776.	NORTH COW CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
777.	OAK RUN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
778.	PACHECO UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
779.	REDDING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

780.	SHASTA UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
781.	SHASTA UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
782.	WHITMORE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
783.	SIERRAPLUMAS JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
784.	WILLIAM (R) ROUSE ROP SCHOOL DISTRICT
785.	BIG SPRINGS UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
786.	BOGUS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
787.	BUTTE VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
788.	BUTTEVILLE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
789.	DELPHIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
790.	DUNSMUIR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

791.	DUNSMUIR JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
792.	FORKS OF SALMON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
793.	GAZELLE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
794.	GRENADA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
795.	HAPPY CAMP UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
796.	HORNBROOK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
797.	JUNCTION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
798.	KLAMATH RIVER UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
799.	LITTLE SHASTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
800.	MCLOUD UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
801.	MONTAGUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

802.	MT. SHASTA UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
803.	SCOTT VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
804.	SEIAD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
805.	SISKIYOU UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
806.	WEED UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
807.	WILLOW CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
808.	YREKA UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
809.	YREKA UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
810.	BENICIA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
811.	DIXON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
812.	FAIRFIELD-SUISUN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
813.	TRAVIS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

814.	VACAVILLE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
815.	VALLEJO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
816.	ALEXANDER VALLEY UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
817.	BELLEVUE UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
818.	BENNETT VALLEY UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
819.	CINNABAR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
820.	CLOVERDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
821.	COTATI-ROHNERT PARK UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
822.	DUNHAM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
823.	FORESTVILLE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
824.	FORT ROSS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

825.	GEYSERVILLE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
826.	GRAVENSTEIN UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
827.	GUERNEVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
828.	HARMONY UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
829.	HEALDSBURG UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
830.	HORICON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
831.	KASHIA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
832.	KENWOOD SCHOOL DISTRICT
833.	LIBERTY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
834.	MARK WEST UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
835.	MONTE RIO UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
836.	MONTGOMERY ELEMENTARY

SCHOOL DISTRICT	
837.	OAK GROVE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
838.	OLD ADOBE UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
839.	PETALUMA CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
840.	PETALUMA CITY ELEMENTARY/JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
841.	PETALUMA JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
842.	PINER-OLIVET UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
843.	RINCON VALLEY UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
844.	ROSELAND SCHOOL DISTRICT
845.	SANTA ROSA CITY SCHOOLS
846.	SANTA ROSA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
847.	SANTA ROSA HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

848.	SEBASTOPOL UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
849.	SONOMA VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
850.	TWIN HILLS UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
851.	TWO ROCK UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
852.	WAUGH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
853.	WEST SIDE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
854.	WEST SONOMA COUNTY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
855.	WILMAR UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
856.	WINDSOR UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
857.	WRIGHT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
858.	CERES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
859.	CHATOM UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT

860.	DENAIR UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
861.	EMPIRE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
862.	GRATTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
863.	HART-RANSOM UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
864.	HICKMAN COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL DISTRICT
865.	HUGHSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
866.	KEYES UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
867.	KNIGHTS FERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
868.	MODESTO CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
869.	MODESTO CITY HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
870.	MODESTO CITY SCHOOLS
871.	NEWMAN-CROWS LANDING UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

872.	OAKDALE JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
873.	PARADISE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
874.	PATTERSON JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
875.	RIVERBANK UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
876.	ROBERTS FERRY UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
877.	SALIDA UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
878.	SHILOH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
879.	STANISLAUS UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
880.	SYLVAN UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
881.	TURLOCK UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
882.	VALLEY HOME JOINT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

883.	WATERFORD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
884.	BRITTAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
885.	BROWNS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
886.	EAST NICOLAUS JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
887.	FRANKLIN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
888.	LIVE OAK UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
889.	MARCUM-ILLINOIS UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
890.	MERIDIAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
891.	NUESTRO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
892.	PLEASANT GROVE JOINT UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
893.	SUTTER UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

894.	WINSHIP-ROBBINS SCHOOL DISTRICT
895.	YUBA CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
896.	ANTELOPE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
897.	CORNING UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
898.	CORNING UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
899.	EVERGREEN UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
900.	FLOURNOY UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
901.	GERBER UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
902.	KIRKWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
903.	LASSEN VIEW UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
904.	LOS MOLINOS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

905.	RED BLUFF JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
906.	RED BLUFF UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
907.	REEDS CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
908.	RICHFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
909.	BURNT RANCH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
910.	COFFEE CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
911.	DOUGLAS CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
912.	JUNCTION CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
913.	LEWISTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
914.	MOUNTAIN VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
915.	SOUTHERN TRINITY JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

916.	TRINITY ALPS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
917.	TRINITY CENTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
918.	ALLENSWORTH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
919.	ALPAUGH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
920.	ALTA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
921.	BUENA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
922.	BURTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
923.	COLUMBINE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
924.	CUTLER-OROSI JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
925.	DINUBA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
926.	DUCOR UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
927.	EARLIMART ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

	DISTRICT
928.	EXETER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
929.	FARMERSVILLE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
930.	HOPE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
931.	HOT SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
932.	KINGS RIVER UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
933.	LIBERTY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
934.	LINDSAY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
935.	MONSON-SULTANA JOINT UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
936.	OAK VALLEY UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
937.	OUTSIDE CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
938.	PALO VERDE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

939.	PIXLEY UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
940.	PLEASANT VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
941.	PORTERVILLE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
942.	RICHGROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
943.	ROCKFORD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
944.	SAUCELITO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
945.	SEQUOIA UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
946.	SPRINGVILLE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
947.	STONE CORRAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
948.	STRATHMORE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
949.	SUNDALE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

950.	SUNNYSIDE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
951.	TERRA BELLA UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
952.	THREE RIVERS UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
953.	TIPTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
954.	TRAVER JOINT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
955.	TULARE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
956.	TULARE JOINT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
957.	VISALIA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
958.	WAUKENA JOINT UNION ELEMENTARY
959.	WOODLAKE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
960.	WOODVILLE UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
961.	BELLEVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

962.	BIG OAK FLAT-GROVELAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
963.	COLUMBIA UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
964.	CURTIS CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
965.	JAMESTOWN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
966.	SONORA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
967.	SONORA UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
968.	SOULSBYVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
969.	SUMMERVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
970.	SUMMERVILLE UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
971.	TWAIN HARTE SCHOOL DISTRICT
972.	BRIGGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
973.	CONEJO VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL

	DISTRICT
974.	FILLMORE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
975.	HUENEME ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
976.	MESA UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
977.	MOORPARK UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
978.	MUPU ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
979.	OAK PARK UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
980.	OCEAN VIEW SCHOOL DISTRICT
981.	OJAI UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
982.	OXNARD SCHOOL DISTRICT
983.	OXNARD UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
984.	PLEASANT VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT
985.	RIO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT

986.	SANTA CLARA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
987.	SANTA PAULA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
988.	SIMI VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
989.	SOMIS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
990.	VENTURA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
991.	DAVIS JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
992.	ESPARTO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
993.	WASHINGTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
994.	WINTERS JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
995.	WOODLAND JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
996.	CAMPTONVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
997.	MARYSVILLE JOINT UNIFIED

SCHOOL DISTRICT	
998.	PLUMAS LAKE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
999.	WHEATLAND SCHOOL DISTRICT
1000.	WHEATLAND UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT