

April 7, 2025 – Notice of Non-Renewal and Administrative Absence

On April 7, 2025, I was formally notified of the non-renewal of my teaching contract for the upcoming school year. A meeting was held to deliver the notice; however, no members of the administrative team (including the superintendent, principal, or assistant principal) were present—despite having been invited to attend.

During this meeting, I formally requested three letters of recommendation from the Superintendent, Principal, and/or Assistant Principals in support of my future employment search. These requests were made respectfully and in good faith, as I had maintained professionalism throughout my tenure and had previously received positive evaluations and endorsements.

Evidence of this interaction, including communications related to the recommendation requests, is available and can be submitted upon request.

April 9, 2025 – Conditional Promise of Letters of Recommendation

On April 9, 2025, I received a phone call from my CEA Union Lawyer, who informed me that the Superintendent had agreed to provide three letters of recommendation—from himself, the Principal, and the Assistant Principal—on the condition that I submit a formal resignation.

This communication confirmed that the district was willing to support my professional reputation and acknowledge my contributions if I chose to resign rather than move forward with the non-renewal process. The offer appeared transactional and pressured, further reinforcing that the district was motivating my resignation as a means of administrative convenience, despite my repeated efforts to request support, accommodations, and clarity.

This interaction is relevant to my constructive discharge claim, as it placed me in a position where resignation was not fully voluntary but influenced by conditional assurances and administrative avoidance.

