

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**1adam12**, (8/25/2009 3:31:57 PM)

Why is Chris Tharp so interested in seeing the legal bills? By making this available at this time would'nt this be information for sisneys lawsuit against the district? Who voted to let Chris Tharp speak for everyone. Isn' this costing the taxpayers more money with his lawyers and FOI requests. The best thing he could do would be to run for school board so he can be informed about private matters that seem so important to him. If this confidentiality is breached then who would ever seek an attorney again. I guess that would open it up for any info we can get when anyone, parent, student or whatever sues the district then we all can see what is going on. I will say this 612 you are at least fair by posting his garbage on your website. It seems that him and his friend matt are not interested in posting all sides on even your website. They even did not post the world article about sisney getting sued in sperry even though it mentioned BA.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/25/2009 4:42:57 PM)

From what I gather, Mr. Tharp does not believe Dr. Sisney's actions are involved at all in the cause of the legal bills. Under the assumption that Dr. Sisney's claims and lawsuits (including John Lare's actions related to the HVAC conspiracy that Dr. Sisney alleged) are not involved, the legal bills would not be expected to be anywhere near as high as they are. Chris, correct me if I've got your point of view wrong.

I don't see how the legal costs could NOT be in large part directly attributable to Dr. Sisney's and Mr. Lare's actions - whether the claims of a conspiracy are true or false.

I think it's safe to say that Mr. Tharp and I are mutually and equally perplexed by each other's thinking.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/26/2009 1:09:08 PM)

A Ledger article announces that the board was "forced to unveil legal billings". More Ledger bias - making sure it comes across like they were trying to cover something up. The article does not mention the concerns they had about releasing the details - only that Doug Mann had tried to keep them confidential by saying that they fell under attorney-client privilege.

The board's statement after a 5-0 vote to release the details:

"Details of legal bills may be released as a result of open records requests after attorney representation has determined the confidentiality requirement of the documents and has redacted the items necessary to protect the school district, its students and employees."

I think it's likely that the billing details will show how much was billed and for what general activity, but won't show the details that justify the costs (that is, of course, if the costs are justifiable). If that is the case, releasing this much information could make things worse. That could be one of the things the board was trying to avoid, along with illegally releasing information relating to pending lawsuits and confidential personnel information.

It sounds like Doug Mann makes the call on what can and can't be released. It seems likely that one of his objectives will be to minimize further damage to the school board's image.

I hope the information will be presented in a press release.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/26/2009 1:52:40 PM)

I posted a comment on the Ledger story saying that Dr. Sisney's court documents are on the brokenarrowforum website. Hope they print it. I would think that anyone posting an opinion on the court costs would have an interest in what is going on with the pending lawsuits.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/26/2009 2:06:27 PM)

Drat, they didn't post it. I'll try again, just to be pig-headed.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/26/2009 2:08:12 PM)

Copying here, for copy 'n' paste ease on my next 12 attempts:

Court documents from both of Dr. Sisney's lawsuits are available to view at brokenarrowforum dot net.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/26/2009 2:19:28 PM)

I can't believe it - brokenarrowforum shows up on the first page of a Google search on "sisney lawsuit -disney broken arrow".

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/26/2009 2:43:44 PM)

btw, thanks for your comment, 1adam12. I'm not afraid for people to see the whole truth.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/26/2009 4:59:25 PM)

Why does the Ledger state that Chris Tharp launched a campaign TWO years ago to make the legal billing information public? It's only been not quite a year since Sisney's employment at BAPS was terminated and Doug Mann's law firm only started working again for BAPS last summer. Isn't that correct?

I noted the new additions to the top right of the brokenarrowforum website main page, including mention of Updike's bankruptcy. Too bad the Ledger doesn't want to print your comment about the website (and neither does BAParentsfor"Truth"). You might have to wait until the Tulsa World does another article on BAPS or Sisney to get the word out.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/26/2009 5:14:12 PM)

Hm, I didn't notice that the article said it was two years. Were there questions around legal billing before the board hired back RFR? Chris, can you clear this up?

It's frustrating that a newspaper seems to want to suppress information. At least the website shows up in a search now, so someone who is looking has a chance of stumbling across it.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/26/2009 8:24:11 PM)

612, on your forum, you provided a link to the August 25 article about the district's legal expenses in the FOI Oklahoma blogspot site, which has the following information contained within it:

QUOTE

The records are expected to be made public this week, says Chris Tharp. He had been seeking the billing records submitted by Rosenstein, Fist & Ringold since September.

"Only took a year, but I got it. Or will get it in the mail later this week," Tharp told the FOI Oklahoma Blog on Tuesday.

END QUOTE

Perhaps someone should advise the Ledger that their reporting accuracy and/or proofreadin leaves something to be desired.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/26/2009 8:25:06 PM)

My proofreadin' leaves something to be desired, too. :)

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/26/2009 8:54:17 PM)

So I guess the "two years" statement is just wrong? That's pretty misleading.

I noticed that the BAParentsForTruth website page that shows the board meeting minutes still says "(Currently Removed from Electronic School Board Site, but obtained by FOI request)" on all of the meeting dates in 2009.

But if you look at the Electronic School Board, there are minutes for all of the meetings since the beginning of the year except three (including the 8/24 minutes that have not yet been approved).

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/27/2009 8:33:50 AM)

Posted on Ledger article "BOE forced to unveil legal billings"

-----

Mr. Tharp started this campaign two years ago, to get the RFR billing information released? A year before RFR was rehired by the school board in August 2008?

From Mr. Tharp's request:

QUOTE

...I am hereby requesting on behalf of Mr. Tharp that the Broken Arrow Public Schools ("BAPS"), promptly make available for inspection and copying all documents in BAPS' possession, custody or control, demonstrating what legal services were performed on behalf of BAPS by the law firm, Rosenstein, Fist & Ringold ("RFR"), from the time it was retained on August 6, 2008...

UNQUOTE

Two years ago?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/27/2009 12:49:19 PM)

The Ledger story now reads:

QUOTE

Tharp, who launched a campaign a year ago to make this information public, said he was delighted by the board's action but couldn't help but wonder why it took so long to get to this point.

UNQUOTE

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/27/2009 12:52:49 PM)

Another attempt - posted on Ledger article "BOE forced to unveil legal billings":

Mr. Tharp's letter to the BOE can be viewed at brokenarrowforum dot net.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/27/2009 1:31:26 PM)

Brilliant. The Ledger posted my comment on the two years (after they fixed the article) but not the one about the website.

\*\* sigh \*\*

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/27/2009 3:57:31 PM)

Yesterday's Scheduling Order from Dr. Sisney's federal case is posted on brokenarrowforum. It goes well into next year.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/27/2009 5:14:41 PM)

Thanks for posting the scheduling order for Sisney's Federal trial. I suppose it would be too much to hope for a dismissal up front. I'm going to mark my calendar for May 17 for the jury trial, just in case it goes that far.

"Tom's" hostility toward your post on the BA Ledger's comments seems unwarranted.

I don't trust those folks who are so dead set against both sides of information being available for public perusal. Why not post the information to lead people to the brokenarrowforum dot net website, unless the intent is to keep people from seeing the whole story and making up their own minds? It's pathetic. If you look at that FOI Oklahoma blogspot articles of August 25 and July 9, neither mentions the lawsuits filed against the board and district which would, of course, increase legal fees over previous years, as well as cause a possible reason for confidentiality of the billing records--examples of very slanted reporting by omission of pertinent information.

Don't worry--there will be a time and place for this information to be more widely disseminated; somewhere other than the Ledger, obviously.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/27/2009 5:24:48 PM)

612, I forgot to mention that the Ledger corrected their article to read from two years to one, because of your post calling it to everyone's attention. Maybe "Tom" doesn't think it's important to be accurate in reporting the facts, but I do.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/27/2009 5:52:27 PM)

My (probably ill-advised and almost certainly unproductive) reply to Tom:

-----

Sorry Tom, I just think newspapers should be careful to report accurately. If Mr. Tharp requested the information two

years ago, my understanding of the timeline was really off; hence my question. If it's a typo, fine.

In two separate articles, the Ledger has incorrectly reported that Dr. Sisney filed his defamation lawsuit after his employment was terminated. I think the difference is pretty significant. Is that splitting hairs too? Are you content to take whatever is printed as fact, even if it conflicts with what has previously been reported?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/27/2009 5:53:26 PM)

I'm trying to post this comment on the August 25 blog article entitled "Broken Arrow School Board votes to release detailed billing records from law firm\*\*\*" in FOI Oklahoma blogspot dot com, but am having trouble getting it to successfully post. I'll post it here for safekeeping while I keep at it.

QUOTE

Why does this blog article and the one from July 9, 2009, neglect to report the likely reasons for the large increase in legal expenses is due to a defamation lawsuit filed by then BAPS Superintendent Jim Sisney on September 3, 2008; the legal work in preparation for Dr. Sisney's suspension October 6, 2008, and subsequent termination on October 23, 2008? No mention was made of the citizen taxpayer demands and actions in the last 12 months filed by John Lare, et al., either. No comment was made as to why the board was reluctant to release this information, which they stated was a concern for confidentiality.

Anyone who is interested in reading the actual legal documents and news articles related to the Broken Arrow School district/board controversy in detail is welcome to peruse the brokenarrowforum dot net website which has links to a great deal of illuminating information on the pending court cases and more.

The Broken Arrow Ledger and the BAParentsfortruth dot com website have declined to print any information for the public about the availability of this website. I wonder why? Is it because they want to control the message in the media instead of truly looking for the truth?

END QUOTE

\*\* At least their headline is unbiased, unlike the Ledger's.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/27/2009 5:58:34 PM)

I'm pleased that the website comes up on a search. At least someone who is truly interested in the history of this situation will be able to find it, even if I can't get any of the Ledger posters to look at anything except what Bob Lewis and Interested Citizen (Bob Lewis?) write.

Thanks Chris for showing your open-mindedness on the bond issue, and pointing out that it needs to be considered on its own merits, not in the context of how people feel about the board members.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/27/2009 6:10:26 PM)

Jolie, your post on FOI Blogspot is very good. I hope you can get it to stick. The board's concern over confidentiality is critically important to understanding their reluctance to release the information, especially since they already have two lawsuits pending against them.

It's wrong for these articles not to report the board's stated reasoning. Even if the reporter/editor doesn't believe them, it's still part of the story.

Tom assumed I was against releasing the information. I'm not against it - I'm just against the board doing anything that is likely to result in more lawsuits against them! If there was a question of illegally breaching confidentiality, I'm glad they protected themselves by going through the due diligence of getting another legal opinion. I'm glad it cleared the way for them to release the information.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/27/2009 6:21:29 PM)

I tried using my livejournal username on the FOI blog, which is one of the choices for posting on it, but I keep getting an error message that says it can't verify my openID account, which was not the choice I made. Too bad.

Other types of accounts allowed: Google, WordPress, Typepad, and AIM.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/27/2009 8:01:48 PM)

I left one very important item out of draft post: the wrongful termination lawsuit against the BAPS district filed by Sisney April 30 of this year--how could I overlook that little legal expense item?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/27/2009 10:52:03 PM)

Oh yeah, the federal lawsuit. Just a minor expense there. I really hope they are able to delay discovery until the motion to dismiss is decided.

People have said that insurance is covering the costs of the 3 board members who are being sued individually by Dr. Sisney. That is consistent with what I have read about school board liability. So - I wonder how much that should reduce the RFR billing.

Or does RFR bill all of it to the district, and then the insurance reimburses? If this is the case, are the figures on the reimbursements included in the RFR billing disclosures, to offset the costs that the district is not liable for?

The answers to these questions should have some bearing on the analysis of the RFR billed amounts.

When I first saw the Ledger article, I thought it said "BOE forced to unveil legal billions"...hee hee

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/28/2009 9:56:40 AM)

Here's a comment I've submitted to the Ledger on the billing story, in response to justanotherokie's comment asking when was Sisney fired and then erroneously posting as an answer the defamation lawsuit reference. Some people really do not understand or remember the true sequence of events.

QUOTE

Sisney filed his defamation lawsuit on September 3, 2008, while he was still superintendent of the BAPS. He was suspended October 6, 2008, and did not request a due process hearing before the deadline. The BOE terminated his employment on October 23, 2008. Sisney then filed a wrongful termination lawsuit against the district April 30, 2009. Searches at the Tulsa World news site will confirm those date.

Gee, I wonder why the BAPS district has a significant increase in its legal fees over the past 12 months?

Why does the FOI Oklahoma blogspot articles of July 9, 2009, and August 25, 2009, neglect to even mention lawsuits by and dismissal of Sisney as reasons for some or most of the increased legal expenses from previous years? Or the explanation offered by the Board and attorneys related to attorney/client privilege and confidentiality? Is it because some people are trying their best to make the Board and the district look bad by only presenting part of the story?

Why does the Ledger an BAParentsfortruth website decline to publish information for the public to know they can read actual numerous court documents related to Sisney's lawsuits free of charge at the website that 612 set up at brokenarrowforum dot net ?

END QUOTE

I suspect that the editor will decline to print the comment because I mentioned the brokenarrowforum. You can't blame a girl for trying! :)

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/28/2009 10:51:36 AM)

I don't know, it might be worth it to the Ledger to post actual information, if it gets people riled up at Jolie again! Ah, the good old days...

I also posted a response to justanotherokie, before I saw your post here. It's very easy to find the answer to that question - it really confirms the appearance that a lot of posters just go with what's presented on the Ledger, without doing any verification or real analysis.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/28/2009 11:27:36 AM)

Well they posted my comment about when Sisney was fired, but neither of the ones where we mentioned the website.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/28/2009 12:02:10 PM)

Maybe you could submit your post again, without the website, so it has a chance of getting posted. People need to think about these things.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/28/2009 12:25:02 PM)

Your post said the most important things about the timeline and then demonstrating the poor journalism habits (or worse, intended bias) of the Ledger. I'll try again with something different if and when it seems appropriate.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/28/2009 12:49:51 PM)

Forgot to copy my response to justanotherokie's question about when Sisney was fired:

-----  
612 wrote on Aug 28, 2009 10:44 AM:

" Sisney filed his lawsuit on 9/3/2008. He was suspended on 10/6/2008 and fired on 10/23/2008.

The Ledger article The "OSBI gets school investigation" story states:

QUOTE

After being fired in a 3-2 vote by the board of education, Sisney filed a defamation of character lawsuit against Mike Rampey, a local eye doctor and "three unnamed co-conspirators" ...

UNQUOTE

I think some who post here would argue with me on anything, but I'm pretty sure September comes before October. "

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/28/2009 5:52:05 PM)

Sperry seems to be cutting it close on announcing whether Dr. Sisney will be given an extension or permanent contract.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/28/2009 9:39:15 PM)

You can expect the announcement to hit the papers late tonight or tomorrow morning. The Sperry BOE is meeting tonight (August 28) and their agenda includes discussion of Sisney's employment:

QUOTE

Executive Session

4. Motion, discussion, and vote to go into executive session pursuant to Title 25 OKLA STAT., Section 307 (B) (1) to discuss the employment, including salary, benefits, duties and responsibilities, and contract of employment of Dr. Jim Sisney, an individually salaried public employee.

Return to Open Session

5. Motion and vote to acknowledge return to Open Session.

6. Board Clerks statement of Executive Session minutes.

7. Consideration and vote on motion to set the terms of and to contract with Dr. Jim Sisney.

END QUOTE

This comes as no surprise to us, particularly after Sisney's friends were hired to administrative positions in Sperry.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/28/2009 10:03:48 PM)

As soon as any news articles appear (anywhere but the Ledger that is), we can put the word out about the brokenarrowforum site. The quicker a comment about it is made, the more people will read it and gain awareness they can access Sisney's lawsuit court documents there. If the Ledger reports on Sisney's hiring, it would be appropriate to try to post a comment on the lawsuit filed against him by the former principal/current employee at Sperry. However, chances are high that the editor will refrain from printing anything related to that.

BTW, this article is now listed as number 50 on the most commented stories (remember when it was at the top of the heap for weeks? :))

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/29/2009 7:30:48 AM)

You are good! I had checked the Sperry school board's minutes but had not thought to check the agendas. We'll know shortly...I expect Dr. Sisney knows already.

I saw that on the All-time Most Commented stories, this article is number 8. At 909 comments, we have quite a few to go to overtake the top story, which has 2581. It's interesting that of the top 7 stories, 6 are about the same topic - ORU.

Agreed, it would be a good idea to post the location of the court documents early in the life of a new news article.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/29/2009 12:09:03 PM)

I guess the person who issues the press releases for the Sperry school district is waiting until office hours on Monday to send out the announcement to the press. I half expected the BA Ledger to get a jump on it, boasting about their guy Sisney getting hired permanently, but even they can't justify reporting on the Sperry school district. That's the job of the Skiatook Journal, which allegedly included the territory of both Skiatook and Sperry, but they don't seem to take the Sperry part too seriously. They never reported on Stephanie Holcomb filing a lawsuit against school district personnel.

The lack of news can't be because they voted no to employing Sisney on a permanent contract basis. The board agenda makes it clear he's the one they want.

It's only today I discovered how tiny a community Sperry is. In 2009, only 1,031 people lived there, compared to 90,700 in Broken Arrow. The school district has only 4 schools total: elementary, middle, intermediate, and high school. The number of students enrolled in BA High School for grades 11 and 12 (2,035) is almost twice the total number of citizens who live in Sperry.

I'm confused, though, because numerous sources report Sperry's population to be somewhere near 1,000, more or less, which is less than the number of students enrolled in their public school district, as reported by Oklahoma Crossroads, which states Sperry had 1,280 students enrolled in October 2008, compared to Broken Arrow's 16,193. Best Schools website listed Sperry as having 1,277 students. Does another community share the district with Sperry? Can you figure out why the discrepancy?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/29/2009 12:10:33 PM)

Correction to last post, second last sentence of last paragraph, should read Greatschools dot net website (not Best Schools website).

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/29/2009 1:19:49 PM)

I thought the additional students might have come from Turley, OK, who doesn't seem to have its own school district, but has a population of 3,352 (as of July 2007) but discovered the town is now part of Tulsa and their students were absorbed into the Tulsa public school system. The only other community close to Sperry is Skiatook (population 6,820 in July 2008) and they have a much larger enrollment (2,525 in 2008/2009 school year), probably more advanced and outfitted school district than Sperry. Estimated median household income in 2007 in Sperry is \$31,460 and in Skiatook \$40,007. Would any Skiatook parents prefer to send their kids to Sperry? Were are those 1,280 students coming from? Although unlikely, could it be Sperry is fudging its enrollment numbers?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/29/2009 1:39:32 PM)

The enrollment number does sound high. Even if you include rural areas whose population wouldn't be included in the town population, that's a lot of extra students.

I know there was concern about students leaving, because the district would lose money. Because it affects the amount of money the district receives, I expect the enrollment number is closely monitored. I can't think of an explanation for why the number of students would exceed the population...

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/29/2009 2:18:50 PM)

I'll bring the subject up when they post a new story on Sperry schools (which is likely to be very soon). I'm fairly sure some of the Sperry parents who read the article will be able to answer the question, if there is an above-board explanation for the numbers.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/29/2009 2:48:37 PM)

Although I haven't done extensive research on population demographics, I did quickly locate one site that showed breakdown of population by age in the State of Oklahoma. It showed that 25% of the population were children under the age of 18. Of those 7% were under the age 5 (I believe they are included in the under 18 age category, too; otherwise, wouldn't they specify ages 5 through 18 as a category instead of under 18?).

To use those very general statistics and applying it to Sperry's population of 1,031 would mean there would be 258 kids under the age of 18 and even less would be of school age, which would make the number of children enrolled in the district even more astonishing.

I am not a student of statistics so I could be way off in this attempt at analyzing the numbers.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/29/2009 3:08:04 PM)

Here's another example of comparing total population to number of children.

In 2000, the City of Tulsa had a population of 393,049 (from city-data dot com). The population of children from the ages of 5 through 19 was 80,766--the last category was grouped age 15 through 19 so I couldn't break it down further). That is 20% of the total population for that US census year (most recent available).

CNN lists the city of Tulsa's population as 382,800. The State of Oklahoma shows public school enrollment for the Tulsa and Union public schools totaling 55,855 students for 2008. That 14.6% of the total population.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/29/2009 3:12:10 PM)

The CNN statistic for total population for Tulsa was for the year 2008 as well, included in their Best Places to Live feature at CNNMoney dot com.

Sorry for leaving that out. My posts could benefit from better proofreading.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/29/2009 3:19:54 PM)

There is a website that shows maps of city limits and school districts...on separate maps unfortunately. It's a little hard to tell, but it looks like the Sperry school district covers a lot of territory - all the way from the western edge of the Owasso district to the Sand Springs district (about 12 miles across). The district is in both Tulsa and Osage counties.

The website is geo dot ou dot edu.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/29/2009 3:58:44 PM)

Using your directions, I pulled up the website for The Center for Spatial Analysis for OU. Is that the correct site?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/29/2009 4:10:06 PM)

Yes. The page with the maps is /MapsFrame dot htm.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/29/2009 4:18:31 PM)

I did a search for 'oklahoma school district maps' and it did give the same site, but gave me an easier page to do searches from. It's difficult to see how much population lives in the areas shown, but even though the space covered by the district is much larger than the official Sperry city limits, there aren't that many roads in the outer areas, which leads me to think it is not heavily populated. I will keep trying to find out more about the total population statistic for the area served.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/29/2009 5:04:56 PM)

Right, cows don't count :)

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**52favoriteteacher**, Washburn--used to be Broken Arrow (8/30/2009 7:09:03 AM)

Tulsa World could follow up on the 4 that pulled

their names...

The rest of the story would be GREAT...

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/31/2009 8:39:55 AM)

No one has asked questions about the 4 that pulled their names. In fact, when we tried to ask how the Kitchens' names could get on the document without them having seen it, the Ledger would not even publish our comments.

There are many questions that someone should have asked Richardson - including how he could claim to have no knowledge of AA's billing typo explanation, when he filed it himself in Sisney's lawsuit - but no one has. Why not?

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/31/2009 9:38:06 AM)

Posted (fruitlessly I'm sure) on Ledger:

-----

Anyone who - unlike Tom - would like to base their opinion on actual information can see court documents on both of

Dr. Sisney's court cases at brokenarrowforum dot net.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (8/31/2009 7:56:37 PM)

The Sperry Public Schools website has the minutes of the special board meeting of August 28 up already. It was specifically for the purpose of discussing Sisney's employment contract. The wording is vague enough to cast doubt as to the final outcome. They discussed it but did they come to any agreement on the contract and its terms? Here is an excerpt from the minutes:

QUOTE

EXECUTIVE SESSION

4. Motion, discussion and vote to go into executive session pursuant to Title 25 OKLA STAT., Section 307 (B) (1) to discuss the employment, including salary, benefits, duties and responsibilities and contract of employment of Dr. Jim Sisney, an individually salaried public employee. Jonnetta Selvidge motioned for discussion and vote to go into executive session at 2:04pm Jeff Carter seconded the motion and all approved.

Jeff Carter-aye

Brian Wedlake-aye

Jonnetta Selvidge-aye

Cindy Wilson-aye

Derrell Morrow-aye

MOTION CARRIES 5-0

RETURN TO OPEN SESSION

5. Jonnetta Selvidge motioned to return to open session at 3:50pm, Jeff Carter seconded the motion all approved.

Jeff Carter-aye

Brian Wedlake-aye

Jonnetta Selvidge-aye

Cindy Wilson-aye

Derrell Morrow-aye

MOTION CARRIES 5-0

6. Board Clerks statement of Executive Session minutes. Cindy Wilson motioned, discussion and vote to go into executive session pursuant to Title 25 OKLA STATE., Section 308 (B) (1) to discuss the employment, including salary, benefits, duties and responsibilities and contract of employment of Dr. Jim Sisney, an individually salaried public employee. No action or votes taken.

7. Consideration and vote on motion to set the terms of and to contract with Dr. Jim Sisney. Brian Wedlake motioned to set terms of and to contract with Dr. Jim Sisney, Jeff Carter seconded the motion and all approved.

Jeff Carter-aye

Brian Wedlake-aye

Jonnetta Selvidge-aye

Cindy Wilson-aye

Derrell Morrow-aye

MOTION CARRIES 5-0

ADJOURNMENT

Cindy Wilson motioned to adjourn at 3:52pm, Jonnetta Selvidge seconded the motion and all approved.

Jeff Carter-aye

Brian Wedlake-aye

Jonnetta Selvidge-aye

Cindy Wilson-aye

Derrell Morrow-aye

MOTION CARRIES 5-0

END QUOTE

Maybe they haven't made a final decision yet, which is why there hasn't been a press announcement.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (8/31/2009 9:49:18 PM)

This kinda sounds like they hired him, but it's hard to tell for sure:

7. Consideration and vote on motion to set the terms of and to contract with Dr. Jim Sisney. Brian Wedlake motioned to set terms of and to contract with Dr. Jim Sisney, Jeff Carter seconded the motion and all approved.

The part that says "to contract with" sounds like it means enter into a contract with him. So my guess is they made it official.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**Jolie2**, (9/1/2009 9:58:11 AM)

Any guesses to explain the delay of the announcement? Do you think its because the terms of the contract are not acceptable (yet) to Sisney? Unless he's accepted the contract terms, right now Sperry schools are without an official superintendent.

[Report Comment](#) | [Ignore User](#)

**612**, Broken Arrow (9/1/2009 10:29:55 AM)

It seems like they would have done the negotiations with Dr. Sisney ahead of time. I don't know why they haven't announced it. I was also thinking that they don't necessarily have to make it permanent - they could extend his interim status for any period of time, possibly through the school year.

With his lawsuits and the Sperry lawsuit against him and the board members, and the conflict around the school board, maybe they are just trying to stay low-key, without a lot of fanfare.