

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

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/21/2009 11:49:00 AM)

Chris, I looked through the board policies, and also tried to find some precedent that would give us some clue as to how the legal decisions are communicated between the board and its legal counsel...didn't find anything helpful. Sorry about that.

Maybe you could ask the board member who represents your area. I don't know if the answer would be specific to this lawsuit, in which case they wouldn't be able to say anything, or if there is a general way these things are done, which they may be able to comment on.

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

**Jolie2**, (10/21/2009 2:54:32 PM)

I posted information about the brokenarrowforum on the TW article about BA interviewing superintendent candidates, in response to someone asking for more information about the controversy.

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

**Jolie2**, (10/21/2009 2:59:51 PM)

to Chris Tharp

The judge's order for a settlement conference (available on brokenarrowforum dot net) specifies that if board approval is required for a decision to be made, then the full board must be present at the conference. This would likely be necessary, even if Sisney/Richardson are the ones paying for costs, etc. The board would have to review the settlement offer and decide whether to accept it or not.

The decision on what to do if Sisney would make a motion to dismiss his lawsuit(s) may have already been discussed and made during a previous meeting about the lawsuits, while looking at possible future developments. I have no idea if this is true, so this is just speculation on my part.

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

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/21/2009 5:24:06 PM)

That's true, Jolie, I hadn't thought of that. They may have already made decisions on foreseeable contingencies in previous sessions.

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

**C. Tharp**, (10/21/2009 6:59:05 PM)

Woah, lets back up a little bit 612. If your last sentence is correct then I (and you) am saying there has been a violation of the open meeting act, cause I don't recall the board ever going into Exec. Session over Sisney's fed lawsuit and I don't recall a RFR atty being at any board meetings in a long time. So please reference minutes or agenda to back up your last sentence. If decisions are being made without exec session then there is problem.

Which brings back my point. How is all of these legal decisions being made on behalf of the district if the board is not being consulted?

Ok, Jolie, to your last post. Board at a settlement conference?? Ok, but if they all meet together over school business they will have to post that meeting in advance per OMA. Right?

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

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/21/2009 7:34:19 PM)

I don't really know what the board's protocol is for discussing with legal counsel the actions to take on litigation.

Surprising, I know, for someone who was on the board for 10 years. :)

I'm not going to go as far as to say there must have been a violation based on the fact that you don't recall something, though.

Why don't you ask your board member if they can clear this question up?

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

**Jolie2**, (10/21/2009 7:45:03 PM)

Chris, I agree with 612 that you should contact your school board representative to have your questions on this issue answered. Neither 612 or I are familiar with how litigation for the district is managed and how communications and decisions are arranged between counsel, district staff, and the board.

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

**Jolie2**, (10/21/2009 7:46:45 PM)

I just submitted this post to the new Ledger article "School board interviewing candidates" dated 10/21/09.

QUOTE

Why is information on Sisney's lawsuits included in this article? It makes no sense to report that information in this context.

The state lawsuit that Richardson is referring to is the defamation lawsuit Sisney filed on September 4, 2008, before he was suspended and before he was terminated. It therefore has nothing to do with a wrongful termination lawsuit. It would seem that Richardson would like others to believe it does, though.

I wish the Ledger would take the time to be clear in its reporting, even if the interview subject isn't. It does make a difference for your readers, who would like to depend on their paper for accuracy and thoroughness in the information it provides.

END QUOTE

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

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/21/2009 8:10:31 PM)

I thought that was weird too. And as usual, Richardson needs to be corrected.

Posted on Ledger article about superintendent interviews, though it may be rejected for having too much information:  
-----

I don't know why this article is predominantly about Sisney's lawsuits when the title suggests that it's about superintendent interviews, but the settlement order shows a different date for the settlement conference. According to the order, the conference is set for 3/3/2010 at 1:30 PM. The 2/16/2010 date Richardson mentions is the deadline for the defendant to respond to the plaintiff's settlement offer, which is due on 2/10/2010.

If there have been changes made to these dates, the order has not been filed yet.

The order also states that the parties may come to a settlement agreement before the conference, in which case they would notify the judge.

Mann, the district's counsel, is quoted as saying that he will file a motion by Oct. 26 asking that Richardson's motion to dismiss be denied, and that the reason for the district's objection will be in that filing.

Richardson has not filed anything since he stated on Tuesday 10/13 that he would be filing a motion to dismiss on Thursday 10/14.

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

**Hmmmm BA!**, Broken Arrow (10/21/2009 8:51:24 PM)

612 Your comment "Surprising, I know, for someone who was on the board for 10 years. :)" Seems supprising for someone who keeps claiming they are not Flippo. I can't recall anyone who is female who WAS on the board for 10 years. Other than you Flippo.

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

**Jolie2**, (10/22/2009 8:12:27 AM)

to Hmmmm BA

612 wasn't being serious in her comment. That was a joke about spending 10 years on the board, because someone on the Ledger keeps identifying her as Flippo. If she WAS Flippo and HAD been on the board for 10 years, she would have easily been able to answer Chris Tharp's questions.

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

**Jolie2**, (10/22/2009 8:15:24 AM)

612, I do hope the Ledger will take the time to publish your most recent post. If they don't, it definitely will say their editorial policy may have changed, but not enough.

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

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/22/2009 8:47:30 AM)

Good work, Sherlock. You've cracked my code.

After a year masquerading as an anonymous outsider, I finally slipped up and mentioned I was a board member for 10 years. Ya think?

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

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/22/2009 8:52:01 AM)

Jolie, the Ledger posted both our comments. We'll probably get hassled for posting, but it's worth it to get the correct information out there.

Regarding Hmmm BA's comment, I am gratified to see that someone is reading the ongoing conversation here, besides those of us regularly posting.

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

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/22/2009 9:35:24 AM)

Posted on Ledger "Former superintendent's federal suit to be dropped" article, in response to this:

-----

Hey 612 wrote on Oct 21, 2009 8:16 PM:

" I'm not asking you anything about Sisney's lawsuit. I'm asking you your OPINION on why no current members of the central office staff or principals were interviewed by the district's attorney or the School Board LEADING UP to Sisney's termination. If he was such a tyrant, wouldn't they want to know what the people who worked directly with him thought? My assumption is that they DIDN'T want to know what these people thought since they had their own agenda already planned. You say what? "

-----

My response:

"Hey 612", I simply don't believe your assertion that no current members of the staff or principals were interviewed. I don't think you know. You say you know two people who say they have not been interviewed. I don't think that's much to go on, even if your word can be trusted. In addition, based on your claim that I am Maryanne Flippo, I have to expect that you have made similar illogical and unwarranted leaps in your analysis.

I believe there were probably extensive interviews, and I believe there is probably copious documentation as to the problems with Dr. Sisney, and that little if any of it has anything to do with his so-called investigation.

I believe the board members' agenda was and continues to be acting in the best interest of the students.

I believe these things are probably true based on the actual information I have seen, and from observing the board members', Gerber's and Sisney's actions. I'm sorry that your conclusion has led you to feel free to publicly accuse potentially innocent people without proof. You and others have damaged our community. The day will come when the board will be able to speak, and I believe some opinions of this controversy will be radically changed.

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

**Hmmm BA!**, Broken Arrow (10/22/2009 2:12:15 PM)

612 comments "I believe the board members' agenda was and continues to be acting in the best interest of the students.

I believe these things are probably true based on the actual information I have seen, and from observing the board members', Gerber's and Sisney's actions. I'm sorry that your conclusion has led you to feel free to publicly accuse potentially innocent people without proof. You and others have damaged our community. The day will come when the board will be able to speak, and I believe some opinions of this controversy will be radically changed."

My response

"The are only 3 reasons you would come up with a conclusion as you have stated "opinions of this controversy will be radically changed."

1. You are truly Flippo who served on the board for 10 years and you know the info.
2. You are getting information from current board members who have violated Executive Session Laws.
3. You are pulling stuff out your But!"

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

**Jolie2**, (10/22/2009 4:31:53 PM)

to Hmmm BA

How about:

4. 612 is a highly intelligent person who has spent many, many hours reading and investigating information regarding this controversy online. Instead of accepting news reports as the full story and Sisney's and Richardson's words at face value, she has taken the time to make sense of the story. This is no easy feat and required dedication and

perseverance. If you would take the time to go to brokenarrowforum dot net and read the list of "36 questions that suggest Sisney was not railroaded" you would understand some of the reasons why she expects the story that Sisney has told is in conflict with reality.

Stop attacking 612 because of your own shortcomings in critical thinking and curiosity. Have you even bothered to read what she has on her website? If you did, you would realize that the information she has collected has come from sources available to the public.

There are plenty of people in Broken Arrow who, if they are decent folks, should be thinking of how to apologize to Maryanne Flippo, Sharon Whelpley, Shari Wilkins, Gary Gerber, and Mike Rampey, if the official investigations clear them of wrongdoing. It's going to take a lot of effort to make it up to these community members for what they've been put through by mean-spirited words and actions.

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

**Jolie2**, (10/22/2009 4:35:24 PM)

P. S. to HmMMM BA

correction to your No. 3 item:

but is spelled butt when referring to someone's posterior or derriere or rear end or fanny.

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

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/22/2009 6:21:14 PM)

Thank you, Jolie, for your kind words and confidence in my research and analysis. I really do try to present information accurately, and make a clear differentiation between verifiable facts and my assessments.

Besides my not being Flippo, everything I have presented as fact can be verified by anybody with information available to the public. (I actually did verify that I'm not Flippo: I asked my mom and checked my library card).

Hmmm BA, I haven't always been this way. When this first started, I was shocked at what it looked like the board was doing. But when it was made clear that legally they couldn't tell us ANYTHING, and legally they couldn't allow public comments - this would put the district at risk for viable legal action against them - some people didn't stop the assumptions, accusations, name-calling, and even calls for retaliation (remember "string 'em up"?).

All of the rancor, when no information was available to the public on which to judge the actions of the board, didn't make sense to me. It seemed that people were delighted to throw stones, without really knowing what the crime was, or whether there really were crimes committed. As I tried to figure out what was behind it, the story Sisney told, which seemed entirely plausible at first, started to show more and more inconsistencies. I am at this point very skeptical of any sort of conspiracy carried on by the board, and more inclined to believe that Sisney was indeed the source of the difficulties, as listed by the board in the "Reasons for Possible Dismissal".

I have told the truth always. If you would like to persist in your belief and/or assertion that I am Ms. Flippo, that's your choice. Your insistence that my identity is driving my opinion is irrelevant. It doesn't invalidate my point of view.

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

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/22/2009 6:23:49 PM)

Hmmm BA, someday when we're good friends I'll post my initial reaction to your comment. I think you'll find it funny.

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

**BAissue**, (10/22/2009 9:28:59 PM)

Wow, dancing around the questions and issues. Much like dealing with the government in real life except this is on a local issue. I think it funny that a little school board wants to try and play big politics.

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

**C. Tharp**, (10/22/2009 10:30:15 PM)

Someone should tell "Hey 612" that the witnesses are more than likely listed on the witness list that are posted on 612's website. I don't recall any teachers or principals on it, but been a while since I looked. But I would say all of the individuals interviewed by RFR for whatever reason are listed on there.

With that witness list public (thank you 612) I would think it somewhat naive to think we don't know who was interviewed.

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

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/22/2009 11:31:25 PM)

There's so much that we don't know about how the lawsuits are handled. I don't think we can know for sure whether we have access to the complete witness list.

The witness list filed in the lawsuit is a preliminary list. It says that they reserve the right to amend as discovery is continuing. Before the trial, a Final Witness List has to be submitted. Except in extraordinary circumstances (lawyer shows on TV I guess), witnesses can be called only if they are on this list.

In the days before and after Sisney was suspended, many witnesses were interviewed in preparation for the due process hearing. There are numerous entries in RFR's billing details. It seems unlikely that all of those interviews were with only the people listed in the preliminary witness list.

One of the entries in RFR's billing details, dated 4/24/2009, reads, "Email with Interim Superintendent regarding employees possibly being deposed in pending litigation and appropriate action to take to protect those employees". It doesn't say which litigation, so there is no way to know if it's talking about Sisney's lawsuit. But its presence indicates that protecting witnesses is a consideration.

The most recent filing in the defamation case is a protective order pertaining to confidential information. This could cover anything – Sisney's cell phone records, personnel records, etc - but it seems likely that witnesses who need to be protected could also fall in this category.

If the district wanted to keep teachers, staff, and principals who testified out of public scrutiny and safe from putting their jobs in jeopardy, which I'm sure we all want, one way they could achieve it would be to leave them off the preliminary witness list, put in place a protective order pertaining to confidential information, and then submit the full witness list, subject to the protective order. Not that I'm an expert by any stretch, but something like that sounds entirely possible to me.

I really don't want our teachers and staff to be afraid to tell the truth because they would be subjected to the same harrassment that the board members and Gerber have had to put up with.

I would be interested in knowing if the protective order lists specific things that are to be kept confidential. I don't know if I'll be able to get downtown any time soon to get a copy...

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

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/23/2009 7:58:59 AM)

I'm getting weary of the pointless discussion with "hey 612" who doesn't seem to get the notion that people can't talk about the pending lawsuits.

This probably won't make it, because it mentions this article...vaguely. I haven't been able to get anything through that mentions TW at all lately.

-----

"Hey 612", you're not going to get the real story from calling "a few people in the central office". No one who knows anything can talk about it. The notion that the board's motives can be deduced based on two people saying whether they have been interviewed is absurd, and suggests that the conclusion was reached before the evidence was considered. As we have seen, you're not alone in that tendency.

If you want to have a real discussion on this, get a real screen name and come over to the article we have mentioned multiple times.

Unless you are willing to discuss it with 612 in a format with no censoring and no delays, I'm done with you.

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

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/23/2009 12:16:03 PM)

Jolie, we wondered why Sisney's alleged threat to Flippo was not included in the "Reasons for Possible Dismissal" letter to Sisney.

I have an idea for a possible explanation. Including that incident in the letter would have made it part of the personnel issue, making it subject to confidentiality requirements. Maybe when they drafted the letter to Sisney, they decided to try to keep it from being locked up, first in the personnel issue, and also possibly in any future wrongful termination lawsuit.

Ms. Flippo could not have talked about it at her press conference if it had been in the letter. They may also be keeping their options open as far as pressing charges.

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

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/23/2009 12:35:42 PM)

Another stellar example of objective reporting. An excerpt from a Tulsa Beacon article, "BA tax hike could be biggest in history", 10/8/2009:

-----

Discord on the Broken Arrow School Board is costing the district a lot more money.

Lawyer fees during fiscal year 2007-2008 were \$8,500 and the total for fiscal year 2008-2009 was more than \$163,000, according to records.

Some lawsuits, firing of the former superintendent Jim Sisney and investigations may also drain support for the massive tax increase.

Sisney had been investigating what he saw as an improper relationship between the district and a local heat and air contractor.

The Oklahoma Bureau of Investigation and the Oklahoma Auditor and Inspector's office are both conducting investigations into the district's finances.

Gerber, on the advice of attorneys, is being tight-lipped about the district's legal woes.

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

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/23/2009 12:48:30 PM)

More from the same Beacon article. I believe the Beacon is run by the same man, Charles Biggs, who used to do the Community World section in the Tulsa World. The Broken Arrow section would frequently offer information about the BA schools. It's possible that Biggs and Sisney became acquainted through this. Biggs may be a Sisney supporter, or may just want to generate interest in his online newspaper through controversy (in which case I am proving useful to him!)

Either way, the article linked on brokenarrowforum dot net from October 2008 includes some information that has never been reported to the public by any other outlet. It seems likely that it was provided to the Beacon by the source - Sisney.

The newspaper's website is tulsabeacon dot com.

-----

Broken Arrow school officials are seeking a \$295 million tax increase, which is believed to be one of the biggest – if not the biggest – school tax hike in state history.

Broken Arrow patrons will go to the polls Dec. 8 to decide the fate of the massive \$295,000,000.00, nine-year, property tax increase.

School officials are claiming it is not a tax increase because the new payments will partially replace expiring bond issue payments.

This package is dramatically larger than any other because officials are using a long-term bond scheme that is joined with a lease-purchase financial package.

Other state districts, including Jenks (\$153 million), Yukon (\$93 million), Claremore (\$42 million), Owasso (\$42 million), Bixby \$34 million and Coweta (\$25 million) have jumped on the bandwagon of extending bond package in a lease-purchase situation to expand the ability to borrow money.

A growing group of Broken Arrow residents are shocked by the size of the bond vote and some are organizing to fight its passage.

An informal poll on the Broken Arrow Ledger website on Oct. 2 showed that 42 percent of the respondents would vote no, 38 percent would vote yes and 21 percent are undecided.

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

**Jolie2**, (10/23/2009 1:33:57 PM)

612, that's a good deduction you've made regarding Sisney's alleged extortion attempt and why it was not included in the reasons for possible dismissal letter. It was a mystery to me, when this fact alone, if true, would be enough to terminate his employment.

You deserve a paycheck for all the work and thinking, thinking, thinking you are doing on this case. :)

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

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/23/2009 2:10:18 PM)

I think we could probably rustle up a few folks who'd be willing to pay to get me to STOP thinking! :)

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

**C. Tharp**, (10/23/2009 2:52:23 PM)

Ha, Yea sure, Tell you what Jolie. I'll write 612 a check as soon as I get paid for hiring a lawyer to educate a school district and law firm about the open records act.

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

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/23/2009 3:58:29 PM)

Hee hee, good one, Chris. Don't you know it's a public service you provide? :)

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

**Jolie2**, (10/24/2009 12:05:29 PM)

I was reviewing the scheduling order for Sisney's defamation trial. The pre-trial conference is set for December 8, 2009, at 9:30 am before Judge Cantrell. Is that when they will set the actual trials dates? That document states the trial is expected to last 4 to 5 days.

other important from the same schedule (available through a link at brokenarrowforum dot net)

November 1, 2009: Discovery must be completed

November 15, 2009: All motions must be filed

If Sisney is going to request dismissal of this case, I would expect it to occur by or on December 8.

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

**BAissue**, (10/24/2009 11:23:36 PM)

"612, Broken Arrow (10/22/2009 11:31:25 PM)

If the district wanted to keep teachers, staff, and principals who testified out of public scrutiny and safe from putting their jobs in jeopardy, which I'm sure we all want, one way they could achieve it would be to leave them off the preliminary witness list, put in place a protective order pertaining to confidential information, and then submit the full witness list, subject to the protective order. Not that I'm an expert by any stretch, but something like that sounds entirely possible to me."

Very interesting to say considering some of your previous acts. I've stayed back and watched this issue from the beginning. Made my own conclusions from my own limited investigation, documents from FOI requests and some sources, not illegal sources as some of you may have. And with the recent issues in the "I'm Voting Yes!" campaign, I'm speaking out now. I've had enough of the corruption and I'm making a push on state legislation to give the people the power to make a total board recall. I'm sure you'll respond "That could never happen" or "It's illegal" but I say, have a look at the constitution. WE THE PEOPLE.

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

**BAissue**, (10/24/2009 11:34:37 PM)

Oh, and I'm gonna pull a 612 here and post again. There's only 2 people on that board actually representing the people. And if you can't figure it out, I'll even give you 5 guesses.

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

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/25/2009 9:19:56 AM)

BAissue,

So – based on your opinion that I'm completely wrong about this controversy, you have deduced that I'm getting privileged information from illegal sources. Um...how does that work? Why would I need illegal sources in order to be wrong?

I would be pleased to have a recall hearing, so that the public could understand the information the board made its decisions on. I think they would too! In fact, Maryanne Flippo said as much in her press conference when she called for Sisney to release his personnel records "so the public can see the same information I had before me when I voted to terminate his employment."

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

**BAissue**, (10/25/2009 1:24:48 PM)

I never said you had illegal sources. But there must be some truth to it for you to respond to it. Obviously you worship Flippo but what you've failed to notice is how human and corrupted she and others can be.

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

**612**, Broken Arrow (10/25/2009 1:54:38 PM)

Some say a failure to respond is an admission of guilt. Some say any response is "protesting too much". \*\* sigh \*\* It appears that there are some who are intent on believing what they want, and are willing to interpret a statement any

way they need to in order to make it "fit" their foregone conclusion. It does give insight into how they were able to reach their other questionable conclusions.

I don't know why so much there needs to be such adversarialness (adversariality? adversarialosity? now that's just silly). I think our goals are probably the same - what's best for BA schools.

I also don't know why some insist on making this about me. I just don't think it's right to jump to conclusions and condemn people based on hearsay, which is all we have right now. Based on what we know for sure, it is entirely possible that the board members took the appropriate action. Anyone who says it's not possible is making assumptions that can't objectively be made at this point.

I notice that the people who think they know the answers - even though they're missing the same information everyone else is missing - tend to portray themselves as smarter than those who say we can't know for sure. But no matter how intelligent you are, you can't know what the board knew at the time they voted to dismiss Sisney. Without that information, you cannot make the call on whether they did the right thing or not. Period. Any alleged corruption is still based on the word of one man. That's not enough for me to go on, particularly after seeing his less-than-constructive actions since this started.

It surprises me that these smarter-than-thou people seem to think it IS a good idea to condemn people without the facts, and in fact get all enraged when someone says let's wait to find out what really happened! What does that say about our community? I think it's embarrassing for all of us.

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

**BAissue**, (10/25/2009 3:36:43 PM)

Interesting considering you're doing the same thing. Condemning those who believe the board was wrong and acting like you're smarter than they are. You've stated many times that the board was right yet you state that we can't come to a conclusion because we don't know everything. Now obviously I'll admit that a real conclusion can't be met until the facts are out but can you? This may be cliché but looking in the mirror tends to help. Now we all want what is best for the schools, but we obviously have different opinions of what that is. But we can say where the majority sits on the issue, or have we forgotten all those rallies, and not the old "I'm BA Proud" rallies, the real community rallies speaking against their rights as voters being denied.

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

**Jolie2**, (10/25/2009 4:19:37 PM)

There is a difference between stating something as fact and expressing an opinion based on information available. 612 has been careful to define which is which in her posts. She has said over and over again that there MAY be good reason that the Board suspended and then terminated Sisney's employment. The board is unable to release the details without Sisney's signed legal release. If they did so, I am sure that Sisney would be quick to file a third lawsuit. Until a trial makes that information public or until he signs a waiver to allow it to be released, we are unable to make that determination. However, we can look at the actions that Sisney has taken from the beginning of this case to see if he is operating on the up and up and in the best interests of the people of Broken Arrow.

If his allegations were true, why did Sisney not go to the proper authorities and ask them to investigate the alleged conspiracy and fraud, instead of taking his case to the media/public and a personal defamation lawsuit? How was that helpful to Broken Arrow? He has cost the district legal expenses when if he reported his alleged suspicions and findings, it would have cost us much less. It was only in December 2008 that he finally provided any information to authorities.

Why did Sisney not request the formality of a due process hearing after he was suspended and before he was terminated from his job? Even if he didn't expect any change in the outcome of the hearing, he and/or his attorney should have known it was the only way to protect his 'whistleblower status' in the event his employment was terminated and he planned to file a wrongful termination suit.

He filed a wrongful termination lawsuit against the district at the end of April 2009, again costing the district's taxpayers more money in legal expenses to defend it. Six months later, his attorney files a motion to dismiss, saying it wasn't the appropriate court for this action (which has not been verified to be true, btw, by the court or anyone else) and his lawyer states that they (Sisney and Richardson) can accomplish everything they wanted to do with the first lawsuit filed. How can that be true? A wrongful termination suit is quite different from a defamation lawsuit. What exactly is Sisney trying to accomplish?

The Broken Arrow school district's attorney is objecting to motion to dismiss the lawsuit. The district wants to move forward with it; it appears the district is prepared to meet and defend itself against Sisney's charges but he is unwilling to have evidence presented at court. The BAPS district's counsel will file an explanation of the reasons it objects to the dismissal of the case tomorrow, October 26.



Nothing yet has substantiated any of Sisney's claims but some have already been disproven. OSBI and State Auditor investigations have not finished.

Maryanne Flippo, a district board member for 10 years, came forward in February 2009, and specifically reported that Sisney threatened her and the board with a PR nightmare related to Air Assurance payments IF the board would not comply with a request related to his employment (she could not specify because of employee confidentiality).

The board, district staff, and Mike Rampey of Air Assurance have repeated stated there was no fraud or conspiracy, yet there are many within our community who refuse to believe them and insist that Sisney's version is the truth, without any evidence to back up his claims.

612 has done an excellent job of refuting many of Sisney's claims in her list of '36 Questions that suggest Sisney wasn't railroaded' on brokenarrowforum dot net. You really should take the time to read it, if you haven't already.

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

**Jolie2**, (10/25/2009 4:28:12 PM)

to BAissue

And by the way, there is a difference between acting like you're smarter than other people and actually being smarter than other people. 612's posts can't help showing that she is intelligent, because she is intelligent and writes well-thought out posts, backed up with sources, instead of general, vague statements and gut feelings. If that makes someone feel she is trying to make herself out to be smarter than other people, that's their problem, not hers. Why should she act and write stupidly to fit in with the rest of the 'majority' of people who have been speaking out against the board on this issue?