

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/25/2009 8:30:40 PM)

I don't believe I have ever stated as fact that the board was right. I have said all along that we don't know, and shouldn't publicly disparage people – volunteers no less! - who may be innocent.

Your statement, "I think it funny that a little school board wants to try and play big politics" falls far short of being willing to admit that a real conclusion can't be met, as do your statements, "There's only 2 people on that board actually representing the people" and "Obviously you worship Flippo but what you've failed to notice is how human and corrupted she and others can be."

Where have you read a post written by me that makes such unconditionally defamatory statements? I don't believe your attempt to make me out to be a hypocrite is tenable. And again, I don't see the need for such hostility. It's just a barrier to constructive discussion.

I have received my share of criticism for my comments. But when comments directed at me show that their author so readily leaped to incorrect conclusions about me and misread my motives, I find it easy to believe they might, with the same antagonistic mindset, leap to incorrect conclusions about the board members, and misread their motives. The vengeful tone of these commenters suggests that they haven't looked at this with an open mind; but rather with a preconceived notion of who was in the right, enhanced by a healthy dose of schadenfreude.

Through research and reasoning, I have resolved the contradictions in this controversy to my satisfaction.

From reasoning through the information that has been reported, my assessment is that the Sisney-was-railroaded story is riddled with contradictions. We know how to resolve them. Whenever you think that you are facing a contradiction, check your premises. You will find that one of them is wrong.

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

Jolie2, (10/26/2009 10:18:27 AM)

612, I hope you don't mind, but I copied and pasted the first two of the 36 questions from your forum to include in my post in response to Interested Citizen on the Ledger article about Sisney filing to dismiss the federal case--giving you credit and the source for it, of course. If the Ledger prints this post, we could try to post a couple more at a time. However, that article will be archived soon.

QUOTE

to Interested Citizen

Read '36 Questions which Suggest that Sisney was not Railroaded' that 612 put together. I'm sure you know by now where that list can be found. Here are the first two items. (Note, when she uses the term "corrupt board" it is in the context of Sisney's allegations of conspiracy, not that it is true)

QUOTE

1) How did the corrupt board get secret blanket PO's and contracts past the other 2 board members, the superintendent, and the CFO, when year after year, they were all there when the board voted to approve them? Over the span of several different school boards, including Max Smith, Dee Masters, and Keven Rondot?

2) How did the corrupt board direct questionable invoices to be paid without the CFO's knowledge and approval?

END QUOTE

I believe time will prove you very wrong. Events are already heading in that direction. Keep watching.

END QUOTE

I also just went ahead and posted questions 3 and 4 in two more posts on the same article.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/26/2009 12:08:25 PM)

Did you see Interested Citizen's reasoning for declaring that Sisney was railroaded? Comments, and a split vote. Dismiss the jury, we've got a verdict!

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/26/2009 12:45:00 PM)

Posted on Ledger, in response to "acutally"'s broken English assertion that I'm Ms. Flippo.

"acutally" -

How are readers supposed to take you seriously when you think it's a good idea to announce online as fact something you can't possibly know? How many other things have you posted as fact, that you really don't know and can't verify?

Go ahead, make yourself look even more ridiculous and tell our readers how you are so sure that I'm Ms. Flippo that you'll post it online as fact. Either that, or tell our readers that anything you post as fact is suspect, because you really don't have any way of verifying it.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/26/2009 1:20:17 PM)

Jolie, I might have just learned something from "acutally".

Maybe these people really do just post as fact whatever they think, regardless of whether it's actually true or can be verified. And if that's what they do, maybe they think that's what WE do! That could explain their perplexing refusal to accept real information, like when several of them said I was lying when I posted the news about Sisney's filing to dismiss.

Maybe they think it's just us making stuff up! We know they're not inclined (for whatever reason) to check into anything for themselves, so they take the "authority" - the newspaper - at its word, and take our information as just an opinion, not as facts from publicly available sources.

Wow.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/26/2009 3:14:48 PM)

Bo Rainey of RFR has filed the defendants' objection to dismissing the federal case. The document is available on brokenarrowforum dot net.

RFR is asking the court to either dismiss with prejudice (meaning the case can't be refiled), or allow it to be dismissed without prejudice on the condition that the plaintiff be required to pay costs and attorney fees incurred by the district in defending against this lawsuit.

Since the district's motion to dismiss is still pending, RFR says that Sisney's filing looks like an attempt to circumvent the court ruling on the Defendant's motion to dismiss, because it might come with a price tag for Sisney.

QUOTE

Motivated by nothing more than the apparent realization that such federal claims are – and always have been – without merit, the Plaintiff now seeks an order from this Court dismissing this case pursuant to Rule 41(a)(2). Because the Plaintiff's action in instituting this meritless litigation was in bad faith, vexatious, and for the purpose of oppressing the District, the Court should sanction the Plaintiff for engaging in such conduct by requiring him to pay the District's costs and attorney's fees.

UNQUOTE

"Vexatious". I'm going to use that word whenever possible.

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

Jolie2, (10/26/2009 6:52:02 PM)

The Ledger has a new article dated 10/25/09 titled "Filing for school board post in December: Zone 5 position held by Stephanie Updike"

I submitted the following comment:

QUOTE

I am relieved that Ms. Updike's term on the board is coming to an end, as I do not believe she is fit for office, as shown by her actions and statements in the past year, and by her own personal financial situation.

I hope that someone with integrity and honesty will be applying as a candidate to serve zone 5.

END QUOTE

I thought if I specifically mentioned her \$4 million personal bankruptcy, the comment would not be published.

Part of my relief is that I won't feel the need to push for her resignation, once the Sisney matter is resolved and the investigation results are published, if everything proves the innocence of the three board members who voted to terminate Sisney's employment and that there was no conspiracy and fraud.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/26/2009 10:05:39 PM)

Has Ms. Updike said whether she will be running again? The article doesn't say, so maybe she has not announced a decision yet.

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

Jolie2, (10/27/2009 8:27:45 AM)

Submitted this comment on the Ledger's article about Sisney motioning to drop the lawsuit:

QUOTE

Why wouldn't Sisney agree to sign a legal waiver so that the Board could release full details for the reasons of his termination? Maryanne Flippo announced in a press conference in February 2009 that they could do so, with his approval and encouraged the media and the public to put pressure on him to do so.

Until we see the full reasons for his suspension and termination, which are still confidential, everything else is speculation.

I do believe Maryanne Flippo was telling the truth when she said that Sisney threatened her and the board with a PR nightmare if he didn't receive what he wanted with relation to his employment. Extortion would be reason enough to terminate someone's employment.

The 36 questions IS relevant because it demonstrates the unlikelihood of Sisney's allegations being true. Do you think that if Sisney has created this mess within our district based on misleading statements and false information, he was fit to remain its superintendent?

Read Bo Rainey's response to Sisney's motion to dismiss the wrongful termination lawsuit.

Apparently, Sisney and Richardson did very little work on that lawsuit. All work and preparations were done by the district.

It is beginning to look as if our suspicions that Sisney was playing a PR game with the media and public was true.

Keep watching.

to "Hey, 612" Enough already. Do you have someone in the ESC with caller ID ready for 612 to call? Otherwise, why keep harping on this point?

END QUOTE

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

Jolie2, (10/27/2009 8:32:22 AM)

to 612

I didn't even think of the fact that Updike could run again. Considering that her large-scale bankruptcy is now public knowledge, she would be foolish to do so.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/27/2009 8:50:34 AM)

Posted on Ledger. Probably won't be published.

"Hey 612", like I said, my comments don't always get through. But we can discuss this freely, without censorship and delays, on the Tulsa World article Jolie and I have mentioned multiple times. How about it? Of course, you'd have to get your own screen name instead of using mine.

Unless of course you'd just like to continue the childish playground taunting from the safety of the Ledger. How about

it? Unless you are willing to move to a forum without censorship, I'm done with you.

I am wondering why you are so keen on getting 612 to make a phone call. Waiting to check the caller ID?

Is this type of reasoning indicative of how you have come to your conclusions about this controversy? Are your assumptions about events as inaccurate as your assumptions about me?

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/27/2009 8:51:07 AM)
posted on Ledger:

I have to wonder why so much hostility is directed at people who simply say we don't know enough to start throwing stones.

I have posted many comments showing reasonable doubt regarding Sisney's accusations. You would think people would be glad to have reason to believe that their school board may not be not corrupt after all; but instead, some seem to take gleeful pleasure in joining in the accusations and name-calling. None of you posting here know for sure what happened. Some imply that anyone who doesn't see the obvious corruption is stupid. But it's not a matter of being smart enough to figure out happened – you simply don't have the information the board has. No amount of intelligence will fill in the blanks, and enable you to interpret the events correctly and reliably, so that you can be sure enough of your conclusion to take it upon yourself to punish people.

When Jolie, 612, and others try to point out the injustice of attacking people – real people, not anonymous commenters - based only on assumptions and unproven accusations, we're attacked, vilified, insulted, lied about. I don't know how you justify it to yourselves, but to me it says a lot about the type of people who have taken Sisney's side, and are willing to publicly disparage volunteers online, with nothing to go on but hearsay and their own feelings of vengefulness and schadenfreude.

What does that say about our community?

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/27/2009 8:54:19 AM)
Posted on Ledger. Maybe one of them will make it.

I wonder if anybody on the Sisney side has ever had their comments censored.

"Hey 612", my comment posted this morning probably won't be published. You should know by now where to find it though, along with all the other comments the Ledger wouldn't publish.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/27/2009 9:49:33 AM)
Well, our comments were published just in time for the article to fall off the Most Commented tab.

I'm going to miss "hey 612". ** sniff **

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/27/2009 10:19:19 AM)
Posted on Ledger (a new candidate for question 37)

"To Jolie",

You take it as fact that Shari Wilkins created a benefits package for AA? Sisney didn't even come out and claim that as fact! He said in his defamation lawsuit, "On May 6, 2008, Dr. Sisney was informed that Board Member Shari Wilkins had business relations outside the BASD with the Rampeys and Air Assurance, by way of a personal business for which she was creating a new benefits package for Air Assurance".

Sisney won't even commit to it as fact in his lawsuit, probably because he knows it isn't true. But he raises suspicion (among gullible people) by bringing up a rumor! And you believe him.

Do you see how you have been led? If this is typical of his accusations, do you see how he has used you?

Mike Rampey says in his Answer to Sisney's defamation lawsuit that neither he nor Air Assurance had any business

relations with Shari Wilkins outside the BASD. Which is stronger – remember these are statements made in court documents – Sisney's claim that he heard a rumor, or Rampey's flat denial of a rumor? I believe both statements are probably true – Sisney probably did hear a rumor. It was dishonest of him to include it in his accusations as a rumor. It would have been easy for him to find out if it was true, and then he could have included it as a fact or left it out if it was not.

The important thing to notice is that he SUGGESTED it, and you BELIEVED it, with nothing to go on but Sisney saying he heard a rumor.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/27/2009 10:21:20 AM)

I think it must take a lifetime of practice to get that sneaky - putting ideas in people's minds by making a claim but cloaking it in a vague "I was informed..." format.

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

Jolie2, (10/27/2009 10:23:48 AM)

submitted this post to the Ledger this morning, in response to "Interested Citizen" and his accusations of corruption between us and the Ledger.

QUOTE

The article was up on the Ledger yesterday. In case you haven't noticed, the Ledger frequently changes/updates the date on its articles--and has been doing that for a long time.

I have no connection to anyone at the Ledger or to anyone involved in this controversy, whatsoever.

What is corrupt about putting up information from factual sources, such as court records, btw, and expressing an opinion based on them? What is corrupt about stating it is unfair to condemn people based solely on one man's unproven allegations? What is corrupt about wanting ALL information available on the subject to be discussed and not just what fits one side's version of events?

END QUOTE

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

Jolie2, (10/27/2009 10:35:49 AM)

If "Hey 612" is persistent, he or she can do a search and the former superintendent... article is still available to read on the Ledger. However, considering how unwilling some people seem to be with regard to research for information online, it is quite possible that person will never bother.

The Ledger is publishing the great majority of our posts. I'm so glad Bob Lewis is off of the staff. I think it has made a difference in what gets through and published on the comments.

I added this post, just for the heck of it:

QUOTE

I had to look up the word "schadenfreude" so I thought I'd share the definition with anyone else who didn't know it, either: it's satisfaction or pleasure felt at someone else's misfortune.

That is a very appropriate description of the attitude I think of some of BA's citizens display who have spoken up with vitriol against the board majority who voted to terminate Sisney's employment.

END QUOTE

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/27/2009 10:39:13 AM)

Since the other article fell off, and I think the "To Jolie" person might have been Interested Citizen, I posted pretty much the same thing on the "Filing for School Board Post" article, where Interested Citizen has already posted his most recent conspiracy theory.

I don't know if it was Interested Citizen or someone else who stated as fact that Shari Wilkins had created an insurance package for AA, but here is some more info on that.

People have taken this claim as fact, but even Sisney didn't claim it as fact.

His defamation lawsuit reads, "On May 6, 2008, Dr. Sisney was informed that Board Member Shari Wilkins had business relations outside the BASD with the Rampeys and Air Assurance, by way of a personal business for which she was creating a new benefits package for Air Assurance".

Sisney won't even commit to it as fact in his lawsuit, probably because he knows it isn't true. But he raises suspicion (among gullible people) by bringing up a rumor! If you are one of the people who took this as fact, do you see how you have been led? If this is typical of his accusations, do you see how he has used you?

Mike Rampey says in his Answer to Sisney's defamation lawsuit that neither he nor Air Assurance had any business relations with Shari Wilkins outside the BASD. Both statements could be true – Sisney probably did hear a rumor, and Wilkins probably did not do outside business with Air Assurance. It was dishonest of Sisney to include it in his accusations as a rumor.

The important thing to notice is that he SUGGESTED it, and people BELIEVED it, with nothing to go on but Sisney saying he heard a rumor.

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

Jolie2, (10/27/2009 10:44:22 AM)

I just submitted this comment to the Ledger on the Updike seat board election article:

QUOTE

to Interested Citizen,

btw, just after I posted here yesterday evening, I posted the exact same post on the Tulsa World article dated 02/26 and titled "BA School Board rejects probe" which has an ongoing conversation about this controversy:

QUOTE

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

Jolie2, (10/26/2009 6:52:02 PM)

The Ledger has a new article dated 10/25/09 titled "Filing for school board post in December: Zone 5 position held by Stephanie Updike"

I submitted the following comment:

QUOTE

I am relieved that Ms. Updike's term on the board is coming to an end, as I do not believe she is fit for office, as shown by her actions and statements in the past year, and by her own personal financial situation.

I hope that someone with integrity and honesty will be applying as a candidate to serve zone 5.

END QUOTE

You can verify that information easily by going to that article yourself and seeing the date and time stamp.

We have kept track of most of our Ledger comment submissions there because of the delay in publishing them and the fact that some never are published.

END QUOTE

The Ledger might actually publish this, even though it mentions this TW article specifically, because it proves our point that there is no collusion with the Ledger.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/27/2009 10:44:51 AM)

Posted on Ledger article, about the article's updated published date:

Editor, thank you for the explanation of the time differences on Interested Citizen's post.

Depending on how the software behind the website works, any update in the article, or even changing its category, etc. could trigger a change in the datetimestamp. I wouldn't want to make any assumptions about anything untoward going on when it could be as simple as the software updating a last-update timestamp in the database.

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

Jolie2, (10/27/2009 10:45:50 AM)

Let me clarify that last sentence...

no collusion between you and me and the Ledger. :)

That doesn't rule out possible previous collusion between the Ledger and Sisney.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/27/2009 11:06:25 AM)

I also posted on the Updike seat article the "schadenfreude" comment (posted here at 10/27/2009 8:51:07 AM) since probably no one will see it on the other article. And I think they need to.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/27/2009 11:19:21 AM)

Collusion between us and the Ledger - ha ha ha ha! The secret deal is, we submit comments, see, and they don't publish them.

Do they not realize how their preposterous statements make them look?

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/27/2009 11:43:39 AM)

Maybe the reason for the updated time is this new (I think) statement in the article. I looked specifically for an indication of whether Updike was going to run again and didn't see it yesterday.

QUOTE

She told the Ledger she has not decided whether she will seek another term.

UNQUOTE

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

Jolie2, (10/27/2009 12:09:22 PM)

612, thank you for pointed out the additional statement in the article. I have submitted another comment on the article because of it:

QUOTE

Stephanie Updike has been accused by a fellow board member during an official board meeting of twice revealing confidential information from executive sessions. She has repeatedly made divisive statements to the press that are often inaccurate and untrue, that point out her opposition to her fellow board members and try to make it look like she's one of the "good guys" on the board. Many people have bought into her posturing and defense of Sisney. If it turns out that Sisney's allegations are untrue and that there was justifiable reason(s) for suspending and terminating his employment, quite the opposite will true of her, won't it? We may discover out that she didn't have the courage to stand up with the other three board members to do the right thing, even though it was difficult and has brought hardship to them. The 3-2 divided vote may then have a completely different meaning to those who have supported Sisney and applauded Updike for her supposed integrity and working in the best interests of Broken Arrow.

I believe Ms. Updike had her own personal agenda during this controversy, and it wasn't with the best interests of our children or our community at heart.

If Ms. Updike decides to run again, I will be in the forefront of repeatedly bringing up the negative facts related to her incumbency and her personal financial situation to ensure all Broken Arrow residents in zone 5 are aware of her record.

END QUOTE

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

Jolie2, (10/27/2009 12:15:37 PM)

I'm thinking Interested Citizen made his remarks accusing us and the Ledger of conspiracy is to discredit us but also to encourage the Ledger to post less of the comments we submit--to shut us up on the Ledger.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/27/2009 12:24:16 PM)

Shut up Jolie and 612? Good luck with that!

I thought he was just being stupid and paranoid, but...yeah, I can see that too.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/27/2009 12:29:46 PM)

Whoa, that article disappeared off the front page fast. Too much truth?

Posted on the Ledger's no-longer-front-page article about Updike's board seat:

On August 4, 2008, Stephani Updike leaked confidential information from executive session, according to a statement read by Shari Wilkins on 6/29/2009.

On August 8, 2008, the Ledger published an editorial about the board's pending decision on whether to extend Sisney's contract for the 2011-2012 school year, stating, "...it must be noted there are five members of the school board and the Ledger is told the votes behind this delay are far from unanimous."

The Ledger was told...by whom?

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

Jolie2, (10/27/2009 1:12:18 PM)

I'll be shocked if the Ledger publishes that last comment.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/27/2009 1:43:11 PM)

It's a good one though, isn't it? No one can rightfully argue that anyone who knew how the vote was going had any business blabbing to anyone, including the newspaper.

They'll argue anyway though; when you bring up indiscretions by Sisney-side people, they excuse it with generalities like "freedom of speech", even though everybody knows the confidentiality requirements override their freedom to blab about it. Good heavens, if freedom of speech overrode confidentiality laws, nobody's medical or financial records would be safe. What a ridiculous argument.

The Ledger has already dropped the article into the back pages. Even if they do publish our comments, they won't be seen by many.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/27/2009 1:47:26 PM)

If the Ledger continues to drop its articles relating to this from the front page this quickly, it might be a good thing. The fewer board-bashing comments, the less we have to try to offset them.

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

Jolie2, (10/27/2009 2:22:34 PM)

The Ledger hasn't published any of our (or anyone else's) comments submitted today on the Updike article. I don't know if its because they are legitimately busy or they just don't want to publish them.

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

C. Tharp, (10/27/2009 2:24:30 PM)

Question?

Per the emails from the lawsuit(from your webpage 612). Bo Rainey is stating "our" objection. anybody figure out when the board has been notified as a "board" and made any decisions by a "board" on this lawsuit. another board meeting has gone and went with nothing ever being presented to the "board" over this lawsuit.

The "board" has yet to be presented with any information about this suit. So who made the lawsuit decisions for the district? Rainey just does what he wants and reports at the end of it. Does the board have any input?

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/27/2009 2:48:37 PM)

Chris, have you asked your board representative? I really don't know how this works.

I am frequently surprised by how complex things can be, and how little I know about how things work. I guess that's why I'm a little more reluctant to jump to conclusions than some. Once you get used to being clueless, you start allowing that there may be additional possibilities that you don't know about and can't foresee.

Possibility 1 - by hiring RFR and setting out their duties, the board has given RFR some level of authority, which

might include taking certain actions in court.

Possibility 2 - the defense is being paid for by insurance, and the insurance company, as the party who will be responsible for paying any damages, is directing the action in the case.

Possibility 3 - The board has previously set forth its wishes for various contingencies in this case, legally in the appropriate forum.

Possibility 4 - The board as a whole or individual members have secretly and illegally been discussing the case with and directing Bo Rainey.

Possibility 5 - The board members as individuals have legally been discussing the case with and directing Bo Rainey.

Possibility 6 - Bo Rainey/RFR staff are illegally making all the decisions without any input from the board.

I'm sure there are more possibilities, because there are a lot of legal things I know nothing about.

Board members are authorized as board members to perform duties individually. They can be notified of things individually; they can provide input on things individually. I don't know if any of the actions RFR has taken so far have required a vote, or if RFR is acting as authorized as the board's counsel. Your representative should know, though he/she may not be able to respond because this relates to pending litigation.

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

1adam12, (10/27/2009 4:52:34 PM)

to c tharp, why do you always assume the negative when it comes to the board. I hope that you will run for mrs updikes position so that you can get in there and find out what you so much want to know. everything I have seen in your posts tends to position yourself with sisney and show the possibility that you are working for sisney. in my opinion that is what he does, gets gullible people to believe that good people like this board are corrupt and get someone like you to continue to try to show a negative light in our community our school board and good citizens in this community and anyone else that you can throw under the bus. It is time for you to take a positive step for the good of the city you live in and look at the people you continue to show in a negative light and see they are really good people. Look at their hearts. People that give of their time and take this kind of abuse from you. why would anyone want to do that unless they really had a love for the children. Come on tharp, get involved in a positive way. You probably don't realize this but some of the very people that you condemn have helped you. Someday you will understand.

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

C. Tharp, (10/27/2009 5:47:53 PM)

It's just a procedure question and I disagree that it should be read as being negative. 612 posted the "negative" implication behind it, not me.

and no, I am not going to ask my boardmember about this topic, since all of it should be exec session stuff. What abuse from that question??

and yes, I am working to be "more positive" and would like to think I am actively working to do that. to those that have helped me, I say thanks.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/27/2009 6:27:38 PM)

Chris, this statement kinda did strike me as a bit negative: "Rainey just does what he wants and reports at the end of it." It comes across accusatory - don't know if you meant it that way.

I did post some negative possibilities, because I can't rule them out, and until I can, all should be considered, negative and positive. But I put more positive ones than negative. Just call me Sunshine!

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

C. Tharp, (10/28/2009 8:20:34 AM)

Ok, I can see that. I meant to put "does Rainey" as a question, not as a statement.

Must think more positive.

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

Jolie2, (10/28/2009 8:26:17 AM)

Wow. The Ledger did publish all but one of our comments on the Updike article, including your last one that specified the possible breach of confidentiality. (They didn't publish the one that mentions the TW article.)

Excellent.

I don't think they would have gotten published if Lewis was still at the helm of the Ledger.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/28/2009 9:43:20 AM)

Wow. The article was taken off the front page yesterday, but now with 11 comments it's on the Most Commented tab, so maybe somebody will see them.

I think you have explained your opposition to Ms. Updike's continued membership on the board sufficiently to answer Interested Citizen's claim that you just don't like her because she supported Sisney.

I am very pleased that they published the one about the Ledger editorial. Wilkins' claim that Updike leaked information is not proof that it was Updike that told the Ledger how the votes were going in executive session. But people need to understand that NOBODY should have been telling the Ledger that information. When you put together the two pieces of information, it shows a fairly good likelihood that it was indeed Updike.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/28/2009 10:38:24 AM)

New Questions coming...the first two are things I've already posted, but the next two are new.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/28/2009 10:38:55 AM)

Question 37

People have taken the claim that Wilkins had created a benefits package for AA claim as fact. Even Sisney didn't claim it as fact.

His defamation lawsuit reads, "On May 6, 2008, Dr. Sisney was informed that Board Member Shari Wilkins had business relations outside the BASD with the Rampeys and Air Assurance, by way of a personal business for which she was creating a new benefits package for Air Assurance".

Sisney won't even commit to it as fact in his lawsuit, probably because he knows it isn't true. But he raises suspicion by bringing up a rumor.

Mike Rampey says in his Answer to Sisney's defamation lawsuit that neither he nor Air Assurance had any business relations with Shari Wilkins outside the BASD. Both statements could be true: Sisney could have heard a rumor, and Wilkins may not have done outside business with Air Assurance. So why did Sisney include this rumor in his lawsuit? Was it to suggest an inappropriate relationship, to get the claim reported by the media and put into people's minds as fact, without going so far as to make a claim that he knew wasn't true?

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/28/2009 10:39:57 AM)

Question 38

On August 4, 2008, Stephanie Updike leaked confidential information from executive session, according to a statement read by Shari Wilkins on 6/29/2009.

On August 8, 2008, the Ledger published an editorial about the board's pending decision on whether to extend Sisney's contract for the 2011-2012 school year, stating, "...it must be noted there are five members of the school board and the Ledger is told the votes behind this delay are far from unanimous."

The Ledger was told...by whom?

Anybody who knew how the vote was going was not allowed to talk about it, because it involves a personnel issue AND a discussion in executive session. Some people may have reservations about believing Ms. Wilkins' statement, but - SOMEBODY leaked confidential information.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/28/2009 10:40:53 AM)

Question 39

Why did Stover send a letter from the Board to Mike Rampey without the other board members seeing or approving it? When Shari Wilkins told him at the 8/4/2008 board meeting that the board members wanted to see the draft letter when he received it from The Center for Education Law, why did he not tell her he had already received it, prepared the final draft, and in fact had it with him at the meeting, ready to give it to Mike Rampey if he was there?

Stover states that he did not give the letter to Rampey or share it with the board members because they all disappeared after the meeting while he was in the bathroom. So why did he go ahead and send it the next day, still without informing the board members that he had even received the draft from The Center, and without providing

them copies – even though the letter was from the whole board? Only when Wilkins asked him two days later about the delay in getting the draft from the Center did Stover admit that he had already sent it.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/28/2009 10:49:03 AM)

Question 40

What did Sisney want the board to do when he “discovered” the conspiracy between them and Air Assurance? According to Maryanne Flippo’s statement at her press conference and Shari Wilkins’ emails, the board was aware that Sisney was researching and correcting some internal processes, and that he believed the issues he had found presented a substantial legal and financial risk to the district. Neither Flippo nor Wilkins deny Sisney’s diligent efforts or the possibility of incorrect procedures that could put the district at financial and legal risk.

Sisney claims that the board “worked feverishly and against all reason to keep the matter from seeing the light of day”. What did they do to stand in his way? What did they refuse to do that prevented him from getting the issues resolved? He has not provided any details whatsoever as to any actions they took to cover up their crimes or block his investigation, and in fact Ms. Wilkins’ email shows that the board was allowing Sisney to research freely, and appears to support his efforts.

Stover confirmed in his statement on 8/18/2008 that he (Stover) was the one who created the agenda and had the power to decide what was on it. This shows that the 3 board members did not block any discussion of the issues from being put on the agenda. The issues were never brought up in a board meeting, so either Sisney never asked for the board to discuss them, or Sisney tried to put discussions on the agenda but Stover blocked him.

Nothing relating to Sisney’s concerns was ever discussed at a board meeting. There were recommendations made by Sisney for the board to vote on. If he had recommended action, it would have had to have been brought up in a board meeting. Unless Stover was throwing out Sisney’s agenda items, Sisney had full control to inform the public, bring up issues for discussion, and make recommendations for the board to vote on.

Why did Sisney not even attempting to address his concerns about the district’s potentially illegal practices with the board?

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/28/2009 10:51:15 AM)

Question 41

Why did Sisney suggest on 6/16/2008 sending a letter to Mike Rampey to ease the contention between AA and the district, and then never do it? Sisney suggested in a meeting with Wilkins and Updike that it would be a good idea for him to send the letter to Rampey to assure him that Sisney did not mean to accuse him of wrongdoing, but had found areas in the district that needed improvement to make sure the district is following the law.

Flippo said in her press conference that in July Sisney told her that if she didn’t get the board to give Sisney what he wanted in his employment contract, he would “go public with the AA story” and create a PR nightmare for the district and for her personally.

So why did Sisney never send the letter? Was he waiting to see if Flippo got him what he wanted in his contract? Holding back on releasing the accusations against AA in case he needed to “go public”?

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/28/2009 11:30:21 AM)

Posted on Ledger article about Updike’s board seat:

There have been many accusations made against the 3 board members who voted to fire Sisney, and some have even suggested that the split vote is proof that they “railroaded” him. Let’s also look at the behavior of the 2 who voted against, and try to make sense of the 3-2 vote.

In addition to the questionable things Updike has done and said, Stover has circumvented board policy as well.

In August 2008, Stover sent a letter from the whole Board to Mike Rampey without the other board members seeing or approving it. When Shari Wilkins told him at the 8/4/2008 board meeting that the board members wanted to see the draft letter when he received it from The Center for Education Law, he did not tell her he had already received it, prepared the final draft, and in fact had it with him at the meeting, ready to give it to Mike Rampey if he was there.

Stover states that he did not give the letter to Rampey or share it with the board members because they all

disappeared after the meeting while he was in the bathroom. Then he went ahead and sent it the next day, still without informing the board members that he had even received the draft, and without providing them copies – even though the letter was from the whole board. Only when Wilkins asked him two days later about the delay in getting the draft did he admit that he had already sent it.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/28/2009 12:07:57 PM)

Posted on the same Ledger article, since I ran out of space on the first one:

This is a followup to my post about Stover and the letter to Rampey, where I used up all my space. If that one isn't published, this one won't make much sense (well, ok, no promises either way).

The point I'm trying to illustrate regarding that particular incident is not so much that Stover violated board rules. It's about WHY he did what he did – especially his failure to tell Wilkins he had already received the letter from the Center for Education law, and in fact had it with him, when she asked him specifically at the board meeting when they were going to get the draft from the Center. That was totally deceitful.

Why was he being secretive about it? What was behind his decisions not to inform the board members when he received it, not to let them review it before he sent it, not to tell them when he had sent it, and not to provide them with their copies? Add to that his implicit denial of receiving the letter when Wilkins asked about it specifically, and this is a picture of some very strange behavior. Why so secretive?

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/28/2009 12:12:52 PM)

Typo in Question 40.

"There were recommendations made by Sisney for the board to vote on."

Should be:

"There were never any recommendations made by Sisney for the board to vote on."

Changes the meaning just a bit...

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

1adam12, (10/28/2009 1:47:09 PM)

On question 39 it appears that stover was only doing what dr. sisney was telling him to do. The letter from stover was on sisneys letterhead. sisney had enough legal knowledge to convince updike and stover that they could be in trouble if he created the pr nightmare. flippo, wilkins and whepply refused to be bullied. They stood up even though they knew it would be hard. when an employee starts making threats and blackmail no matter what the consequences you have to get rid of the employee. The problem with stover is that he should never have been the president with his inexperience at being a board member. it was obvious that he was not qualified when he allowed meetings to get out of hand and allowed people to slander board members and others in public meetings even though their own policy prohibited that. Even mrs updike knew there were problems with sisney or she would not have offered sanctions or discipline instead of firing. In my opinion pride and manipulation have been at the root of all of this. pride by a superintendent, pride by two board members, even when they know they are wrong pride will not allow them to apologize,. pride by a superintendent that when he found out he was wrong he cannot ask for forgiveness and leave this community alone. pride by some citizens that cannot admit they have been bamboozled by a professional. there is much talk about bullies in our schools, in my opinion 3 board members got rid of the head one. for your own amusement google adult bully sometime and see if the shoe fits.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/28/2009 1:53:58 PM)

Posted on Ledger:

It is unfortunate that people's thinking can be swayed by general, unsubstantiated accusations.

That is Sisney's tactic, and that is Interested Citizen's tactic. An example is the suggestion that Wilkins created a benefits package for AA. Interested Citizen posted that as proof of Wilkins' wrong motive in firing Sisney. But not only did Mike Rampey state in his court document that Wilkins had no dealings with AA or him besides the school district, but Sisney didn't even make that claim. He only said that he was informed of it. He has not ever asserted that it is true, in his lawsuit or at any other time.

Even though this "fact" is most likely completely made up, it made its way into media reports, comments, and

conversations. People's opinions are influenced by it. This has been Sisney's tactic, and there are many examples in this controversy of his use of it. Some commenters are perpetuating the myths by repeating them as if they have been shown to have merit. You have to wonder what their motives are.

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

C. Tharp, (10/28/2009 2:42:26 PM)

Let me understand. I ask one question about procedure and get accused of being negative and not moving on and such. and then come back and see all of the above and yet I get singled out for attacking individuals???

Whatever....

and to your question 38, they don't take votes in executive session, they have to be done in the public. I mean they were in Executive Session until around 12:02 am around that period(I was there). Any moron could probably reason it was not an "unanimous" decision on anything if they were in there that long. Duh? Wow, in exec session for 4 hours and Bob Lewis figures out for himself that they were not in an agreement. Come on, everyone at that meeting waiting on them to come out new there was a big disagreement going on. Maybe Lewis left the meeting early, which he probably did, have someone call him later to let him know when they got out,(which I have seen him do). and then whoever gave him the update, Bob then says "What took them so long?" other person says "Probably arguing over Jim's contract". then the "feel" of the meeting is relayed in paper. you are going to need more than what you have posted to sell me that exec session was violated on this one. I am here to tell you that was the exact "feel" of that meeting.

thinking positive! :)

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

C. Tharp, (10/28/2009 2:56:03 PM)

612, please quit answering all of your questions with more questions. It's driving me nuts. Most, if not all of your questions end with a question mark. Give your answer, not another question.

Please.

thinking positive

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/28/2009 3:59:56 PM)

Chris, the article specifically said "The Ledger is told...". That's where the objection comes from. Nobody who knew anything should have been telling.

Put that together with Ms. Wilkins' claim that Ms. Updike leaked information from executive session, and there is reason to consider thoughtfully the possibility that Shari Wilkins isn't necessarily lying, Stephanie Updike might really be informing people of things she shouldn't, and the Ledger might be less than objectively reporting on Bob Lewis' friend Jim Sisney.

If the Ledger says "The Ledger is told..." when it really means "Bob and a few other people figured probably...", we can rely on them even less than we thought, and should seriously rethink believing anything they have told us about this - most of which has heavily favored Sisney's side of the story.

So - either someone blabbed or the Ledger misrepresented the level of integrity on its information.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/28/2009 4:17:55 PM)

I'm sorry I'm driving you crazy, Chris. I suspect your irritation with me has more to do with the content of my posts than with their style.

The reason I ask the questions is that I want to draw a clear delineation between what is established as fact by information that's available to the public, and what I see as puzzling discrepancies between that information and the picture that Sisney has presented. I don't have the answers to the questions I ask. In some cases, I may have a theory (example - why did Stover keep the letter from the board? 'cause Sisney told him to) but I don't want to make it sound like that's the only possible explanation. Just because I can't think of (or don't want to think of) another possibility doesn't mean there isn't one. Like I said, I get surprised a lot.

Always with the antagonism! I don't like conflict, and I wish we could get along better.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/28/2009 4:40:28 PM)

Posted on Ledger article about Updike board seat:

This is kinda funny. The date on this article now (at the time I'm submitting this) says Tuesday, October 27, 2009 11:55 AM CDT.

Interested Citizen's post accuses Jolie and Giggles of insider, corrupt games with the Ledger based on the appearance that they somehow posted their comments before the article was published. That post is dated Oct 27, 2009 9:25 AM...before the article's published date.

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

1adam12, (10/28/2009 5:18:57 PM)

hey chris, on the attorneys bills have you or anyone else ever found out any information as to the item on 10/20/2008 that is regarding attempted embezzlement of funds by using forged checks?

by the way thanks for being positive. I really think you are probably a likable guy. thanks

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/29/2009 7:45:05 AM)

I should have known someone would try to mischaracterize my statement that Updike leaked information out of executive session ACCORDING TO A STATEMENT... - the "...according to a statement" wasn't enough for them. I wish they would use their brain power to consider reality instead of grasping at anything to try to avoid it.

Incorrect, Hmmmmm. I said, "...according to a statement read by Shari Wilkins on 6/29/2009."

What was stated as fact is that Wilkins made that statement! Standard reporting. How would I be able to say for sure if Updike was the one who leaked information?

"To Jolie and 612", I don't believe I claimed that voting was done in executive session. Maybe you inferred that from the Ledger's statement, "The Ledger is told the votes behind this delay are far from unanimous." What do you think is the likely explanation for this statement, since no votes were done outside of executive session either? Everybody knows that official votes have to be done in open session. So what was the Ledger talking about, and where would it get any indication of how the discussion was going (official votes or not), if not from someone in executive session?

I know it's hard for some people to accept things they don't want to see, but put together Ms. Wilkins' claim that Ms. Updike leaked information from executive session and the Ledger article's statement that someone told the Ledger how voting was going on the issue that was being discussed in that same executive session. There is reason to consider thoughtfully the possibility that Shari Wilkins isn't necessarily lying, and Stephanie Updike might really be informing people of things she shouldn't.

Nice try trying to catch 612 making unverifiable claims. Keep looking.

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

Jolie2, (10/29/2009 8:29:38 AM)

I'm starting to like Judy Collis (if she's the one who is acting as managing editor replacing Lewis). She is allowing the publishing of our comments that give actual facts that are damaging to Sisney's side of the story.

Your last comment is already posted.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/29/2009 8:52:08 AM)

Posted on Ledger. I know I'm probably beating a dead horse, but it's frustrating to see people refuse to consider information that threatens their point of view. I did it, and so can they.

"To 612 and Jolie", what does my alleged ignorance about executive session have to do with the possibility that Updike leaked information from executive session? This is personnel-related information, so it's not ok for anyone to talk about. How did you get "characterize the discussion rousing" from "The Ledger is told the votes behind this delay are far from unanimous."?

The Ledger's statement is very specific, and it indicates absolutely that someone told the Ledger how the votes were coming out. I notice that people defending Updike tend to interpret that statement loosely, to mean something else. If the Ledger meant "they're taking a long time and it seems like there is some disagreement", how could they accurately state "Ledger is told the votes behind this delay are far from unanimous."? Either someone leaked information (about actual illegal votes or figuratively – we don't know which) or the Ledger made it up. Which of these do you prefer? Neither is acceptable to me.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/29/2009 8:53:22 AM)

And this one.

Hmmmmm, if you would use your brainpower to consider possibilities outside your favored conclusion instead of to attempt to discredit my reasoning by mischaracterizing what I say, you might find that some of the nagging inconsistencies in your point of view can be resolved.

This is not about me. I have seriously considered the possibility that Updike is telling the truth and Wilkins and Flippo are lying. I think it's likely, judging from your attempt to criticize me instead of dealing with the reality of the events I brought up, that you have not considered thoughtfully the possibility that Wilkins and Flippo are telling the truth and Updike is lying.

I used to be where you are. But there were too many puzzling inconsistencies. This is not about 612, and information is not your enemy.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/29/2009 8:59:58 AM)

They didn't publish either of my posts about Stover's secretive behavior with the letter to Rampey. Drat.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/29/2009 9:23:37 AM)

And this one. If someone complains that they are sick of me, I would have to say they probably have good reason.

The people who are refusing to consider the possibility that Updike leaked information from executive session, with the evidence that confidential information regarding the topic discussed in that same executive session was printed in a newspaper article 4 days later – are these the same people who took Sisney's statement that "he was informed" that Wilkins was doing outside for the Air Assurance as undeniable proof that she had no other reason to vote to fire him except that she was associated with AA?

Are these the same people who insist that if a vote is not unanimous, the majority must be wrong?

I'm just sayin'...

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/29/2009 1:23:06 PM)

I am curious as to what was in the letter Stover said he sent to Rampey. (And if he even did send a letter – we don't know for sure from the emails). If 1adam12 is right, it would be what Sisney wanted said.

If the letter said what Sisney had suggested before (as agreed by Wilkins and Updike) – that Sisney did not mean to accuse AA of wrongdoing, and that he was working on cleaning up some significant problems within the district's procedures - that would probably negate Sisney's claims in his defamation and wrongful termination lawsuits. It seems unlikely that Sisney would want to let AA off the hook at this point in time. He had not filed any lawsuits yet, but at the time the letter was supposedly sent, had already threatened to "go public with the AA story", if Flippo's claim is true.

On the other hand, if the letter did not go so far as to recognize that AA had not done anything wrong, thus protecting Sisney's claims in his lawsuits from contradictions, Sisney would certainly not want the board members to see it or have a chance to modify it. Stover's behavior regarding the letter is perplexing, but this scenario would explain it.

I don't think the letter is in any of the court filings we have access to. It would probably be included in one of the many general "all correspondence..." items on the witness list.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/29/2009 4:32:15 PM)

"Hey 612" is back...yea

with the same lame defense somebody else (or maybe the same person) brought up.

"Hey 612", I wish you would get a name of your own. Mine's pretty dumb, and I don't know why you would want to be associated with it.

The article did not "characterize what happened as heated". The article stated specifically "The Ledger is told...". If

the reporter had meant to give a general description of the atmosphere, I think that's what he would have done. Either the reporting is misleading or somebody blabbed. Which do you prefer? Neither is acceptable to me.

Discussing the general atmosphere that prevailed in executive session may not be prohibited, but discussing personnel issues is. That is the one and only topic of the article in question, and the subject of the statement in question.

You have no idea what the board was facing when the 3 members "shirked their duties". Until you do, that description is unfair. I have given as honest a portrayal of events that I can; that is in fact my only purpose in commenting on this. Anyone who makes statements like yours clearly has not.

The Ledger has declined to publish my other comments. You know where to find them.

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

C. Tharp, (10/29/2009 10:02:11 PM)

Ok, been very busy today. first chance to come back and "glance" over the blogs. to 612, post too much and I wont read them.

Thank you Adam12 for realizing that I am being positive, and in that light, I will say "I guess it could have rained more today, so be happy it only rained an inch".

Here we go: 612, still not enough to sell me, sorry , but you are still stretching way far to say that a violation happened there.

to adam12: yea, I saw the check thing and no, I don't have any idea about that. But, the way things are going with budgets the check would probably bounced anyway

One more thing before I go: the way you guys are hammering on Stover he is going to be scared to go to the bathroom at any board meeting. 612, you are essentially saying he timed his restroom break so he could do something "not correct".

The way you are going the next time I see Stover heading for the head at a board meeting I am going to be hearing the music to "peoples court" in my head.

thinking positive :) !

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/29/2009 11:24:58 PM)

If a school board begins proceedings to fire its superintendent, it has to notify him of the upcoming vote to terminate, and give him an opportunity to request a due process hearing before the board.

Stephanie Updike said that if Sisney requests a due process hearing, the three board members who "came out against his employment" should recuse themselves from the hearing.

That's like presenting a case to a jury, and then dismissing as biased any jurors who concluded based on the evidence that the defendant is guilty.

Ms. Updike should know, as a school board member, that the school board is not just the first level of authority over employment of administrators, it's the ONLY authority.

Was her statement made out of ignorance? Did she really not know that there is no alternative to the due process hearing before the board – the whole board – biased or otherwise? Or was she intentionally trying to stir up outrage in the community, by providing us with the assumption that the 3 board members were up to no good?

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/29/2009 11:31:08 PM)

Chris, you should know me better than to think my objection is to Stover using the bathroom. That's just obtuse.

Losing patience. 612

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

C. Tharp, (10/30/2009 12:30:56 AM)

Obtuse? I can't tell you how pleased that makes me feel to think I have inspired someone to use that word. I love it!

sorry, but you lost me on your post before it though. Alot of those comments came out of left field and I have no idea what they mean. That kind of stuff is way too serious for those of us that choose to think positive! Let the lawyers

handle it!

Maybe by Monday I can figure them out, although I doubt it or care.

Have a good weekend kids!

Positive thinking :)

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

Jolie2, (10/30/2009 2:20:58 AM)

Chris Tharp

If you are having difficult understanding 612's posts, why are you criticizing her? She is very thorough, logical, and precise in her writing. If you don't get it, that's okay, you don't have to, but don't take it out on her because of your inability to grasp the information.

Your last posts seem flippant. If you don't care about the details, that's fine, but please don't tell someone else how much to write or what to write in order to suit your reading preferences. You aren't the only one reading these comments. Some of us actually understand what 612 is writing about and appreciate her research, analysis, and commentary.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/30/2009 12:00:11 PM)

I am hoping to get a chance to use the word "contumacious" soon. But I hope Chris isn't the inspiration... :)

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

Jolie2, (10/30/2009 5:53:32 PM)

submitted to the Ledger on the Updike article, just now:

QUOTE

to PBG

Do you think someone who has recently filed a personal business bankruptcy for \$4 million of debt is someone who should be making financial decisions for our school district? I don't.

No matter which side of the controversy a person has chosen, this fact alone should make them think twice about trusting the judgment and choices of that person.

PBG, why don't you lay off the accusations? There are plenty of people other than the three board members who voted to terminate Sisney's employment who dislike the actions he has taken against our district and members of our community during the past year.

Updike should be judged on HER behavior, for what SHE has done and not done. That is what I have been writing about.

Violating confidentiality rules is a big deal. Speaking publicly against other members of the board and their actions is a big deal, particularly if statements made are untrue and misleading.

I believe that Maryanne Flippo, Sharon Whelpley, and Shari Wilkins made their decisions about Sisney's employment based on what they thought was in the best interests of our teachers, administrators, and our district. I think they had the courage to do what they thought was the right thing to do, even knowing the criticism they would receive for it, because they couldn't reveal the specific reasons their decisions were based on, to protect employee confidentiality.

I have nothing to do with the BOE or the district, other than being a parent of a school-age child.

END QUOTE

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/30/2009 6:03:08 PM)

Posted on the Ledger.

Hee hee, good one, PBG.

All we have done is present the POSSIBILITY that maybe there is a reason to be anti-Sisney. Critics of the board members have gone way beyond presenting their opinion as a possibility.

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

612, Broken Arrow (10/30/2009 6:21:32 PM)

Oops, ended up adding some.

Hee hee, good one, PBG. So the only way someone can have an opinion different from your exalted opinion is if they are involved on the "wrong" side of this controversy? It's not possible to look at publicly available information and come to a different conclusion?

All we have done is present the POSSIBILITY that maybe there is a reason to be anti-Sisney. Critics of the board members have gone way beyond presenting their opinion as a possibility.

From what I have seen, Ms. Updike has engaged in some very questionable behavior in the past year. It's only fair to bring it up to people who need to make the decision on whether to vote for her, if she runs again.