

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

Jolie2, (11/1/2009 4:09:10 PM)

New article up at the TW "Former Employee Sues Sperry School District" dated 10/31/09. I filed a btw post on the thread this afternoon, in response to the first comment to the article asking Sisney to do to Sperry's board what he did for Broken Arrow:

QUOTE

Jolie2, (11/1/2009 4:04:25 PM)

to Can't wait for the truth

Be careful what you wish for.

So far, none of what Dr. Sisney has claimed about Broken Arrow school district or its board of directors or Air Assurance has been proven. Some of his claims have already been disproven, including one allegation that was explained away in the documentation attached to his defamation lawsuit filed Sept. 5, 2008.

He is now filing a motion to dismiss his wrongful termination lawsuit that he filed April 30, 2009, in federal court, three months after the district filed its motion to dismiss. The BA school district's attorney filed a response last week in opposition to Sisney's motion to dismiss, insisting on reimbursement for the district's legal expenses and costs related to preparing for the lawsuit. A settlement conference has been ordered by the judge.

Sisney portrayed himself as a persecuted whistleblower to the media and manipulated the public into believing his story. It worked too well, for a while. The end of this story may surprise a lot of people who believed the tales that Sisney was telling. The board and district have been unable to tell their side of the story fully because of employee confidentiality requirements and pending litigation filed by Sisney. Maryanne Flippo requested in February 2009, during a press conference, that Dr. Sisney sign a written release to allow the district to legally release information from his personnel files that would reveal the causes for his employment termination. He has not done so.

Ms. Flippo said that Jim Sisney threatened her and the board with a PR nightmare regarding Air Assurance, if they failed to give him something he had requested regarding his employment. If her assertions are true, Sisney is guilty of blackmail. You can read the full text of her press conference remarks through a link at BROKENARROWFORUM DOT NET.

If you think his actions were for the good of the district of BA, ask yourself why he didn't take his allegations and any proof he said he had directly to authorities when he discovered it. Instead he went to the courthouse for a personal defamation lawsuit and to the media to convince people he was being wronged. Is that the way a professional would take action on a matter of this magnitude? It took more than seven months before any 'evidence' was turned over to authorities by Sisney. Investigations by OSBI and the State Auditor and Investigator were begun at the end of 2008 and are still ongoing.

You can read official documents from both lawsuits on the website BROKENARROWFORUM DOT NET plus other information on the Sisney/BOE controversy.

I strongly suggest that anyone interested in this information first read "41 QUESTIONS THAT SUGGEST THAT SISNEY WAS NOT RAILROADED" linked at the very top of the home page of the website.

END QUOTE

I'm going to try to remember to do searches for articles related to Sisney/Sperry twice a day, to try to catch articles like this soon after they show up, so more people will have a chance to read a reference to BrokenArrowForum dot net.

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

Jolie2, (11/1/2009 9:11:08 PM)

Here's an interesting post from someone in Sperry that was posted just after mine (copied and pasted here on my last post)

QUOTE

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

car, sperry (11/1/2009 6:44:31 PM)

Tim Weaver (Former Sperry High School Principal) is still being paid his full salary for this school year by the current administration and school board even though he is not working at the school since the end of last year. This is related to the previous lawsuit by former elementary principal Stephanie Holcomb that was settled for \$52,000. Dr. Sisney and Board President Darrell Morrell did not give either principal their requested due-process hearing. How much is Weaver going to be paid off after he files that same lawsuit that Holcomb filed. If you recall the same school board bought out former superintendent Dr. Rayma Harcher for \$62,500. Why is the district still wasting district funds paying for an individual who is not working? He is still represented on the website as an employee. Sperry Schools are suffering with lower student enrollment (transfers out of the district), lower test scores, bad morale and suffering with higher administrative costs. This is public record and can be requested through the Open Records Act. All this information is being suppressed by school board members. The school board is still involved with the day-to-day operations of running the school. It would be interesting to know how much more is being spent on administrative salaries compared to years past because of actions by Cindy Wilson, Morrow, Selvidge and Sisney.

END QUOTE

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/2/2009 10:30:24 AM)

I'm sure "Car" knows more than I do about what is going on in Sperry, but I have heard a lot of people complaining about contracts being bought out, and I don't think they understand that there are terms in the contracts that require a payoff if employment is terminated before the contract is up.

I don't know about these specific contracts, but I don't think it makes sense to assume that the school board agreed to pay these people money if they didn't have to. I don't think the people complaining know what the contracts stipulate either.

So if they don't know whether the person needed to be fired, because it's a personnel issue, and they don't know whether the board had to pay them off, because it's a personnel issue, why do they think they know for sure that the board did something wrong?

I do agree with "Car" that denying due-process hearings is a problem. That does have the potential to waste more money, in litigation and settlement costs.

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/2/2009 11:11:47 AM)

Posted on the Sperry article. Come on, Jolie, do like "Can't wait" says, and use your common sense.

"Can't wait", Sisney owes you and many others his gratitude for being so willing to advocate his version of events without questioning whether his claims can be verified or his accusations even make sense. You get the usual bonus for implying that anyone who doesn't see the obvious is stupid or not using their common sense. Some of us have taken a closer look, and we have our doubts.

Regardless of whether Sisney's allegations have merit, certainly our district employees, vendors, and school board deserve to have them proven before they are vilified and excoriated.

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

Jolie2, (11/2/2009 2:00:47 PM)

The good news is that the Ledger published most of our comments on the Updike story.

The bad news is that the same old, same old ignorant response/attacks are being made. It's getting old.

Hey, did you know that a bankruptcy is no indictment of a person's judgment? Now you do, courtesy of "Hey Jolie." While I agree that sometimes a bankruptcy is out of a person or company's control, many times it IS the result of bad decisions made by the person/company filing bankruptcy. If Updike runs again, I do think the public is entitled to ask questions about that bankruptcy and hear answers from her in explanation about it.

"Hey Jolie" has also instructed me to lay off the Updike/bankruptcy--stat." I guess this person is not so sure about what others might think of someone filing a high dollar amount bankruptcy and is afraid it might damage her chances at re-election, even if he or she thinks it makes no difference. Too bad for "Hey Jolie" that I don't take instructions from anonymous posters telling me to be quiet about topics I find important to discuss.

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/2/2009 2:27:09 PM)

I'm not sure I'd vote for Donald Trump or Walt Disney either.

There do seem to be a few people who would rather we not bring things up. Did you see how many people hollered

at me for saying Updike told the Ledger how the vote was going? Except – I didn't say that. I just stated the documented facts and asked "who told?" They connected the dots themselves, and then yelled at me for showing them the dots!

Why would they want the public to have less information rather than more?

The "stat" is curious – why the urgency to hush up something that supposedly doesn't matter?

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/3/2009 1:31:22 PM)

Got my new Hall of Shame quote for today, from the Ledger article on the Pride's success at OBA. I'm sorry, but it's wrong to use a positive article like this to take a dig at somebody on an unrelated issue.

Hope you're proud of yourself, BAissue. This is not the behavior you learned in the Pride.

BAissue wrote on Nov 3, 2009 12:25 PM:

" Once again the grandest band, with no help from the school board. Great feeling standing with "family", past alumni, and saying the creed that binds us select few together. "

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/3/2009 1:36:15 PM)

P.S. It would be equally offensive if someone had used the Pride article to insult Sisney. Leave it where it belongs!

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/3/2009 5:51:02 PM)

Posted on Ledger Updike story (in two parts)

In the days before the 10/06/2008 board meeting where Sisney was suspended, Stephanie Updike spoke out strongly against the agenda item to prohibit public comments at the special meeting.

"I can't believe the arrogance of shutting out comments from the very public we are suppose to be serving."

"I am appalled that a public body would put a gag order on the public. That's incredible to me. I know the public is pretty outraged by that."

It seems odd to me that Ms. Updike would not understand that allowing comments would have been irresponsible and unfair to Sisney, and in fact would have put the district at legal and financial risk. Did the people who expressed outrage not realize that there might have been comments AGAINST Sisney, and those would have to be allowed too? The Ledger article stated that about half the spectators on 10/6/2008 cheered Sisney; the other half cheered when the board voted to suspend. How would it have been fair to Sisney to allow any comments – positive or negative, reasonable or outrageous - to be made that might have influenced (or could be claimed to have influenced) the decision that was about to be voted on by the board? This would be a major boost to the plaintiff in a wrongful termination case, and rightly so. That is why the board could not legally or ethically allow comments.

It is now a board policy not to allow public comments at special board meetings or in regard to any employment-related issue. As far as I know, it was not at the time in Broken Arrow. However, it was and is a very common policy on boards across the country. The Broken Arrow BOE was following accepted convention, and protecting the district from risk of legal repercussions.

Knowing what they must have known as board members, Mr. Stover and Ms. Updike nevertheless chose to take a strong public stance on allowing public comments that was reckless and antagonistic – as if they intended to stir up the public on an issue that they knew could not be compromised.

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

C. Tharp, (11/4/2009 10:27:37 AM)

I still can't believe you are rehashing stuff from that long ago. But, since I was there I do not think your statement about half cheering the suspension is correct and since you are an anonymous blogger, we can't prove (and you won't) if you were there or not. I think it was the first four rows on the left side of the board that did some cheering. I don't think that qualifies at half, I give maybe 15%. If anyone has a dvd of that meeting, then prove me wrong.

and since we are rehashing old crap. I would like to point out that the oklahoma gazette newspaper in oklahoma city has used Mrs. Flippo's famous quote again about the public doesn't have the right to know. October 28 or 29 issue. Wow, does that quote have legs. If this keeps up she may want to think about putting a trademark on that statement.

It's in the media relations/opinion section about Civic responsibility. The writer for the gazette added: "She obviously forgot whose money she was spending". Not my quote, theirs.

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/4/2009 10:42:42 AM)

Chris, as I said, it was the Ledger's statement. It's relevant because Ms. Updike may run again, and people need to know if she did questionable things.

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

Jolie2, (11/5/2009 10:36:32 AM)

Submitted to the Ledger on the Updike story this morning:

QUOTE

to How Interesting (or should I say Dee Masters?)

Yes, I'm sure that the point of writing comments on the Ledger is to direct them to previous Board members only. [sarcasm]

Everyone is entitled to their opinion. Ms. Dee Masters, former board member, made quite a lasting impression on many people by her public behavior and comments at board meetings at the beginning the controversy. Certainly, it was nothing to be proud of.

Being a previous board member doesn't necessarily give anyone a leg up on common sense, good judgment, or courtesy, as Ms. Masters has proven to us this past year.

You don't have to be a board member to understand the rules of not revealing information discussed in executive session. If Ms. Updike did do this (twice), as reported by Ms. Wilkins during a special board meeting, she is not a trustworthy person and should not be re-elected to the school board.

END QUOTE

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/5/2009 11:20:03 AM)

I had to respond too, what with having been on the board myself.

KIDDING, ya'll.

Oh well, it was fun being one of the board members while it lasted. Are the people who insisted I was one of the 3 amigos that gullible, or did they cavalierly post a claim that they had no proof of, and that they knew was highly unlikely to be true?

What does that say for their critical thinking skills and/or integrity?

Tell 'em, "How Interesting", if you think I'm really one of the 3 amigos.

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/5/2009 11:31:58 AM)

Regarding the suspension hearing - I'm rehashing this because I don't think it was hashed right the first time.

The number of people supporting the suspension, the accuracy of the Ledger's reporting, and whether I was there or not is neither here nor there.

What I am trying to get at is that even if there was only one anti-Sisney person there, that person would have been allowed to speak too. How would it have been fair to Sisney to allow any comments – positive or negative, reasonable or outrageous - to be made that might have influenced (or could be claimed to have influenced) the decision that was about to be voted on by the board?

The outcry was against "suppressing the public's opinion". There was no barrier to the public expressing their opinion to the board members – only to the public speaking to the public in the board meeting. Stover even brought up – ridiculously – the first amendment right to speech. The First Amendment doesn't give you the right to speak about anything, anywhere, anytime! Nobody's right to free speech was being violated by the board's decision to leave out the public comment section of this meeting, for legal and ethical reasons. Individuals are free to let their board member know what they think and want. But it would have been inappropriate, unethical, and irresponsible to allow

public comments in the meeting where the decision was to be made on a personnel issue.

Since Stover and Updike should have known this, their motives and actions are questionable.

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/5/2009 11:43:26 AM)

I thought that was funny too, Jolie, that "How Interesting" appears to believe we offer our perspective for her benefit. There are some minds that I don't think can be changed no matter how compelling and readily available the evidence.

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/5/2009 6:00:20 PM)

This is a keeper. Ms. Masters does not think I am intelligent enough to be one of the 3 amigos. Next time someone calls me Ms. Flippo I will be able to quote Ms. Masters. Maybe they will believe her.

How Interesting wrote on Nov 5, 2009 3:36 PM:

" No 612, I don't think you are one of the three amigos. I believe that any of the current or prior board members would make more intelligent comments than you have presented to the public. Keep on blogging. You, Jolie and Giggles are the highlight laugh of my day. "

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/7/2009 9:11:37 AM)

There is a NewsOn6 video clip on the "School Board Suspends Superintendent" story, posted 10/06/08 and updated 10/07/08. Does anybody know who the woman is who says, at 1:50 in the clip, "They will be hung up, one by one, if I have to do it myself. This is just insane."?

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/8/2009 3:14:52 PM)

Found a couple of comments that attribute the "they will be hung up..." statement to Dee Master. She was appointed to the board in 1993 when Andy Fiorentine resigned. She served until 1996 when she was defeated by Max Smith; she never served a full elected term. Board members she served with include Sylvia Belitz, Michael Barron, Ed Koepsel, Carl White, and Sharon Whelpley. Maryanne Flippo was first elected to the board in 1999; Shari Wilkins in 2008.

The "How Interesting" posts could be from Ms. Master, or any other previous board member, or anybody just pretending to have been a board member. I think the chances are pretty good that it's Ms. Master.

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/8/2009 3:27:32 PM)

I probably don't need to point this out, but just in case - Dee Master never worked as a board member with Maryanne Flippo, Stephanie Updike, Shari Wilkins, Terry Stover, or Jim Sisney. Yet apparently she considers herself to be knowledgeable enough about the personalities and confidential issues involved to be able to say who should be "hung up" - even without the answers she was yelling for at a board meeting.

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

C. Tharp, (11/9/2009 7:49:37 AM)

Hey Detective Ironside, I don't think Ms. Masters has internet access. Unless she is going to the library or somewhere else to blog. and for that matter, I really doubt Dee has even heard of the term blogging.

ask her yourself.

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/9/2009 9:41:24 AM)

BAissue, leave the Pride out of this. Your claim that I am a board member is preposterous; but even if there were any possibility of it being true it doesn't belong on a Pride article. Your behavior is unbecoming a Pride member.

If you implied that I pretended to be a Pride member, I did no such thing. The picture had a caption that said "We're number 1". It needed to be clarified that they were reciting the Pride Creed, not bragging, and I copied part of the Creed into my comment to help people understand what it was about.

Direct your spiteful, ludicrous comments at me HERE or in my email. Keep it OUT of Pride articles. How do you think Mr. Davis would feel about seeing your comment?

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/9/2009 10:53:47 AM)

Ok, so Chris says it's not Dee. Which other Sisney-supporting former board members would be so unprofessional as to make such a petty comment online?

Or maybe it's not a former board member at all - just a Sisney supporter who's lying.

We're kind of out of good options, aren't we?

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

Jolie2, (11/9/2009 12:57:33 PM)

Submitted this post to the Ledger under the article "State Champions -- Again!" dated Nov. 2, 2009

QUOTE

BAissue, enough already. You are making assumptions about who is who, without foundation. How would you like people to start assuming you're one of the 'other' board members because of YOUR stance on the controversy? Are you a current or former board member? I don't think so. Just give it up and accept that we are members of the community who have opinions and want to express them.

All of us in Broken Arrow are proud of the Pride!

Jolie (not now or ever was a Board member)

END QUOTE

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/9/2009 1:34:24 PM)

BAissue has identified 2 board members posting on the Pride story. I guess Jolie finishes the trio, huh BAissue?

Board members everywhere! Oh my!

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/9/2009 11:21:05 PM)

Ok, y'all caught me. I'm a former board member who engaged in criminal activities going back to at least the 1990's. For all these years (including years before I was even on the board), I was clever enough to be able to sneak these schemes past superintendents, CFOs, and multiple board members, including Sylvia Belitz, Michael Barron, Dee Master, Ed Koepsel, Carl White, Max Smith, and Greg Green; assisted of course in my nefarious scheme by Sharon Whelpley, with whom I had been plotting for years (long before I met her) waiting for our opportunity to give Air Assurance preferential treatment for no particular reason.

And it would have worked too, if it weren't for that meddling Dr. Sisney! Nobody knew anything was wrong until April 2008, when Dr. Sisney stumbled across an invoice that I had failed to cover up the illegal payment of (illegal payment that benefited me in no way whatsoever – I just like ripping off school districts). It was then that I started working feverishly and against all reason to keep the matter from seeing the light of day. Really, I did.

Since Dr. Sisney had found me out, announced it to the press, and filed a lawsuit, I decided the best way to keep it quiet would be to fire him and really fire up the public. Drawing attention to the corruption he exposed would definitely be the best way to keep anyone from finding out about it! See, after all those years of being a mastermind criminal, I suddenly got real stupid. Then I started posting comments online, coyly pretending not to know anything about how a school district is run. Of course, that was easy for me, since after ten years I suddenly turned incompetent! I know I'm breaking confidentiality laws by speaking about the lawsuits and personnel issues, but I'm willing to take the risk for the reward of being called names by the elite and enlightened Broken Arrow citizens I used to pretend to represent.

I only have one regret – that I never had any sort of purpose in committing any of my crimes. I realize now that the REALLY smart corrupt school board members actually have personal gain from their crookedness. Sharon kept telling me we were forgetting something, but did I listen? No - I was having too much fun changing dates on invoices and not attaching work orders – oh the depravity! Here I thought I was having a real caper – I thought I was a real racketeer, and come to find out I forgot to collect the cash!

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

Jolie2, (11/10/2009 9:16:23 AM)

That's a keeper, 612. I had to read that gem out loud to my family. Thanks for the laughs.

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/10/2009 11:34:05 AM)

:)

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/10/2009 6:28:38 PM)

In the federal case, Richardson has filed a Response to the District's response to Richardson's motion to dismiss without prejudice. It's on brokenarrowforum dot net.

Richardson says that the district can't have incurred that much in costs yet, especially since the district claims the plaintiff has been "less than diligent". He says that the plaintiff has responded to discovery requests, and has provided sufficient Initial Disclosures and supplements.

Richardson points out that he tried to curtail further expense on the Defendant's part by requesting Defendant agree to a stay on discovery pending a decision by the Court, and the defendant did not agree to the request.

I didn't see the request for the stay on discovery in anything filed. Maybe it was a verbal or email thing, or maybe I just didn't recognize it.

If Mann has to file a Response to the Response to the Response now, it's going to start getting confusing.

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/11/2009 11:35:06 AM)

I guess I'm not convinced that "it's not that much" can really be considered grounds for saying you don't owe something. If somebody's actions caused somebody else to lose money, the amount is irrelevant. A small amount is more likely to be forgiven by the wronged party, but it's not within the offender's rights to say "I don't owe it because I consider it a negligible amount".

Mann argues that Richardson knew (or should have known) that the case had no standing in federal court, and that he shouldn't have filed in in the first place. Richardson argues that when he filed it, he didn't know it didn't belong in federal court; it was only after further information was uncovered that he was able to tell. A judge should be able to make that determination based on the initial petition, and that's what should be used to decide whether Sisney pays the District's court costs – not how much the bill is.

I can't think of a valid argument though, for saying that the district brought its bills on itself. I think Richardson will have to show how it could possibly have had merit when he filed it, and what information was uncovered later that changed that. Even if he can do that, there is no reason for the judge to make the district pay its own legal fees, since they have not been shown to be in the wrong. You can't just go around filing lawsuits and then saying never mind, without reimbursing others' costs that were incurred as a result of your actions.

I think it's likely that Richardson will have to accept a dismissal with prejudice, which is the other alternative requested by Mann.

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/11/2009 11:54:15 AM)

I say "Mann" and "Richardson"...I know others from their firms are working on this and they may not personally be drafting the documents and filing things. But they are the primary counsel for the parties involved, and it's easier to keep track of just the two names.

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

Jolie2, (11/11/2009 5:26:44 PM)

612, re-read the bottom of page 6 and the top of page 7 of the defendant's opposition to the plaintiff's motion to dismiss. I thought it meant that even though usually if a case is dismissed with prejudice, the defendant does not recover attorney fees, that in this circumstance, because Sisney/Richardson acted in bad faith, etc., Sisney should still be responsible for paying the court costs and legal fees. Are you sure it doesn't? Let me know what you think after re-reading it.

(this document is available to read in full at brokenarrowforum dot net)

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/11/2009 9:42:59 PM)

Hm, I thought RFR was asking for one or the other, but since it says "sanction", they may mean that they are saying this case has the "exceptional circumstances" under which a defendant may recover attorneys' fees with a dismissal with prejudice.

"...a defendant may not recover attorneys' fees when a plaintiff dismisses an action with prejudice absent exceptional circumstances..."

RFR asks the court to dismiss with prejudice, and then says that in addition, the court should award the District its attorney's fees and costs because the plaintiff acted in bad faith for making them defend against a meritless federal lawsuit, especially when he already had an action against them.

"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."

I think you're right, RFR is asking for both. And why not - if you don't ask for it, you're not going to get it.

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/12/2009 12:37:11 PM)

Posted on TW article "BA board pares applicants for superintendent to four", 11/12/2009

Thank you Board for your wisdom in taking the time to do a thorough search and thoughtful selection on our new superintendent. Thank you Dr. Gerber for continuing to serve our community through this transition.

In the coming months, in addition to meeting our new superintendent, we hope to see the investigation results and resolutions to Dr. Sisney's lawsuits.

Court documents in Dr. Sisney's lawsuits and other documents are available on brokenarrowforum dot net.

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/12/2009 12:43:16 PM)

I hope the Ledger doesn't run a story about the superintendent search. I hate to see all the hateful comments about Dr. Gerber, but it's so hard to try to balance them when the Ledger controls what comments get through.

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/12/2009 1:23:26 PM)

Of course, by "try to balance them" I mean "be rude and biased and trash talk everybody".

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

Jolie2, (11/12/2009 4:40:19 PM)

Nice comment on the new TW article, 612. You deserve to win first place. :)

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/18/2009 10:59:12 AM)

Posted on Ledger article "BA school district says it can absorb latest state funding cuts"

It's frustrating to see people who can't let go of their inaccurate conclusions continue to post rumors and smear good people, but I believe they are in the minority. It would be good if the OSBI results would come out before the vote, but even if they did, there are those who will continue to hold onto their grudge against all reason. I expect to see nasty comments from them for a long time, even after the evidence shows that they have been fooled and manipulated.

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/18/2009 11:55:52 PM)

Chris, I'm puzzled about something. Dr. Sisney states in his defamation case that he did not receive an extension on his contract. So he knew this before 9/3/2008.

I haven't been able to find a board meeting where they voted on his contract renewal. Maybe I've just missed it - do you know which meeting had the vote?

I would think it would be after 8/8/2008, since that's when Bob Lewis wrote his editorial asking what the holdup was. So that would put it between 8/8/2008 and 9/3/2008. That narrows it down to the 8/12 and 8/25 meetings, and I don't see a vote in either one. Am I missing something? Were they not required to vote on the contract extension?

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

1adam12, (11/19/2009 6:55:17 AM)

to thenight1, steve, I read your blog in the ledger that you were voting no on the bond because of your continued belief that gerber did wrong. have you ever looked at dr. gerbers commitment to this community for his whole life and you continue to believe someone that has yet to prove one thing. My question is this, does your boss at custom heating and air support the bond or will he be voting no also. I think the school, teachers, students and business of the community need to know if he feels like this or does he just have one rogue employee. I know the votes are "sealed" and we will never know but we at least know what one of his employees think. come on steve get out of your little box and do something for the kids this time.

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

thenight1, (11/19/2009 11:19:06 AM)

I have not stated anytime since this bond was announced that I was voting no because of Dr Gerber doing wrong. I simply believe the new super should be able to set his own priorities. If someone can show me that passing this bond still allows the new super to get bonds approved without raising taxes, I will reconsider supporting it. As I currently

understand it, there will still be bonding capacity, but using that additional capacity would result in raised taxes. That makes those harder to pass and handicaps the new super.

I have children in BAPS and would love to see many of the things in this bond happen but I want BAPS to succeed long term and to me that means not handicapping a new superintendent.

As for your guess as to my identity, the bond issue contains over 3 million for new air conditioning units and water heaters, If I were Steve, wouldn't I want it to pass to get that business? Also, custom heating and air is a member of the chamber of commerce who have come out in support of the bond. Feel free to keep guessing (I can't stop you) but it doesn't really accomplish anything. 612 and Jolie have both been accused of being people too and I don't believe those accusations either. I've even vouched for 612 regarding that matter.

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

1adam12, (11/19/2009 11:52:55 AM)

to thenight1, so if a new superintendent comes in and decides he does never wants a bond and that children in prefabs is ok then you are ok with that? The board, the administration and a committee put this proposal together. yes your boss is on the chamber but does not even live here so can't vote. has not publicly said he was supporting it. I don't know who 612 and jolie is but I know who you are steve. no guessing. what is the luxury you refer to that you cannot buy into on this bond? Did you give your input when you had the chance? please steve open your mind and do something for the kids and get rid of the anger.

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

thenight1, (11/19/2009 4:53:14 PM)

I don't think I've displayed any anger and certainly don't feel angry myself. I have not commented on the school board issues for some time as I am waiting on the OSBI and audit reports. Until those facts are in, I feel I have nothing further to add to that conversation but continue to listen to others with an open mind. Jolie and 612 have raised some very valid questions. I even trust the current school board which you think I am so angry about, to select the new super and will support their choice.

I've spoken to several teachers and a former teacher and as far as I can tell, Dr Gerber's performance since he has been super has been good. No reason to be angry with that. Interestingly enough, some (not all) of those teachers have told me in private that they are also voting against this bond for reasons that are their own.

As to the luxuries in this bond, a covered practice facility is a luxury. The band has won a national championship without a covered facility and the football team has made the playoffs without one. Hydraulic lifts for an orchestra pit are a luxury. I've been in a number of performance halls for high school and college level arts programs and managed to enjoy every event both with and without orchestras without a moving pit. I personally consider getting rid of temporary buildings to be a luxury but one I am willing to pay for and support. I have attended classes in temporary buildings and still managed to learn the material. My kids have attended classes in temporary buildings and still managed to learn the material. If any of those buildings are unsafe, then the replacement of those buildings would not be a luxury. I am willing to support and pay to replace them but if the new super says leave the kids in safe, prefab buildings then, yes, I am fine with that.

There are many things in this bond issue I would like to see passed and if all four candidates publicly said they support it, then that is enough for me. I have not heard of that happening though. Please correct me if I am wrong and they have. The long term success of our schools is vital and I want our superintendent and the schools to succeed. Convince me that this bond in no way handicaps the new super and I'll support it, even with the luxuries in it. I am displaying an open mind and am willing to change based on what I think is best for the kids long term, are you? I've clearly stated a reasonable request as what is needed to change my mind.

As to the other questions, I prefer to remain anonymous as do others here, even yourself, and will not make further comments that indicate who I may or may not be. My feelings are genuine and my own only so my identity doesn't really matter. You are free to 'know' or guess as to who I am.

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/19/2009 11:05:30 PM)

It's not the superintendent who sets priorities for the district - it's the school board. There is no issue of his hands being tied if the board provides him with his objectives and the funds to achieve them.

The problem would be if he stepped into a district with many needs (like BA) but with nothing authorized or funded to remedy the problems. That is what voting NO will accomplish.

I doubt very seriously that our new superintendent will thank Broken Arrow citizens for voting down the bond issue.

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

WoodyWayne, (11/20/2009 1:11:31 AM)

Maybe we should hire a Superintendent, CFO, HR Director, Construction Manager, etc.; who live in the Broken Arrow community and can vote on these issues that matter so much to them!

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/20/2009 9:12:31 AM)

The proposal isn't just trying to make things more comfy for people. Obviously students can learn in portables. It's also taking cost effectiveness into consideration. Our portables have been in service much longer than was anticipated, and we are having to retire them, which means we're faced with either replacing the portables or expanding the buildings. In addition to being unsightly and inconvenient, portables have a higher maintenance cost and a shorter useful life. So it isn't just a matter of comfort, or even just a matter of trying not to drive away potential teachers with a substandard work environment. It's a matter of long-term economics.

It's the same with the lift in the PAC. We have already made a huge investment in the PAC, and the plan is to pay for the investment in part with revenue from shows that perform there. Without the lift, some shows can't be performed there. They are considering it not only because it would allow more flexibility in our own productions, but also because the investment is expected to bring more revenue.

Again, economics. These factors need to be analyzed and considered. Looking only at the improvements simply as "luxuries" is short-sighted. The administration is looking ahead at the long-term outlook, not trying to save money in the short run at the expense of the long-term future of the district.

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/20/2009 8:36:59 PM)

A timeline of events is posted on brokenarrowforum dot net. It's pretty detailed, and contains sources for every event listed. Hopefully it will be a handy reference.

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/25/2009 10:53:40 AM)

From PBG's post on the Ledger article, "2 Area superintendents call BAPS bond financing plan 'highly creative'", it looks like he has overcome his distaste for the board and administration and is now supporting the bond issue. The major reason he brings up is the portables - the lack of security and not wanting to spend money to maintain them.

Hopefully it will be possible for others to separate the bond issue from their feelings about the board and administration. Whatever conclusion people come to, it should be based on the many factors involved in the bond issue, not feelings based on possibly inaccurate perceptions.

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/25/2009 4:46:40 PM)

I see people saying "stop spending money you don't have", on articles in the Ledger about the bond issue. While that's sound advice for a trip to the mall, that's not how school districts operate, ever.

On a much smaller scale, I spent money I didn't have when I bought my house, because I thought it would be a better deal in the long run. Now my mortgage payment is the same as rent would be on a house half the size, and it's almost paid off.

Compare \$0 per month plus full equity in a house to steadily rising rent forever, with no equity... is it always bad to spend money you don't have?

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

612, Broken Arrow (11/28/2009 8:57:29 AM)

Posted on the TW "For the children / BA school bond deserves approval" story published today:

All indications at this point are that Sisney trumped up the accusations against the school board. He has asked the judge to dismiss his federal case; everybody knew it had no merit. The Broken Arrow District has OBJECTED to Sisney dropping the case - now why would they do that if Sisney was right and the board members are guilty?

Much more information pointing to this conclusion is available on brokenarrowforum dot net.

The bond issue is not about Sisney's antics. People need to judge it on its own merits, not because they're still clinging to their misdirected anger based on Sisney's unfounded accusations.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/2/2009 11:06:15 AM)

The Ledger's "Bond oversight committee named" article says:

QUOTE

According to the guidelines adopted by the board Monday, no current employee of the district may serve on the panel; members must have a good record of personal fiscal responsibility; and no current elected officials may serve on the committee.

Meetings will be subject to the Open Record Act.

UNQUOTE

I noticed that one of the requirements is a record of personal fiscal responsibility. What are the criteria for showing personal fiscal responsibility?

Someone admonished Jolie for bringing up Ms. Updike's bankruptcy on an article about Ms. Updike possibly running for re-election, saying that "a bankruptcy is no indictment of a person's judgment". Would a bankruptcy (or two, as in Ms. Updike's case) be considered a factor in choosing members of this committee?

Just wondering how some people can consider personal fiscal responsibility to be an important characteristic for members of this committee, but not for board members, who are responsible for the oversight of ALL the districts finances.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/2/2009 11:28:03 AM)

Posted on the Ledger opinion article, "Support BA Bond Issue"

It probably won't be published because I mentioned the website.

Anyone who has concerns regarding the behavior of school board members can find more information about the controversy at brokenarrowforum. The controversy with Sisney should not be a factor in deciding whether to vote for the bond issue.

You may be surprised at what wasn't reported. My take on the situation went from shock at what it looked like the board was doing to a healthy skepticism of the allegations against the board members. Their side of the story has not been told, and can't be until the lawsuits are resolved. But there is a lot to consider besides what we have seen in the news.

Much of what was taken as fact a year ago has proven to be just rumor. Please check the facts and circumstances before reaching a conclusion.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/2/2009 11:50:58 AM)

Posted on the Ledger "Bond Issue a Win-Win" by Stephanie Updike.

I am wondering if maybe since the Ledger is pro-bond, they will be a little less restrictive in allowing our comments through.

Thank you, Ms. Updike, for pointing out that the focus should be on the merits of the bond issue.

The reasons for the 3-2 votes and the accompanying turmoil are yet to be made public; without knowledge of these reasons, no member of the public has the information needed to state conclusively that either side is guilty of wrongdoing.

As Ms. Updike stated, the administration has taken steps to ensure that the public can have confidence in how the bond dollars are being spent, including naming an independent oversight committee. With these steps, and in the absence of factual information warranting distrust of the administration, there is no reason to cite lack of trust as a reason for voting no.

There may of course be other reasons citizens may be against the bond issue. From what I have seen, the administration welcomes questions and concerns and is doing its best to address them.

