

Everybody Knows...

- The School Board has run amok with their own personal agenda, while running up legal fees to shield themselves from justice.
- The School Board carried out a plan to eliminate Dr. Sisney when he caught on to their shenanigans.
- Air Assurance has bilked Broken Arrow for years, and schemed with the District to shut out competitors.
- The District is misspending our money and cheating our children, despite the best efforts of two of the board members to end the stranglehold of the majority.

Right? But Did You Know...

Dr. Sisney claims that the corruption on the board, including the practice of using blanket purchase orders to circumvent the bidding process, goes back until at least the 1990's.

Did you know...

...Blanket purchase orders are approved every year by the entire board, in the presence of the superintendent, and are approved for payment by the CFO?

⇒ *For Dr. Sisney's claims to be true, the superintendent, the CFO, and all five board members on all boards during this timeframe would have to be in on the scheme, including Dr. Sisney, Trish Williams, Sylvia Belitz, Michael Barron, Dee Master, Ed Koepsel, Carl White, Greg Green, Keven Rondot, Sharon Whelpley, and Maryanne Flippo. Dr. Sisney has never explained how he could have been unaware of the use of blanket purchase orders, or how the three board members could have orchestrated the scheme with Air Assurance without the knowledge of the others—especially since Shari Wilkins joined the board in April 2008, the same month Dr. Sisney allegedly discovered the criminal conspiracy. Curiously, Dr. Sisney has never accused any employee or board member of taking money or gaining personally in any way; there has been no motive suggested for the board's alleged criminal acts.*

Dr. Sisney claims that he tried to investigate the corruption in the District and on the board, and the three board members "worked feverishly and against all reason to keep the matter from seeing the light of day."

Did you know...

...Dr. Sisney waited 8 months after he first suspected corruption on the board in April 2008 to file a report with any investigation or law enforcement agency?

...Dr. Sisney never reported the suspected corruption to any state school authority?

...Dr. Sisney had access to legal counsel that specialized in school districts, which the three board members did not have access to?

...Shari Wilkins' emails show her encouragement to Dr. Sisney in his investigation, and show her serious support in correcting any problems he might find that might create legal or financial issues for the district?

⇒ *For Dr. Sisney's claims to be true, he would have to have no way to inform any authority of the board's corruption and its actions to block him from dealing with it. This is clearly not the case; a superintendent with the freedom to consult with legal counsel, email his disapproval of the board to all District employees, have two local newspapers present his complaints to the public, and file a lawsuit against board members would certainly have the knowledge and opportunity to alert the appropriate authorities if he truly suspected wrongdoing.*

The three board members boycotted a meeting on 8/18/2008, claiming that they were unable to put items on the board meeting agenda. Stephanie Updike claimed on 9/15/2008 that she didn't believe anyone had been prevented from putting items on the board agenda.

Did you know...

...in the 8/12/2008 board meeting, about a month before Ms. Updike made her comment, Dr. Sisney explicitly stated to all present, including Stephanie Updike, that he had received requests from Sharon Whelpley and Maryanne Flippo to put an item on the agenda, and that he had denied them? In his words, documented in the board meeting minutes: "I told her no and that the item would not be added. The Board President had also told her no."

⇒ *Either Stephanie Updike didn't believe Dr. Sisney at the meeting, or she is not being truthful.*

The three board members included an agenda item not to allow public comment at the board meetings where they voted to suspend and terminate Dr. Sisney's employment. Stephanie Updike addressed a group of parents, condemning the "arrogance" of "putting a gag order on the public", saying she was "appalled" and the public was "outraged". Terry Stover wrote an editorial in the Ledger criticizing the action, and claiming it was a violation of the First Amendment.

Did you know...

...if comments supporting Sisney had been allowed, comments against him would have to be allowed too?

...any negative comments would not only be unfair to Sisney, but would also be a strong argument in a wrongful termination lawsuit that the board's decision was influenced by the comments?

...it is common practice among school boards across the country not to allow comments in any special board meetings, or in meetings in which personnel decisions will be voted on, for the reasons of fairness to the employee and protecting the District against lawsuits?

...the First Amendment does not mean that everybody is guaranteed the right to say anything, any place, at any time?

⇒ *For Stephanie Updike and Terry Stover to have spoken out supporting allowing comments, they would have to 1) be in favor of being unfair to Sisney and opening up the district to a (viable) wrongful termination lawsuit; or 2) be ignorant of the unfairness and legal problems with allowing comments, and misunderstand the meaning of the First Amendment; or 3) be trying to stir up public opinion against the three school board members despite the three board members' correct, prudent, and fair-minded stance on this issue.*

These are just a few of the puzzling discrepancies that have come to light in the process of researching Dr. Sisney's claims. Please see the website for much more, including the 14-page Timeline of Events, with references for all entries, and over 40 Questions which suggest Dr. Sisney was NOT railroaded.