

Broken Arrow Ledger Censorship

“Reps. from state auditor’s office meet with BAPS board members”

08/23/2010

Censored!

612 wrote on 8/24/2010 8:55 AM (approx.)

So now we're attacking the board for NOT breaking the law? Y'all were really big on the law when somebody made up accusations that they broke it.

But now they should break the law, figuring the punishment probably won't be too severe?

Is that the way you live your life, justanotherokie? Because the board has ethics rules. Maybe you don't.

Your attempts to pretend they're hiding something because of the procedure they had to follow are ridiculous. I hope it's making it clearer to people how ridiculous your attempts to smear them have been all along.

612 wrote on 8/24/2010 12:00 PM (approx.)

To You, what the heck are you talking about?

The middle of his investigation? He had 6 months and he did NOTHING. He wasn't given the chance? In 6 months? What specifically are you saying the board members did to stop him?

Why didn't he alert the authorities if he really suspected corruption? That was his duty, and if he really suspected corruption yet didn't report it, he not only failed in his responsibility but he is complicit in allowing the alleged corruption to continue. That's ok with you?

He had 6 months, yet in his deposition said he had no evidence. He called no witnesses.

What invoice alterations are you talking about? The date changes? Sisney didn't even present that as evidence in his federal case, because he knows it's meaningless. It's evidence that the invoices came in after expenditures were frozen for the year.

YES, he actually alleged there was criminal activity between the board members and AA! Where have you been? "Criminal activity", "cover-up scheme", "misdemeanor and felony offenses" - these are HIS WORDS!

If he was merely trying to fix procedures, why would he accuse board members of corruption, and why would they be concerned for themselves?

I've noticed that some board-bashers are trying to downgrade their criticism to "incompetence", when they used to be the ones assuring us there would be handcuffs and jail.

612 wrote on 8/24/2010 12:15 PM (approx.)

"To You", I don't think you really believe what you say.

If Sisney truly suspected corruption, he failed in his duty to alert the authorities, and is complicit in allowing the corruption to continue.

If he didn't suspect corruption, he filed two bogus lawsuits and lied to us in the media.

He told us that in his opinion, there was criminal activity, a cover-up scheme, and misdemeanor and felony offenses. He claimed in his lawsuits that the board members fired him in retaliation for discovering the corruption he suspected between them and AA.

Either he suspected corruption or he didn't. Either way he handled it badly.

Claiming the board members didn't let him investigate doesn't make any sense. He had 6 months before he was fired. Yet in his deposition he said he had no evidence. What was he doing all that time? And what could board members have possibly done to stop him? No one has ever come up with any ideas.

Are you saying he was merely investigating procedural issues, and they fired him in the middle of that? That doesn't make any sense either. Without criminal activity, his "retaliation" claim is meaningless.

Do you summarily dismiss the Counterclaim? Or do you think that's normal and acceptable behavior for a superintendent?

I think we will continue to see the backpedaling theme from board bashers who previously predicted handcuffs and jail. It's just incompetence now, is it?

612 wrote on 8/24/2010 12:30 PM (approx.)

What a load. Is anybody still buying the "they wouldn't let him investigate" story? Seriously, what in the world do you think they did to stop him?

And why, in the 6 months between the time he discovered their alleged corruption and the time he was suspended, didn't he TELL SOMEBODY?

The right thing for a superintendent to do would have been to call the state superintendent, or the state auditor, or OSBI. Why didn't he? Nobody has answered that. (Hmm, maybe because he didn't want an investigation in his district?)

Suspected corruption in his own district, and he doesn't report it! What excuse can you people possibly come up with for that?

Did the board members cut off his phone service? Did they disconnect his email (oh - apparently not. Have you read the counterclaim?). Did they lock him in a closet? Did they threaten his family? Did they post a guard with him at all times so he couldn't get a message out? Did they bug his house?

What did they do to stop him?

And why the flip-flops? First AA is defrauding the district. Then it's just procedures. Then it's a conspiracy! Then it's just procedures. Then it's retaliation and a massive cover-up. Well, which is it?

612 wrote on 8/24/2010 1:30 PM (approx.)

I notice that any time I mention Sisney's claims as reported in the Ledger's January 2009 article, my comment doesn't get posted. He was quoted as saying that in his opinion, there was criminal activity, a cover-up scheme, and misdemeanor and felony offenses. I am not making this up. I did not quote the Ledger's article; only his quotes. They are his words and the Ledger can easily verify it. The Ledger has posted comments containing quotes before, and does not list quoting people as a term violation. Why does the Ledger not allow comments that state the facts as it stated them on January 16, 2009?

612 wrote on 8/24/2010 2:30 PM (approx.)

If you missed class the day Sisney accused the board members of taking part in a criminal scheme with AA:

From Sisney's federal lawsuit:

11. ...AA has for several years engaged in a criminal scheme, in association with some employees of the Broken Arrow School District in violation of the Competitive Bidding Laws of Oklahoma. The scheme was used to avoid the Competitive Bidding Laws of Oklahoma.

12. In furtherance of the criminal scheme, three members of the Board of Education commandeered the School Board in July and have worked feverishly and against all reason to keep the matter from seeing the light of day. As part of the ongoing scheme, Superintendent Dr. Jim Sisney was fired in retaliation for threatening to investigate and expose the scheme that had gone on for several years.

16. ...The three members of the board and Mike Rampey wanted Dr. Sisney gone as part of a continuation of the criminal scheme.

From Sisney's deposition:

Q. What personal knowledge do you have that those three board members wanted you gone as part of a continuation of the criminal scheme?

A. A large pattern of factual events.

Q. What's the criminal scheme?

A. Make money.

Comments posted on the article:

612 wrote on Aug 18, 2010 7:21 PM:

" Thanks, Ledger, for the report on a rumor from an unknown "reliable source", an analysis of someone's mood made by someone who doesn't know him, and the illogical leap of assuming board members made a mess and are trying to hide information because state law doesn't provide for random parents to attend the meeting. But I think I'll wait for actual information.

Really big eye roll. "

giveitup wrote on Aug 18, 2010 7:31 PM:

" GIVE ME A BREAK! Why does the Ledger give this woman any credibility. CONNECT THE DOTS FOLKS...SHE'S THE VOICE OF THE MAN IN SPERRY! She's the same person who led the campaign against the school bond...the same person who said on the radio that MIKE RITZE told her to call the out of town agitators who bankrolled their campaign. Her comments are all connected to the disgruntled former employee (now in Sperry) AND Mike Ritze AND Mike Reynolds...remember what he did last week. All of this is nothing but an attempt to cast doubt on the result of the audit in an attempt to continue the perpetuation of misinformation they have cast on this community for the past two years. Yes...she is the woman who handed out the fliers at the christmas parade that were full of lies and misinformation. "

612 wrote on Aug 18, 2010 8:49 PM:

" Why this Concerned Parent was hanging around available to offer such gems in an interview I don't know, but she is associated with the group that orchestrated a campaign to assist Sisney with his PR attack on BA Schools administration: BAParentsForTruth (formerly BAParentsVSBABOE) and with the administrator of the website representing that group.

Will the Ledger look into her background and try to figure out what her motivation for attacking the administration might be, or do 612 and Jolie have to do it, as usual? "

Ben Franklin wrote on Aug 18, 2010 8:53 PM:

" Can you hear the ghosts? It's almost as though this is a made for Discovery channel event. Wonder if there are any bones buried under the PAC? Is Jimmy Hoffa's remains in the foundation? Do we have alien goblins living on the third floor surrounded by a secret police force?? Talk about poor reporting.

Seriously? You give a lady who went on the radio opposing the school bond who said, "I called Mike Ritze and he put me in touch with Stuart Jolly" the same space and credibility as the Superintendent? It isn't like the former Super is the one she's critiquing. It is not as though she has had access to the audit. She's a puppet for Ritze and Sisney to cast doubt and YOU are giving her the space!!! Shame on the Ledger for this kind of irresponsibility. Even the Enquirer gives a clearer picture than this.

Now she has "inside sources"? Like who, a former news station employee? Possibly a former district employee now working in Sperry?

Good grief Ledger. You've never reported details. You've been long on setting up questions to that leave people to make conspiracy rooted decisions of their own. Yet you've been almost absent in reporting details of court proceedings, documents, filings, subpoenas, etc. You know, the stuff that REALLY matters? Instead you let some woman who owns two businesses in Tulsa, pays taxes to TPS and hangs out with Ritze and Reynolds serve as a "voice of reason" in your reporting. "

PBG wrote on Aug 18, 2010 9:54 PM:

" First, Mrs. Vuillemont-Smith needs to understand that the audit is not available to the public for 14 days. There is no need to get angry because it is state law.

Second, the school board cannot comment about the findings until they obtain a copy of the report and I am sure the board needs to meet together to discuss a plan of action.

I hope everything turns out okay. We need to be united as a community and support the school district. If there are any problems then the school board is going to have to act quick with corrective action.

My question, I wonder why Dr. Gerber, Mrs. Flippo, and Mrs. Updike were not included in the meetings? I guess it because they are now considered the public and not part of the school system. "

We want facts wrote on Aug 18, 2010 10:00 PM:

" not more rumors. The timing of Rep. Reynolds and Ms., Vuillemont-Smith's comments casting doubt on the audit results before they are made public seem to be premature. There are NO facts presented by either of them. Let's just wait for the results. I doubt that that will happen. Prepare to hear more of these transparent comments and rumors right up until the results are released. Who would fear the results and hate the attorney most? Just one person, in my opinion. These tactics seem awfully familiar to anyone who has followed this. But, let's see. "

Abe wrote on Aug 19, 2010 8:34 AM:

" The Ledger has once again failed the Broken Arrow community. Someone needs to replace the people in charge and bring in a real newspaper. "

Honestly Now wrote on Aug 19, 2010 9:46 AM:

" Since when does reporting the facts AND what the people think not constitute good reporting? If there are still intense public thoughts about events surrounding the purchasing practices of BAPS and the termination of Sisney, and obviously there still is, why is that not proper reporting? If the collateral issues and thoughts are not reported, then a two page newspaper article becomes one paragraph.

We may or may not agree with Vuillemont-Smith's attitudes and questions, but reporting them is right down the line on what news is all about. If 612, Ben Franklin, PBG and Abe were there asking questions at the followup news conference, I would expect the Ledger to report them also.

Don't shoot the messenger for delivering the news. Vuillemont-Smith got the jump on you this time for being there when you grumbling people were not. "

Amazed wrote on Aug 19, 2010 11:35 AM:

" Oh sure, lay into the newspaper for simply reporting what occurred just because what occurred doesn't please you. "

612 wrote on Aug 19, 2010 11:47 AM:

" I don't think it's by coincidence that Vuillemont-Smith's opinion is the one reported in the story. If the Ledger ever wants to include mine, they know where to find me.

Concerned Parent Ronda published an article echoing Reynolds' criticism of BA Schools' attorney attending the meetings. In it, she stating that attorneys are not typically present in audit exit interviews.

Apparently she is well-versed enough in how audit releases are typically handled to proclaim that attorneys are not usually present; yet she is surprised and angry to find that as a citizen she is not invited?

She also stated in that article that there have been no charges filed against BA Schools, so the attorney is not needed. How does she know there isn't anything in the audit that will lead to charges against BA Schools - which would most definitely be the attorney's business? "

Journalistic Integrity wrote on Aug 19, 2010 12:09 PM:

" Dear Honestly Now, We have read much, much more of what one person thinks than anything factual since this started. And, as a matter of fact. we've read NEGATIVE thoughts of one person more than anything else. THAT'S why the response is so strong. The Ledger has not been even handed in much of its reporting. With close to 100,000 residents and 16,000 students, the one newspaper in town should demonstrate some factual reporting as well. Being dominated by one person using various people repeating the same mantra as the ex- school leader, doesn't seem to reflect good sound judgment as a journalist and businessman. When presented with an opportunity to rise to the occasion of journalistic integrity and failing to do so, it is no wonder newspapers have lost so money. It is a formula for insignificance and downright failure. Reporting rumors is akin to the sensational rags we see at the supermarket checkout counter. That style is a choice, And, it has its price. School employees have long memories especially when it comes to those who continually malign them and their work. One manifestation of that is where they spend their money and advertisements they don't read. "

He Who wrote on Aug 19, 2010 12:10 PM:

" 612, I'm sure if you had been there and made comments, the Ledger would have reported on them, just like Vuillemont-Smith's. If you had wanted to be quoted in the article as being one in attendance, WHY WEREN'T YOU THERE? At least Vuillemont-Smith cared enough about the process to be at the press conference. Your complaints fall on deaf ears here. "

again wrote on Aug 19, 2010 12:24 PM:

" 612, obviously you fail to recognize the huge difference between you and V-S. She is an actual real quotable person with a name. You on the other hand are an anonymous nobody. You rip the Ledger for not reporting it the way you want, but how would they be ripped for using quotes or info from a ghost like you? You, 612, had the same opportunity to make your presence at the PAC to show whatever support or side you wanted. You chose not to. V-S did, and regardless if you agree with her or not, you have to respect that she made her opinions known publicly and not afraid to put her name behind it. There is no reason why you, 612, should even get close to that recognition in the press when you are a "nobody".

to use your quote "find me". Really? You have to exist somewhere beyond cyberspace to be considered real and credible. "

again wrote on Aug 19, 2010 12:33 PM:

" Integrity, same to you. If you support a side one way or another, then you could have been down at the PAC also and your quotes could have been there also.

Come on, lets see some folks put their names on record as supporting the past actions of the BOE. Maybe if they had some actual people that are known to have integrity in the community then some of us might take notice of what they did and why more. I am sure the ledger would be there in a minute to get those quotes of support. "

612 wrote on Aug 19, 2010 12:44 PM:

" "again", you mean I'm not a former board member, a relative of a board member, or a cop? I'm nobody? "

Thanks for clearing this up for the people who keep making ridiculous claims about my identity.

Do I have to stop calling myself Officer 612 now?

Who here still thinks board members (and/or former board members) will be led away in handcuffs? I have seen a lot of commenters downgrade their abuse of the board members from criminal activity to incompetent. You know that if they are merely incompetent, that means the accusations made in the media about them were (gasp) LIES, don't you? "

Hey 512 wrote on Aug 19, 2010 2:42 PM:

" 612, you still sound like a school board member or a close relative or confidant of one of the board members involved. Your implying that board members won't be hauled away in handcuffs doesn't make it so. I think it's more likely though that Sisney will be successful in his wrongful termination suit against the three amigos. They simply acted too childishly and sloppily to avoid that penalty.

While I'm at it, here's another thing I am thinking. If there is nothing embarrassing to the school district in the State Auditor's report, it would have been revealed in the normal course of a regular school board meeting. There would be no need to meet with board members 2, 2 and 1 in meetings closed to the public. "

justanotherokie wrote on Aug 19, 2010 3:35 PM:

" Just like everyone else we'll have to wait until September 2 back from August 2.

I hope the still unknown vacationer had a good time.

Maybe they are following our fearless leader in the White House's lead work a week, vacation a week, work a week, vacation a week. "

JaredA wrote on Aug 19, 2010 5:11 PM:

" This doesn't support one side or the other, but let's make sure we aren't propagating error. This info is from a news article. I assume it is accurate, but we know how that goes. But, as reported:

STATE LAW requires that the audit be presented to the Board members before the audit is released to the public. But, the STATE LAW also has this thing called the Open Meetings Act which kinda interferes with the audit being presented to the full Board. To comply with both requirements of STATE LAW, the auditor met with no more than two Board members at a time to avoid a quorum. This 2-2-1 scenario doesn't mean the school has something to hide, nor does it mean they don't have something to hide. Compliance with STATE LAW trumps partisan speculation.

Because of STATE LAW, the auditor cannot leave any copies of the audit. This prevents the Superintendent or any Board member from discussing the findings. Also, I believe STATE LAW then dictates that the audit (can be?/must be?) made public two weeks later.

And, despite what any particular parent or legislator says, neither the District nor its attorney has control of this process.

Also, this was an audit commissioned BY the District. Some posters seem to be forgetting that little gem.

Now we can go back to debating our favorite theories. "

612 wrote on Aug 19, 2010 5:11 PM:

" "Hey", I think the problem in revealing the results in a regular board meeting is that it's state law that the board has to review it before it can be seen by the public. If the public sees it at the same time because it's in a public board meeting...you see the problem, right?

So do you really assume that there was something embarrassing for the board members and that's why they met in non-

quorum groups? You don't think the law had anything to do with it at all?

Regardless of my identity, what I'm saying is true and verifiable. Bias is irrelevant when we're talking facts, and I never ask anyone to take my word for anything. Unlike the board-bashers, I have never relied on rumors to try to sway someone's opinion.

Go ahead, tell me specifically what I've said that's inaccurate, and what you have that's publicly available information to back it up.

I don't believe the board members (or former ones) would be posting online. Your assumption that they might seems to be based on an assessment of their character based on accusations that are, so far, totally unproven. "

again wrote on Aug 19, 2010 6:33 PM:

" I have a bridge to sell you. You obviously have not been reading the Ledger since this erupted. You are NOT well read nor informed. I read in the Ledger that the law requires that the auditor meet privately with BOE members only two at a time so as not to violate the Open Meetings Act. And, two weeks later the audit results would be made public. As far as my identity, YOU FIRST! I'm sure you know who I am! "

justanotherokie wrote on Aug 19, 2010 6:44 PM:

" Looking at other news stories this Vuillefont-Smith was the star of the conference.

612's criticism was completely out of order. BA was just covering what was said in the news conference.

612...Are you really Nancy Pelosi incognito? "

Emma wrote on Aug 19, 2010 7:12 PM:

" The density of some of you is amazing! State Law says that they can't have a meeting with all the board without it being a public forum and that they get to have 14 days, without a copy of the audit, to review the findings. That's not a BAPS BOE decision....it is the State of Oklahoma. You got a problem with it, take it up with the State courts.

Mrs. Smith got her 5 seconds of fame on TV....probably all in the world she wanted.

Ledger, would have been an interesting question to see if she was connected with the Mrs. Smith who had her book review turned down. That would have been a decent question to ask and showed some journalism skills. Instead, you went for the tabloid journalism you have been producing for well over two years now.

Whatever the results of the audit, at least it won't be long before the Ledger will have to find something else to create some type of news over. Look out city government! "

Joe wrote on Aug 19, 2010 9:27 PM:

" I agree with 512, no matter who has done what, wrong or right, why would the board not allow for a quorum so the audit could be subject to the open records act? Why not just have transparency on the matter? If I had nothing to hide I wouldnt care where and when and how we had the meeting. So go ahead 612, and jolie I am sure you have some reasoning behind this so please do tell. "

612 wrote on Aug 20, 2010 7:12 AM:

" Joe, it's state law, not the board's decision.

It's not my reasoning or Jolie's. It's state law. "

Joe Cook wrote on Aug 20, 2010 8:16 AM:

" They had to meet in non-quorum groups according to state law otherwise it would be required to be subject to open meetings laws. Even if they had met in executive session it would have still be subject or in this case a violation of state law. Law requires this not be made public until after meeting with the BOE.

If you don't like the board fine. Vote them out. If you don't like the Auditor, he's up for reelection. If you don't like the law...well I guess lobby for a change. That seems to be a buzz word these days. :) "

The Outlaw 612 wrote on Aug 20, 2010 9:22 AM:

" Do those of you who are bashing the board for following state law realize what you're doing? Jumping to conclusions and impugning people's character and motives simply because YOU don't understand the reasoning.

Deja vu. "

Joe wrote on Aug 20, 2010 10:03 AM:

" 612, since the Board requested the audit they could of had the results reported with a quorum but because they did not do this with a quorum now the law of the 2 weeks goes into effect from my understanding. Is this not the case? I did not see in the LAW where it states you can not have the results reported in a board meeting or a quorum. "

Jerry wrote on Aug 21, 2010 9:08 PM:

" That a way EMMA, and the most of the rest of you, blame ALL the controverser on the BA Ledger, Lord knows that the BOE and MR. Goober, & Dr. Sysney had NOTHING to do with it all! Are you people REALLY that biased!???? "

JaredA wrote on Aug 23, 2010 3:06 PM:

" Hey JOE: I have tried reading the state statutes about this audit procedure. I did not see the part that you caught regarding BA's right to make an early release of the audit if they were the one who commissioned the action. My findings only discuss the requirements of the auditors' office. Can you direct me to your source? "

Hey Jerry wrote on Aug 23, 2010 3:35 PM:

" Whether it's called a bias or not, they certainly seem to have an agenda that won't let them see the forest for the trees. It seems to me that they are willing to slash and burn anyone or any organization to destroy Sisney. My guess is that some time or other, he said or did something to or about them and they just haven't been able to handle it. "

justanotherokie wrote on Aug 23, 2010 4:33 PM:

" 612, perhaps they are following one state law. But by following it they are discarding the 'Spirit' of another state law.

In your myopic view of right and wrong I believe you missed that point.

Would there be a fine or jail time imposed or would only the two week delay have been negated.

If the latter is true then the Non-Quorum could be reasonably construed as just another delay tactic. "

hello wrote on Aug 24, 2010 8:40 AM:

" Wow, 3 days since we heard from 612.

Maybe she found out what might be in the audit and is having to revise her spin.

or could she be researching what species of crow taste the best "

612 wrote on Aug 24, 2010 8:49 AM:

" You're reaching, justanotherokie. :) "

PBG wrote on Aug 24, 2010 9:16 AM:

" The audit will be release in 9 days. The Ledger better schedule overtime for the web master. "

JaredA wrote on Aug 24, 2010 9:32 AM:

" I don't understand some of these accusations against the District in regard to this State audit. There may be much to be critical about in certain actions of specific individuals who are (or were) board members and school administrators, but when the School officials follow State requirements and still people rail against that, where is your credibility? Especially when the results will be made public in two weeks. That is not unreasonable.

I know that no matter how the audit comes out, there are those who will be upset that it didn't confirm their bias, and therefore they will continue to talk of conspiracy and collusion. I am under no delusion that this is going to satisfy the radicals.

For me, personally, I am anxious to compare the State's results against the last couple of annually required audits, and the special audit that came out in January. As a patron of this School District, I hope all will be found well and in order, but I am not so naive that I can't face reality. "

612 wrote on Aug 24, 2010 9:39 AM:

" I expect that there will be errors found and recommendations to improve procedures and tighten controls. There may even be some wrongdoing found somewhere in the district. I have no way of knowing, and have never claimed there wasn't.

What I have said is that I think it's extremely unlikely that the audit will show that Sisney's claims of criminal conduct among board members and Air Assurance were true. I still think it's extremely unlikely, and I will certainly admit I was wrong if board members were indeed found to be knowingly breaking laws in a scheme with AA to make money, as Sisney claimed.

If, on the other hand, no intentional wrongdoing on the part of the board members is found, what are you going to say then? It was rigged? Cleaned, like you claimed the last audit was? The state auditor is in on the scheme? He was bribed? He left things out for his own political gain?

Or are you going to admit you attacked innocent people based on nothing? "

To You wrote on Aug 24, 2010 10:48 AM:

" JaredA: It just seems incredulous that there is a state law that would require this two week delay before releasing the results. There's no real purpose for it, especially in this instance.

612: So you admit that the three amigos terminating Sisney in the middle of his investigation as to why the AA invoices were altered and bidding procedures not followed with no legitimate explanation? Why are you now just beginning to give Sisney his due after all of your diss comments? Did he actually allege that there was collusion between board members and AA or did he just wonder out loud what the motive was for not following clearly established purchasing procedures?

You know, it could be that the board members were just not doing their job in paying attention to expenditures and all of the hanky panky was in Gerber's office. BUT SISNEY WAS NOT GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO FIND OUT WHAT WAS GOING ON BEFORE HIS TERMINATION. Why would the three amigos terminate the man that was trying to fix the problem? To cover up that they were incompetent?

That was the real crying shame in Skiatook. The board members that were elected to do a job were asleep at the switch and let Johnson get by with stealing from the kids education. Are the B A School Board members also guilty of being asleep at the switch, only to wake up just in time to terminate the wrong person? "

hello wrote on Aug 24, 2010 12:42 PM:

" to: "To You"

Bingo! "

JaredA wrote on Aug 24, 2010 1:51 PM:

" Response to TO YOU:

I don't understand the State requirement of a two week delay in publically releasing the audit, it may or may not have sound reasoning behind it. Take that up with your legislator. What is not reasonable is to attach some nefarious motive to the School District because they are following the Law. Just because you don't see a purpose doesn't releave the School from its obligation to follow it.

As you look to lay blame, remember that it is the Superintendent that is in charge of administrating and operating the schools, not the School Board. The Board may be guilty of not properly overseeing the Superintendent, but the Board does not conduct the HVAC bidding process or approve and pay the bills. Did certain Board members improperly insert themselves in the bidding and purchasing process? Maybe, but even Dr. Sisney doesn't make that accusation. Dr. Sisney, in part, only alluded that Board members interfered with his internal investigation. "

612 wrote on Aug 24, 2010 2:07 PM:

" He had 6 months of complete access to records and staff. He came up with nothing. How much time do you think this "investigation" should have taken?

Since he first suspected a conspiracy in April 2008 involving district staff, board members, and a vendor, why did he not involve the authorities? In the 6 months before he was suspended in October, he didn't inform the state superintendent, the state auditor, or any investigative authority. How is that excusable? "