

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

Totally Concerned, Jenks (12/15/2009 1:36:26 PM)

Whoever it is I just hope they focus some serious attention on the faculty of their Middle Schools!

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

2ndjoyce, BA (12/15/2009 6:26:48 PM)

Jarod!

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

Tom Schadle, Broken Arrow (12/15/2009 7:06:11 PM)

Gary Gerber is the best candidate for this position. No need to waste time and money, just makes his appointment permanent and start working to do what schools are to do - educate children. Stop the bickering, you're wasting our money and playing politics and games with our children's future.

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

BA5, (12/16/2009 7:19:16 AM)

It's time that BA got some new blood in place. Someone that isn't associated with all the scandals that has taken place over the past year. Gary Gerber is not the best candidate for the job or the board would have acted on hiring him permanently. Whoever gets the job better have a lot of energy.

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

golfer girl, (12/16/2009 8:46:02 AM)

I thought Gerber was retiring next year and that is why his appointment was temporary. ?

I hope they fully research both candidates. I was surprised both are current Asst. Supts.

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

Jolie2, (12/16/2009 9:44:05 AM)

Gary Gerber stated he did not want the job permanently, only for the one-year period, so he could focus on rebuilding trust, teamwork, and stability within the district, the bond issue, and helping a newly hired superintendent get settled in.

After working for the district for 35 years, he's entitled to have more time for things other than work.

His remarks on this subject can be found in an April 2009 BAPS press release "Gerber appointed superintendent through 2010" and an October 2009 press release "Statement from Dr. Gerber regarding superintendent search" which was issued to restate that he was not interested in holding the position permanently, only for one year. Both press releases are available on the official BAPS website.

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

Jolie2, (12/16/2009 10:54:07 AM)

Whoever is chosen to be the new superintendent for BAPS will be a part of some wonderful changes within the district, partly due the recent passage of the historic school bond issue.

We have some exciting, happier times to look forward to here in Broken Arrow, when the current controversy is finally settled once and for all, and we all can put it behind us. I hope that time comes soon.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/16/2009 11:49:25 AM)

If you have noticed that comments are being shut down on articles involving the Broken Arrow controversy with Sisney, please see the website associated with my profile for the explanation.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/16/2009 4:08:45 PM)

Drat, the Ledger hasn't published the comments I made this morning. Maybe they're getting tired of me saying the same thing over and over. I know I am.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/16/2009 11:48:48 PM)

The Build A Better Broken Arrow Committee thanked voters for passing the bond issue in the Ledger opinion article "Even for BA, bond vote impressive". The committee consists of the following people:

Russell Peterson, Chairman
Scott Graham, Vice Chair
Wes Smithwick, Member
Mickey Thompson, Member
Bob Lewis, Member
Pastor Joe Cook, Member

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/17/2009 7:58:25 AM)

Posted on Ledger "Board Members Want Countersuit Against Sisney", in response to He Who, who is still struggling to understand the article:

He Who, please refer to my answer to momof3inba to clear up your seemingly intentional confusion over how "how a person can be threatened without knowing about it".

I am probably not the only reader wondering about your motives in continuing to bring up this incorrect interpretation of the article as some sort of proof that the board members are lying.

Anyone who has been following this story, and especially anyone who has been commenting on it and claiming to be an insider, as you have, knows that the threats were brought up last February, and that what is new is the recovered emails.

Are you seriously pretending that you think someone is trying to say that the board members just now found out they had been threatened? I don't think anyone reading this is falling for that at this point.

I don't know what other information you claim to have, but if you have interpreted it as badly as you have interpreted the meaning of this article, I don't think the board members have anything to worry about.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/17/2009 8:03:23 AM)

Tulsa World, please let me know what is wrong with my comments when you delete them. I posted my own words on the one that was just deleted. Is that against policy?

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/17/2009 9:50:04 AM)

Posted by me on the Ledger (not copied).

I posted this comment on TW earlier, but it was deleted when Chris reported it as being copied from the Ledger. The TW has verified that it was NOT copied, and said I can re-post it. To help avoid this situation, it would probably be a good idea to specify that we are posting our own words, not copying.

Thank you, TW, and please let us know if we are in violation. Also please be aware of the attempts to silence us by reporting our comments and lying about whether they are in violation.

Posted on Ledger "Board Members Want Countersuit Against Sisney", in response to PBG and Jerry:

Board members Whelpley and Wilkins signed up to serve our community as board members, not spend time in court. They have done nothing wrong. To the contrary, they have shown that they will carry on putting the needs of the district first even in the face of extreme criticism. They have shown no sign of any lack of attention to the District while dealing with the court battle that was thrust upon them. Portraying them as preoccupied with the court situation is inaccurate and irresponsible. Not to mention ungrateful.

Jerry, I hope you will read the court document. It's long, but the emails are included, near the end. See what you think after reading them with an open mind. I trust that you will see that Dr. Gerber deserves better, after his years of service to Broken Arrow, than to be called derogatory names. Please consider the possibility that the "under the table stuff" sounded plausible on the surface, but in reality was merely a smokescreen. You are asking for proof that there was not any corruption. So far there is no proof that there was. Until there is, I don't think it's right to call people names and presume guilt.

Sincerely, 612

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/17/2009 9:51:45 AM)

Both of my comments were published on the Ledger.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/17/2009 9:59:11 AM)

I would encourage anyone who is concerned about who have representing us on the Bond Oversight Committee to

find out more about who is reporting our comments in an attempt to prevent us from getting the true story out to the public.

See the website associated with my profile (click on the 612) to see who is getting our comments deleted, and other things this person has done and said. Decide if this is the type of person we want to entrust with the decisions involving our money and school district.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/17/2009 10:16:25 AM)

My words again, posted also on the Ledger:

The Ledger has been very fair-minded on this article in publishing my comments. However, readers should know that there is an effort to delete our comments from articles on other sources. The person responsible has been reporting our comments as violations, and lying about the supposed violations.

We know who this person is, and I would encourage everyone who is concerned about who we have representing us on the Bond Oversight Committee to take note of this behavior. Is suppressing information and maliciously combing through comments to falsely report them as violations befitting a Committee member who will be expected to make responsible decisions and represent Broken Arrow citizens with integrity?

Ledger, I hope you will publish this comment. As a news outlet and proponent of free speech, I would expect you to disapprove of this behavior.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/17/2009 11:25:05 AM)

Posted by me in response to somebody bringing up the bidding and audit:

Apparently some are still falling for Sisney's claims of corruption. Ann Wade's statement established early on that bidding procedures were not followed; this is not in contention. Keep in mind that the HVAC blanket purchase orders were approved by the whole board – not just 3 members, presented to the board for approval by the superintendent, and approved for payment by the CFO. Some have tried to point to this as proof of wrongdoing on the part of the board members; please understand that it is impossible to hold them accountable without holding the other board members, Sisney, and the CFO accountable.

The counterclaim says that Dr. Gerber emailed Dr. Sisney in 2006, specifically asking Sisney if he wanted to hire employees to handle HVAC maintenance and/or get bids from other companies. Dr. Sisney did not respond to Dr. Gerber. Dr. Sisney's claim that he didn't know that blanket purchase order were being used, or that they weren't following bidding procedures, is absurd. We don't know if the email is in the 2300 pages of recovered documents. I think it's likely that it is.

The audit did not find any evidence of intentional wrongdoing. I am sorry if that makes you feel ill. If the OSBI investigation does find evidence of intentional wrongdoing, that will change my perception of this issue.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/17/2009 1:09:42 PM)

** sigh **

They never stop bringing up all the old and utterly ridiculous arguments.

I have addressed the issue of not allowing comments at the board meeting in detail. 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.

Wonderment, are all of your assumptions as well thought out and verified as your assumption that I am Ms. Flippo?

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

Jolie2, (12/17/2009 2:09:14 PM)

I know, 612, it does get tiresome, doesn't it. You demonstrate far more patience than I do. Fortunately, you are taking the time to go through the steps, one by one, to point out the inaccuracies in their assumptions. Perhaps it is helping change perceptions for some people, who may be reading and not posting, now that additional information about Sisney's behavior has been documented and available for the public to read.

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

Jolie2, (12/17/2009 3:05:11 PM)

PBG on the Ledger is still harping on wanting to replace the entire BOE "for the kids." Here is the response I wrote to him on the counterclaim article there:

(my words)

"Let's not, PBG. Voters chose who they wanted to represent their zones. You'll have to wait until election time comes around again to make a new choice. Those folks in zone 4, it looks like your choice is already made for you, as Jerry Denton is running unopposed to replace Stephanie Updike in February 2010.

I don't know why anyone would want to run for a school board seat after the miserable treatment shown to three of our own so recently.

If I had been one of those three ladies, I would have been so angry and hurt, likely I would have resigned, and if I could afford to do it, move out of town to get away from so many hateful individuals showing that much disrespect toward me. Luckily for us, they have shown courage when their mettle was tested and are going to withstand this storm of controversy that one man's allegations brewed up.

I believe that, unlike a lot of people who say the words but don't mean it, those three individuals truly did have the school district's best interests at heart when they made the decisions that they did related to Jim Sisney's employment."

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/17/2009 3:35:27 PM)

Thanks, Jolie. I'm wearing out. Such obstinate refusal to let go of an illogical mindset and implausible account.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/17/2009 3:54:14 PM)

To be posted soon on the website associated with my profile (click on the 612):

Apparently Dr. Sisney was a no-show at his deposition. It was scheduled for 12/17 at 9:00 AM. He and his counsel had been notified by certified mail.

At 9:36, after not hearing from Sisney or his counsel, the District's attorney tried to call Sisney's counsel's office. They told him that neither David Keesling, Denise James, or Charles Richardson was available. Then they kept him on hold for 20 minutes before letting him speak with Gary Richardson, who told him that Sisney's deposition had "fallen through the cracks".

Counsel for the Defendant has filed a Motion to Compel in Sisney's federal lawsuit. They are asking only for the court to require Sisney to attend his deposition; they are not at this time asking for sanctions although they are entitled to.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/17/2009 4:24:29 PM)

Documents are posted...click on the 612 to get the website address.

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

Jolie2, (12/17/2009 5:17:53 PM)

These are my words:

If it is as it appears to be, from recently revealed documents, that Jim Sisney made up the allegations against the former majority of three board members and Air Assurance, I wonder how Sisney is planning on getting out of the predicament he has placed himself in? Is he just hoping this will all just go away if he ignores it?

Maybe someone has a suggestion or two to give him?

(I also submitted this comment to the Ledger)

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/17/2009 5:30:58 PM)

My comment responding to Jerry wondering if I'm an insider and therefore biased:

Merely being an insider does not guarantee bias.

On the other hand, wouldn't an insider know what really happened, and therefore be qualified to determine which "side" is right?

Bias is only bias if it's a predetermined notion. (Definition: a particular tendency or inclination, esp. one that prevents unprejudiced consideration of a question; prejudice.) If it's a considered opinion based on observation and analysis, it's just good judgment.

Anyway, for the record, as I have stated many times, I'm nobody. People who insist that I'm Maryanne Flippo look foolish indeed to me.

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

Jolie2, (12/18/2009 9:33:52 AM)

These are my words:

"I'm for following the rules, PBG. Who has the power to remove school board members if there is no proof of wrongdoing? I don't think there is a clause to do so based on someone's personal dislike of an individual. You have to wait until the next election.

Stephanie Updike was called out for leaking confidential information from board actions--in April 2008 (likely the confidential letter that Maryanne Flippo wrote to other board members outlining her concerns about Jim Sisney's behavior, which Updike allegedly then passed on immediately to Sisney himself, per court documents filed) and in August 2008 (perhaps related to Sisney's contract/performance evaluation during confidential executive session that the Ledger reported on the status of in Bob Lewis's editorial of 8/8/09), plus making critical comments about other board members's actions WITHOUT stating she was speaking on her own behalf and not as representative of the board (Ledger interview article June 2009).

Oh, and did you happen to read the lengthy email that Jim Sisney wrote to Stephanie Updike in August 2008 advising her what to do to help him undermine the board majority? That's with the court documents filed Dec. 11 in the pleading for a counterclaim against Sisney.

Do I feel sympathy for Stephanie Updike? No. By her own actions, she was complicit in creating the firestorm of controversy, dividing our community, based on alleged false allegations. She knew what she was doing. Actions have consequences."

(Submitted to the Ledger this morning)

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

Jolie2, (12/18/2009 9:45:18 AM)

I forgot to save another of my comments submitted to the Ledger re. Updike's comment in September 2008 that she didn't believe anyone had been prevented from putting items on the board meeting agenda (the reason that board members boycotted the August 18 board meeting) and pointed out that in the August 12 board meeting, Sisney specifically stated that both he and Stover had told Flippo and Whelpley they could not add an item to the meeting agenda and that Updike was present at that meeting. (Thanks to 612 for initially making that connection and bringing it to our attention.)

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/18/2009 10:00:33 AM)

My comment:

Hm, wonder why whenever I inform readers of any new developments in Sisney's lawsuits (from publicly available sources), focus shifts to me. What's the problem, you don't like the news so you try to discredit the person reporting it? 612 is not the story, folks.

Try to find one comment where I have provided information that is NOT publicly available. Try to find one comment where I have provided information as fact that is not true and verifiable.

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

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

It is so ridiculous for people to pretend they know anything about me. It just shows their ignorance of how to find out factual information about this. I find it and post it, and they illogically assume I'm an insider AND wrong. That doesn't even make sense.

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

Jolie2, (12/18/2009 10:39:59 AM)

The Ledger is doing a great job of posting all of our comments lately and doing so in a fairly quick manner, which helps tremendously.

They published my last two comments which I will post here, too.

THESE ARE MY OWN WORDS

" I'm for following the rules, PBG. Who has the power to remove school board members if there is no proof of wrongdoing? I don't think there is a clause to do so based on someone's personal dislike of an individual. You have to wait until the next election.

Stephanie Updike was called out for leaking confidential information from board actions--in April 2008 (likely the confidential letter that Maryanne Flippo wrote to other board members outlining her concerns about Jim Sisney's behavior, which Updike allegedly then passed on immediately to Sisney himself, per court documents filed) and in August 2008 (perhaps related to Sisney's contract/performance evaluation during confidential executive session that the Ledger reported on the status of in Bob Lewis's editorial of 8/8/09), plus making critical comments about other board members's actions WITHOUT stating she was speaking on her own behalf and not as representative of the board (Ledger interview article June 2009).

Oh, and did you happen to read the lengthy email that Jim Sisney wrote to Stephanie Updike in August 2008 advising her what to do to help him undermine the board majority? That's with the court documents filed Dec. 11 in the pleading for a counterclaim against Sisney.

Do I feel sympathy for Stephanie Updike? No. By her own actions, she was complicit in creating the firestorm of controversy, dividing our community, based on alleged false allegations. She knew what she was doing. Actions have consequences. "

and as a follow-up to that post, *** I WROTE ***

" After three of the board members claimed that they were prevented from putting items on the agenda and boycotted a board meeting on 8/18/08, Updike claimed on 09/15/08 that she didn't believe anyone had been prevented from putting items on the board agenda.

However, in the 08/12/08 board meeting, a month before Updike's comment, Sisney stated that he had received requests from Whelpley and Flippo to put an item on the agenda and he denied them. Quote: "I told her no and that the item would not be added. The Board President had also told her no." So why did Updike misrepresent the truth? She was in attendance at that board meeting. "

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/18/2009 10:49:55 AM)

Jolie, the points you posted about Updike SHOULD shock people. But I think they will fall on deaf ears. Watch - they'll accuse you of attacking her unfairly.

** sigh **

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

Jolie2, (12/18/2009 10:52:10 AM)

*** These are my words ***

Even if Ms. Updike was not paying attention at the 8/12/08 board meeting, when Sisney specified that Whelpley and Flippo had tried to place an item on the agenda but were refused, she must have seen it mentioned in the memo to her from Sisney two days before (dated 8/10/08). It's in the memo itself and on the first page of the attachments that accompanied it. We know she received it, as she did the PowerPoint presentation, as requested, and followed the script that Sisney prepared for her at the 8/12/08 board meeting.

Again, that memo and the attachments are available to read in full at the end of the court documents that are linked in the article above.

(I also submitted my written comment to the Ledger.)

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

Jolie2, (12/18/2009 10:56:18 AM)

I still think that the number of people posting on the Ledger are very few, while there may be a much higher number reading what is written. I think it is worth taking the time to do a decent job defending our side of the debate, even if the other side of the argument resorts to illogical comments based on emotion and wishful thinking, instead of backed up by fact, or insulting someone with a message they don't agree with. I know you feel the same way or you wouldn't spend the time you have researching and posting information for the public to read.

I do think that there are some people who know the score but are intentionally posting to mislead people and keep up the false perception that the board members are guilty of misconduct.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/18/2009 10:58:59 AM)

Think anybody will take me up on my challenge to find a comment where I posted as fact something that was not publicly available? I doubt it.

They won't find anything. I don't know anything that's not publicly available. Wish I did.

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

Jolie2, (12/18/2009 11:05:13 AM)

612, I don't think anyone will, not even the FOI King himself. He wouldn't want to prove himself wrong but will go to great lengths to give the impression that he is right.

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

Jolie2, (12/18/2009 11:07:20 AM)

Wow. The Ledger already published my latest comment, re. Updike.

Please, please, Ledger, keep up the open, free exchange of information on this issue.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/18/2009 11:30:46 AM)

My comment:

Incorrect, "Hey Jolie". That is Sisney's story, and it is disproven by his own words at the board meeting. Not only that, but the policy applies to the public, not to board members.

All of the factual information on this issue is available to people who really want to know the truth.

All the attempts to mislead by posting incorrect information on the Ledger is not going to change the truth.

I urge everyone who really wants to know the truth to look at the available documents yourself. Don't believe me - you have no more reason to trust me than to trust any other anonymous poster.

Verify it for yourself before you buy into what these people are trying to tell you.

If you want to know where to find this information, email me. The Ledger posted Jerry's email address in his request for me to email him, so I hope they will allow this comment.

[my email address here - see my profile for the address]

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/18/2009 12:08:34 PM)

Jolie, do you know what this is referring to?

"You are apparently not aware that a Broken Arrow school board member cannot send an e mail to two or more other board members (a quorum) without being in violation of the Open Meetings Act unless the transmission is strictly for information purposes."

Is this person saying that it's impossible that Maryanne Flippo wrote a letter to the other board members, because she wouldn't have broken the rules, and in the same post claiming that it's impossible that Maryanne Flippo was not prevented from putting something on the agenda, because she broke the rules?

If the criteria for deciding whether something really happened is whether it breaks the rules, why does this person not apply that to both claims?

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/18/2009 12:43:18 PM)

My comment regarding the "You are apparently not aware..." comment

"Hey Jolie", Jolie is not the one making the statement that Flippo sent a letter to the board members.

The counterclaim says, "On or about April 29, 2009, Flippo wrote a confidential letter to her fellow members on the Broken Arrow Board of Education."

Jolie's knowledge - or lack thereof - of Open Meetings laws is irrelevant.

Are you really saying you know for sure that Flippo didn't write a letter to the board members solely because it would have broken rules? 'Cause next you tell us that we have to believe that she broke rules, and that's why her agenda item wasn't added.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/18/2009 1:14:52 PM)

My response to the person who said Ms. Flippo's letter to the board members would have been in violation of the Open Records Act:

I looked it up. Actually, sending a letter (whether on paper or in email) does NOT violate the Open Meeting Act provided that there is no response from, or interaction related to such documents among, the members prior to the public meeting.

So sending a letter to fellow board members is not in itself a violation. If it had been in email and they had replied-all to discuss it, it would be in violation.

Or if they had followed up with a discussion based on the letter, prior to a public meeting, that would have been a violation.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/18/2009 4:45:22 PM)

My comment on Ledger:

The Motion to Compel has been granted. The federal court has ordered Sisney to appear at his deposition on Tuesday, Dec. 22 at 9:00.

That is the third Motion to Compel filed against Sisney this month. The deadline for discovery is 12/31/2009. Why the noncompliance?

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/18/2009 4:49:35 PM)

Correction, it's only the second motion to compel this month.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/18/2009 5:10:16 PM)

The Order is posted on the website...click on the 612 to get the website name from my profile.

I wonder if it is unusual to have to compel the PLAINTIFF to provide his evidence and show up at his deposition.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/18/2009 6:59:47 PM)

Top 13 Things That Are As Likely as Sisney's Deposition "Falling Through The Cracks"

13. Broken Arrow Schools paying for HVAC work done at an eye doctor's office
12. Reynolds happening across Broken Arrow Schools sick pay records on his own, and becoming concerned one random school district, outside his constituency, among many that followed this practice
11. AA setting a fire in the wrong storage unit to destroy documents that they could have quietly shredded
10. Three board members orchestrating criminal activities since at least the 1990's, over the course of several boards, none of which the newest board member was on
9. Richardson not knowing that Sisney's waiving of his due process hearing would destroying his chances in a wrongful termination lawsuit
8. The Rampeys being in executive session discussing Sisney's contract
7. Sisney not knowing about the blanket purchase orders he had presented to the board for approval for HVAC work over the past several years

6. The Kitchens signing a taxpayer demand letter without ever seeing it
5. Sisney really fearing there was corruption but not telling any authority about it for eight months
4. A yearly legal budget of 8,500 being sufficient for a school district with 16,000 students
3. Stover and Updike not being aware of the legal risk in allowing public comments regarding a personnel issue at a board meeting
2. Sisney being blocked from investigating by board members who couldn't even control their own agenda
1. Stover being forced to send the letter to Rampey without the other board members seeing it because they all disappeared after the board meeting while he was in the bathroom

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

Jolie2, (12/18/2009 8:12:21 PM)

I hope you will post a link on your website to a page with the "Top 13" list. Very good, 612. :)

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

Jolie2, (12/18/2009 8:12:45 PM)

And don't forget to post your list on the Ledger. It's a winner.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/18/2009 9:05:48 PM)

In the Counterclaim, on page 9 of the 2nd half, Sisney's email mentions the Chief Financial Officer departing "with her issues". Wonder what really happened there.

In the same paragraph, Sisney refers to the elimination of THREE positions - Gerber's, Miller's, and the COO, Wes Smithwyck. He says "There are good reasons that this many positions and people are gone without a hearing."

Bet there's a lot more to that story than the District having "lots of issues and problems to work on", as Sisney explains it.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/18/2009 11:25:44 PM)

Thanks, Jolie. I am hoping that the Ledger will publish an article about Sisney skipping his deposition, Richardson's excuse, and the order for Sisney to attend his deposition on the 22nd.

If they do publish an article, I think the Top 13 (14 now) will fit in nicely.

There is a link on the website :) I even corrected some typos.

"Fell through the cracks" indeed.

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

Jolie2, (12/19/2009 8:55:12 AM)

I don't think the Ledger will think the story qualifies for an article of its own. Now if Sisney is a no-show on Tuesday morning, that would certainly be worthy of reporting, as Sisney would be facing sanctions at that point, and it would be even more difficult to use the "fell through the cracks" excuse a second time. Maybe he will call in sick?

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/19/2009 9:37:02 AM)

Maybe the "Unholy Three" will "work feverishly and against all reason" to keep him from making it to his deposition.

Can you just picture that? :)

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/19/2009 5:10:07 PM)

Sisney warned about hiring RFR in the Powerpoint presentation he provided to Updike, saying that RFR attorneys had made mistakes, settled when they should have fought, weren't ready for court dates, and cost too much.

Does it seem ironic that RFR seems to be totally on the ball, documenting in detail Sisney's inadequate responses and filing motions to compel to show that they were doing their best to meet deadlines, while Sisney's attorney let his deposition "fall through the cracks"?

Does it seem ironic that Sisney's attorney tried to get the lawsuit dismissed - a plaintiff trying to drop his own case - but RFR wouldn't allow the case to be dropped even though it meant the District would pay no damages? Sisney wanted to give up, and RFR wanted to fight.

I wonder how factual that Powerpoint presentation was.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/19/2009 5:15:34 PM)

From the counterclaim, it sounds like the Powerpoint presentation was among the recovered documents. RFR may

have a slander case against Sisney, if there were exaggerated or false claims presented in the board meeting.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/20/2009 9:43:36 AM)

My comments on Ledger to BA Issue who says there is "obvious corruption" and wonders why we defend it:

BA Issue, so far nothing has shown that there is corruption, much less "obvious corruption". The only things that even point to corruption are Sisney's accusations, many of which have been debunked already, and many more of which were suspect even before this new information came out.

That's why I am defending these people - because everything points to their innocence.

None of Sisney's accusations have been backed up with any evidence whatsoever. He refuses to provide the extensive evidence he says he has, and he skipped his deposition. Now the judge has had to force him to attend his deposition on Tuesday. Sisney says it's too soon for the plaintiff's counsel to be asking the questions, but the discovery deadline is in 11 days! What is he waiting for?

You might want to think about what you are defending.

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

Jolie2, (12/20/2009 11:29:44 AM)

I wrote this response and submitted it to the Ledger before I read yours.

*** These are my words ***

The only corruption we're beginning to see evidence of is Sisney's and possibly Updike's. Explain why people are so eager to defend someone who was blackmailing our district's governing body, lying to the community and creating a scandal that harmed individuals and our community's reputation, and cost our district in time and money to defend against lawsuits based on these false claims?

The truth is beginning to be revealed, and it will all be proven in time. Yet there are many who continue to defend what has already been disproven. What are their motivations?

Jolie

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

Jolie2, (12/20/2009 11:51:05 AM)

The only reasons that Sisney didn't want RFR hired is because he didn't want the board majority to have access to their own legal counsel and he knew that they would do a darn good job of defending the district against his claims. He was afraid of their competence, not incompetence.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/20/2009 1:18:21 PM)

Jolie, comments haven't been disabled on this article yet. Maybe our comments are no longer offending all those fine upstanding citizens who were so concerned about the content of our posts that they felt compelled by conscience to report our comments as violations.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/20/2009 1:45:39 PM)

Jolie,

"He was afraid of their competence, not incompetence."

I think you nailed it.

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

Jolie2, (12/20/2009 3:31:11 PM)

*** these are my words ***

to 612

There might be only two motions to compel this month, but there has been three motions to compel filed by the defendant (the School District) against the plaintiff (Sisney) since October 2009.

Wasn't it Sisney's idea to file this wrongful termination lawsuit against the school district? You wouldn't think so by all the foot dragging and incomplete, vague answers he's giving in the court required documentation.

What's the problem? Maybe there isn't any evidence to back up his claims?

(also submitted to the Ledger this afternoon)

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/20/2009 11:19:29 PM)

The Ledger posted a comment from The Thinker (is it possible to be more pretentious than to pick that as a screen name?) on another article that was made after our comments, so ours may not make it. Drat. We'll see in the morning...

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

Jolie2, (12/21/2009 9:50:26 AM)

The Ledger published your comment and the one of mine mentioning Sisney's foot dragging on his Federal lawsuit.

My other comment was perhaps a little too strongly worded implying Sisney's guilt, so I don't blame them for choosing not to publish it.

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

golfer girl, (12/21/2009 10:28:46 AM)

If Updike shared Flippo's letter to the board with Sisney and that started the threats to Flippo... could Updike be included in the moral majority's charges against Sisney regarding emotional distress? Seems like there has to be a way to hold her responsible for the "fire" she set under Sisney. She had prior knowledge of Sisney's threatening and intimidating demeanor and shared this information with him anyway? Just seems to me there is a case in there against Updike.

Actually, Updike did Sisney no favors. It may have turned out better if he just continued with the evaluation process and learned of the boards concerns about his demeanor that way. Was it his access to Updike's confidential information that ultimately did him in, ironically? Could this be why board members shouldn't be "on the down low" with superintendents? It undermines the process.

Is it possible that Updike set up Sisney to bully board members and stage this melodrama with her inability to honor her commitment to fellow board members of confidentiality? She can't say she didn't have knowledge of Sisney's plan to intimidate and target members... she was in conspiracy with him and obediently followed his plan.

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

Jolie2, (12/21/2009 11:55:24 AM)

Even though Updike's participation in the conspiracy is now documented, we shouldn't ignore Stover's contributions to misleading the community. He had to know that Sisney's claims about corruption connected to a long-ranging scheme with AA was bogus, as he had been on the board long enough to know the process of approving payments to contractors. He worked with Sisney to keep certain board members from putting items on the agenda. He and Sisney had exclusive contact with the legal representation for the district until RFR was hired. He knew employee actions handled in board meetings were confidential and that comments made at board meetings related to those actions would not be in the best interests of the community. Still he rallied the community against the board community with his public statements condemning the public's inability to make public comment at the special board meeting relating to Sisney's employment. He covertly signed and sent the letter to Mike Rampey, even though he knew the other board members wanted to review it and approve it first, not bothering to mention it to other board members until the subject was brought up.

Jim Stover, at the very least, did not stand up for what is right and protect the board members from false attacks. Instead he helped foment public outcry against them. He could have been a voice of reason and calm and prevented Sisney's allegations from ever being seen as reasonable, but he chose instead to help Sisney, for whatever reasons.

Both Stover and Updike failed our community and their fellow board members with their unethical behavior. Fortunately, Updike's term is almost over, but Stover will remain a board member for a little more than a year (current term expires Feb. 2010).

Stover needs to be held accountable for his actions during this time of upheaval in the district as well.

Perhaps there is more evidence of Stover's collusion with Sisney in the 2300 emails recovered from Sisney's computer records.

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

Jolie2, (12/21/2009 11:57:05 AM)

I wonder how Jim Sisney is preparing for tomorrow's deposition?

Tick-tock, tick-tock, Jim.

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

Jolie2, (12/21/2009 12:07:42 PM)

I just read the BAPS district's and State of Oklahom's list of requirements for eligibility of becoming a candidate for a school board election. Neither set of requirements mention anything about a person's history demonstrating personal fiscal responsibility or that bankruptcy would make a person ineligible to file. Isn't that odd? Yet, in order to serve on the subcommittee overseeing the BA school bond issue, you have to meet that requirement.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/21/2009 1:20:53 PM)

Jolie, "I wonder how Jim Sisney is preparing for tomorrow's deposition?"

It may be Richardson who has to prepare - another excuse. It's going to have to be more convincing than "we forgot".

What happens if they hold out past the discovery deadline? I would think it would be harder to get their evidence and testimony to be considered in trial. That would then make it harder to present a winnable case (assuming their evidence was actually in their favor). Under the circumstances, losing the case is probably preferable to committing perjury.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/21/2009 1:22:38 PM)

Just got a warning - we're not allowed to use private individual's names in comments. If our comments are deleted, that's why.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/21/2009 2:01:47 PM)

I don't blame TW for needing to protect themselves against any kind of liability for allowing comments that could be considered libel. They certainly can't have a legal expert monitor every comment and decide whether it's likely to get them sued.

Since it seems to be very common practice on other articles to mention individuals' names, I think we can assume that comments on this topic are being monitored especially closely. Maybe someone is putting pressure on TW, trying to limit our ability to post certain information and viewpoints as much as possible.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/21/2009 3:12:07 PM)

My comment on Ledger, changed slightly to remove names:

Keep right on trying to discredit me. I'm not the story. Quote all the technicalities you want – it's not going to change the reality of what happened.

Let's pretend a board member did violate an Open Meetings law. Does that make it ok for the superintendent to make false accusations against vendors, businessmen, attorneys, and board members? Does that make it ok for him to spend all his time plotting with a board member to control what the board puts in his evaluation, and trying to force them to give him an extension whether it's good for BA schools or not? Does that make it ok for him to threaten people with a PR nightmare, and then follow through with his campaign to publicly smear innocent people, embarrass the community, and force the District to spend huge amounts of time and money to deal with the mess he has made?

What are you going to try to convince people of next – that the ex-super's attorney really just let his deposition "fall through the cracks"? That the ex-super was blocked from reporting the conspiracy by board members who couldn't even control their own agenda? That a yearly legal budget of 8,500 is sufficient for a school district with 16,000 students? Good luck with that. The only people who will be convinced are the ones who started out that way and can't let it go, despite all evidence to the contrary.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/21/2009 3:13:35 PM)

And this...

"Hey whoever", here are a few more things for you to work on convincing people of.

That the OKC Representative happened across Broken Arrow Schools sick pay records on his own, and became concerned about one random school district, that discontinued the practice years ago, outside his constituency, among many that followed this practice; that AA set a fire in the wrong storage unit to destroy documents that they

could have quietly shredded; that the board president was forced to send the letter to AA without the other board members seeing it because they all disappeared after the board meeting while he was in the bathroom (a violation by one of your "good guys"!)

You can't refute anything I have pointed out about the ex-super's foundering lawsuits, debunked claims, and baseless accusations, because all of the evidence – or striking lack of evidence, since he refuses to provide any in his federal case – speaks for itself. So go on trying to dig up "violations" – you'll find plenty on his side.

Tomorrow's the day he's been waiting for, for over a year. He finally gets to tell his side of the story – without the supposed bias of the board of education. He refused to schedule his deposition, then when the defendant's counsel had to set it for him, he didn't show up. We'll see if he shows up tomorrow, or if the defendant's counsel has to file yet another Motion to Compel. The deadline for discovery is 12/31/2009.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/21/2009 5:25:54 PM)

And this to the person who apparently thinks the superintendent should be able to override the board:

Is that all you got out of the counterclaim? A suspected violation of the Open Meetings Act? I'm pretty sure I saw some other stuff in there. Like this:

The counterclaim says that in addition to trying to prevent the board from addressing the issues it saw fit – its right and obligation as the governing body of the school district – the ex-super tried to block them from calling a special meeting! He claimed the superintendent has the right to control what the board discusses and when, quoting a board policy. Does that make any sense? Board member zone 5 said that the duty of the board of education is to set policy and provide oversight. The ex-super specifically blocked them from adding items to the agenda that would SET POLICY.

Did it occur to any of the ex-super supporters that maybe when that board policy was written, the author did not anticipate a hostile takeover of the business of the school board by a rogue superintendent? Allegedly, when the ex-super tried to take over, the board tried to correct the loophole in the policy, and he blocked them, citing the very policy they were trying to correct. You see this as a good thing for the superintendent to do? Do you think this is the intent of the laws governing school districts – to make the board powerless to do anything the superintendent doesn't agree with? Because that's what you're defending.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/21/2009 11:03:40 PM)

The ex-super has asked the court to excuse him from showing up at the deposition the court ordered.

He has filed a Motion to Stay to keep him from having to go through with his deposition tomorrow, Tuesday Dec. 22. He asks the court to protect him from the "defense counsel's unreasonable and oppressive discovery demands". He states that he will file a Motion to Disqualify Counsel, because "counsel for the plaintiff discovered new and relevant information regarding the involvement of defense counsel with parties and potential witnesses in the lawsuit..." in the federal case as well as the state case.

The plaintiff asks the Court to protect him from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense, including forbidding the disclosure or discovery.

[I bet discovery, if he went through with it under oath, would be embarrassing.]

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/21/2009 11:29:28 PM)

The document is posted on the website associated with my profile...click on the 612 for the website address.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/22/2009 8:18:40 AM)

I think the ex-super's plan is to add RFR (law firm or individual attorneys) to the district lawsuit. Right now, RFR is not involved in it at all, so he has no grounds to say that RFR shouldn't hear what he says in his federal deposition, and have access to his interrogatory answers and any evidence he provides.

If he adds RFR to the other lawsuit (as a witness or defendant), he can say it's a conflict of interest for RFR to be involved in his federal case.

I doubt if it would stick, but it might buy him some time. I think he's trying to run out the clock on discovery. Of course, the judge can probably extend the discovery deadline if he wants to.

He may be referring to the recovered emails as the new information. Maybe he has to change his story now?

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/22/2009 8:22:58 AM)

Note: on the above post, RFR refers to a law firm, not an individual.

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

Jolie2, (12/22/2009 10:25:22 AM)

So the ex-superintendent is afraid of answering questions under oath. I would think he would be. Does he really think he can get away with this? The legal firm representing the school district in the federal case appears to have grounds for their own lawsuit against the ex-superintendent for slander and libel, based on the most recent allegations against the district's counsel made on the motion to stay.

RFR (the legal firm) is not going to let the ex-super escape the consequences of his actions, in my opinion.

I don't see any way out of this for the ex-superintendent. He will be held accountable. Once the OSBI/State Auditor investigation results are out, there will be no denying the facts and who is responsible for the problems the district has faced for the last year and a half.

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

Jolie2, (12/22/2009 10:40:26 AM)

These are my words:

The ex-superintendent has filed a motion to stay on his federal lawsuit, to avoid answering questions under oath during his deposition rescheduled for today, making vague accusations against the school district's counsel, and asking for the court's protection from "the defense counsel's unreasonable and oppressive discovery demands".

Does he really think anyone is still willing to believe his story, after every effort he makes on this lawsuit that HE filed against the district, is to avoid answering questions with specific answers?

Does he really think he can make this all go away by avoiding it and making further allegations?

"Oh, what a tangled web we weave, when first we practice to deceive."

I posted this comment on the Ledger, with the name of the ex-superintendent specified there.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/22/2009 10:49:38 AM)

So far I've tried to post the news about the Motion to Stay on the Ledger 3 times. My later comments showed up (which surprised me, considering what they said), but nothing about the attempt to avoid the deposition.

I wonder if the Ledger is considering reporting it themselves.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/22/2009 11:25:47 AM)

The Motion to Stay is denied.

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

Jolie2, (12/22/2009 11:47:10 AM)

The ex-superintendent has a pattern of avoiding dealing with issues he is responsible for handling. Here are some examples of that:

He allegedly didn't answer an email from the spring of 2006 from then assistant superintendent inquiring about bidding out heating/AC contract work and possibly hiring employees to handle routine maintenance.

It is alleged that, in the past, he didn't talk to a board member just because he didn't like him/her (one of the past board member's concerns in a confidential letter to board members in April 2008 and allegedly given to the ex-superintendent by another board member) BEFORE any concerns about the heating and air contractor were raised.

When a heating and air contractor invited him to go over, item by item, the concerns he (the ex-super) had raised about the company's billing, he did not do so, and instead made allegations about corruption, despite a detailed letter from the contractor addressing his concerns.

He avoided writing an apology letter to the same contractor in June 2009, even though he told board members he

would do so.

In the summer of 2008, he would not speak to certain board members (the majority) except through an attorney.

Instead of immediately reporting suspected corruption to official authorities, the ex-superintendent waited until after filing a lawsuit, holding press conferences, etc., for eight months before providing any evidence to authorities to investigate.

The school district's attorney has had to file three separate motions to compel in the last three months of 2009 in the federal lawsuit filed by the ex-superintendent in April 2009, in the effort to get specific information required of the plaintiff for discovery. Deadline for discovery is 12/31/09.

And now the ex-superintendent files a motion on 12/21/09 to stay to avoid answering questions at the legally required deposition under oath which was rescheduled for 12/22/09, as ordered by the court.

This pattern is not limited to his involvement with the Broken Arrow community. It is continuing in his new position as superintendent of Sperry. On June 23, 2009, he told the then elementary school principal that he would notify her by June 30, 2009, of his decision regarding her employment status. He apparently never followed up and he and the board never scheduled a hearing for her before the board to address the proposed non-renewal of her employment contract, which she had requested several times. She filed a lawsuit against the superintendent and two board members, based on denial of due process and the Sperry school district settled her claim with a payout of \$54,500.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/22/2009 12:35:50 PM)

Did you see BAdad's comment on the Ledger? Always good to accuse someone of being ignorant by spelling it "ignorent".

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

Jolie2, (12/22/2009 2:21:31 PM)

My comments, in my own words, to "The Thinker" who is taking a new tack, saying he thinks it is entirely reasonable to wait for the outcome of the OSBI investigation before proceeding with any civil actions.

Perhaps BA's ex-superintendent should have waited for the outcome of an OSBI or State Auditor's investigation into his allegations of misconduct before filing lawsuits against individuals and the district, but he didn't, did he?

I'm betting that, right now, the ex-superintendent is wishing he had never filed those lawsuits or ever made those allegations in the first place. I don't think things are turning out the way he he had hoped and planned for back in early 2008.

Nothing will stop the truth from coming out now. Nothing. Those persons who lied and manipulated events while holding public office will be held accountable.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/22/2009 2:40:03 PM)

I agree with the Thinker on this one. That way we will know who they should be filed against!

I think the Thinker's list and my list probably don't include the same people.

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

Jolie2, (12/22/2009 4:23:05 PM)

These are my words in response to "Hmmmmm" on the Ledger stating that it would be at our own peril to second guess the most competent legal wizard [name of attorney representing our ex-superintendent] and his strategy in defending (oops, I mean representing) our ex-superintendent.

I would disagree with you about [name of attorney representing ex-superintendent]'s law firm's competence after reading their attempts at providing non-answers on behalf of [ex-superintendent] in the discovery process of the Federal lawsuit.

Missing dates to submit legal documents requiring motions to compel to be filed?

Allegedly allowing your client's deposition date to 'fall through the cracks' ?

Are these strategies of a competent attorney?

How about [attorney representing ex-superintendent] denying in January 2009 that he had ever heard about the explanation for the billing of work for Sequoyah school to an optometrist's office instead as a typo, as the addresses were similar, and the wrong choice was made on a computer pull-down menu for work location? Yet, that explanation and much more was detailed in Rampey's letter of June 27, 2008 (item 3 on page 3) which was filed as an exhibit with the ex-superintendent's defamation lawsuit in September 2008.

What about filing a taxpayer demand on 01/07/09 with 10 signatures, two of which belong to a couple that state in a letter of 01/14/09 to [attorney representing the BA school district] "I did not agree to anything that was in this letter or even seen it. I do not want to be part of this action." ? How did their signatures end up on the document then, if that statement is true?

If you want to read competent attorneys' work, in comparison with the work product of Richardson's firm, check out the documents filed in court by [attorney representing BA school district] and [attorney representing two current and one former board members].

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/22/2009 5:51:13 PM)

Peril?

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

Jolie2, (12/22/2009 6:18:15 PM)

Sounds pretty serious, doesn't it? :)

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

Jolie2, (12/22/2009 6:42:44 PM)

Were these following examples also evidence of [attorney to BA's ex-superintendent]'s competence:

Allowing and defending the now ex-superintendent's choice of not requesting a due process hearing before the school board regarding his suspension and pending termination. This choice precluded the now ex-superintendent from being able to successfully win a wrongful termination suit.

However, attorney for the plaintiff (the ex-superintendent) went ahead and filed a wrongful termination lawsuit on plaintiff's behalf in Federal court in April 2009. The defendant's attorney (for the school district) pointed out to the court in his motion to dismiss the Federal lawsuit in June 2009 that the now ex-superintendent did not exercise his right to a due process hearing and that he was given adequate, legal notice of his right to request one, thereby negating the plaintiff's claim that he was not afforded due process.

In early October 2009, plaintiff's attorney files a motion to dismiss the case, stating that counsel has determined that Plaintiff's claims and remedies are not, at this time, federal in nature, and should be heard in state court instead.

It is highly likely that it was the research done by the defendant's counsel during discovery that was provided in their motion to dismiss in June which allowed plaintiff's counsel to make that determination.

Of course, it is possible that if the now ex-superintendent filed the lawsuits with the intention of manipulating public perception and coercing individuals into complying with his demands, he would not care that he couldn't win the lawsuits, as he may have planned to quietly dismiss them before they went to trial. In which case, his attorney may have been assisting him in his goals, knowing full well, in advance, that not requesting a due process hearing would doom the success of a wrongful termination lawsuit.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/22/2009 6:58:39 PM)

Yep, the strategy is really coming together now. When you're trying to decide between dismissing the lawsuit you filed with prejudice, dismissing it without prejudice but paying the opposition's legal fees, and committing perjury, you know you've hired the best!

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

Jolie2, (12/22/2009 9:20:12 PM)

That about sums it up, 612.

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

Jolie2, (12/22/2009 9:22:26 PM)

612, I hope that you also submitted your most recent post here on the Ledger. It's a beautiful response to Hmmmmm's comment.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/22/2009 9:30:38 PM)

I wasn't going to, but it came out so good I couldn't help it! :)

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/23/2009 7:40:41 AM)

My comment on Ledger to some attempts to clarify to us what we are actually saying:

Jolie, don't you love the "what you are saying is" responses, where someone takes what you actually said, goes off on a bizarre, irrelevant, and usually ridiculous tangent, and tries to attribute it to you. I know I do.

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

Jolie2, (12/23/2009 9:10:37 AM)

I wonder why the Ledger did not want to print part 1 of my comments of examples of the ex-super's attorney's incompetence. They accepted part 2. I've gone ahead and edited my original post and resubmitted it:

*** These are my words ***

Are these also examples of the ex-superintendent's law firm's competence?

Missing dates to submit legal documents requiring the defendant's counsel to file motions to compel to gain compliance?

Allegedly allowing your client's deposition date to 'fall through the cracks' ?

How about the ex-superintendent's counsel denying to the media in January 2009 that he had ever heard about Air Assurance's explanation for the billing of work for Sequoyah school to Hudkin's office instead as a typo, as the addresses were similar, and the wrong choice was made on a computer pull-down menu for work location? Yet, that explanation and much more was detailed in Rampey's letter of June 27, 2008 (item 3 on page 3) which was filed as an exhibit with the Sisney's defamation lawsuit in September 2008.

What about the ex-superintendent's counsel filing a taxpayer demand on 01/07/09 with 10 signatures, two of which belong to a couple that state in a letter of 01/14/09 to Doug Mann of RFR, counsel for the BA school district, "I did not agree to anything that was in this letter or even seen it. I do not want to be part of this action." ?

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

Jolie2, (12/23/2009 9:15:15 AM)

to Tulsa World Web Editor

My apologies for not catching and changing naming specific individuals in my last post. All of those names, however, have been in the media's reporting of the BA controversy and are directly connected to lawsuits filed.

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

Jolie2, (12/23/2009 9:43:23 AM)

*** These are my words *** which I submitted to the Ledger this morning:

A citizen certainly has the right to request information about government's actions. That does not guarantee that those requests are helpful or made with the public interests in mind. A private citizen can have his or her own agenda that he is following when he or she is active within the community. It does not always mean he or she is behaving intelligently or with integrity.

When someone who purports to be interested in freedom of information then runs around throwing away flyers that attempt to disseminate information that he disagrees with and reporting comments he disagrees with to website monitors, then I would have to question his original stated intentions of being a good citizen interested in finding out the truth and making it available to the public.

That is why the FOI King deserves mention because he has done the above. Ask yourself why.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/23/2009 12:01:23 PM)

My comment to someone who felt the need to educate Jolie on the definition of a public office

"To Jolie", it should be pretty clear by now that Jolie's statement referring to "Those persons who lied and manipulated events while holding public office" means the two board members who helped [ex-super] pull off his PR nightmare - and the wool over your eyes.

All your attempts to discredit by nitpicking aren't going to change the truth. Stay tuned.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/23/2009 12:14:28 PM)

I noticed in the prepared speech given by the board member in support of the ex-super, she said that he shouldn't have to accept an altered contract.

I wonder if there was talk about making a change in his contract that weakened some power? At one time, I suggested that he refused to agree to a change in his contract. Since the board never finished his evaluation or officially offered a contract extension, it should not have gotten to that point. However, as we have seen, one of the board members seems to have no compunction about informing the superintendent of the confidential business of the board. It's very possible that he was told about the potential changes in his contract.

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

Jolie2, (12/23/2009 3:58:56 PM)

The Ledger has posted all of our recent comments this afternoon.

Someone with the username of 'Perjury' is harping on about 612 being a specific board member.

Don't you get tired of that old claim? Is everyone who defends the ex-superintendent, the ex-superintendent?

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/23/2009 4:47:18 PM)

It really shows the way these people think. Like the board members would really be commenting online!

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/24/2009 9:11:08 AM)

Ok, I posted my Confession of a Former Board Member. Hope the Ledger publishes it. I asked them to publish both halves or neither.

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

Jolie2, (12/24/2009 10:37:01 AM)

You have a very good chance of it being published, I think, and it's the perfect rebuttal to "Perjury." It was satisfying to wake up this morning and see that the Ledger published all three of my comments submitted last night (not copied here).

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/24/2009 11:55:09 AM)

Drat. They went with the "neither" option.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/24/2009 12:20:06 PM)

How noble of "To Jolie" to come to the rescue of Ledger readers by responding to our "half-truths". I wonder how they can consider our referring people to actual verifiable information "half-truths".

Besides, if the Ledger would publish more than half of our comments, maybe we COULD tell the whole truth!

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/26/2009 8:17:20 AM)

Posted on new TW story "BA to have new school board member, published today:

A small correction - the board member who is being replaced was not censured. A censure is an official reprimand.

The board voted to disavow this board member's comments. The purpose of this was to ensure the public understands that the statements made by one member were not to be taken as the official opinion of the Board. That's because one member cannot speak for the organization without its approval.

This would not have been necessary if this board member had made it clear that she was speaking as an individual, as another board member did at her press conference in February.

The intent of the disavowal was not to punish her, but to make sure the public knew that her comments did not represent the board's opinion, for both public relations and legal reasons.

There is new evidence that points to the likelihood that the clashes between the 3 board members and the superintendent (with the retiring board member siding with the superintendent) were engineered by the superintendent.

Not only has he tried to get his own wrongful termination lawsuit dismissed (the school district objected to the dismissal), but he has been evasive on the Interrogatories associated with it, and has had to be forced to attend his

deposition, after refusing to schedule one and then failing to show up at the one that was scheduled for him.

In addition, over 2300 documents have been recovered from his school computer - documents and emails he had deleted before being suspended. Some of these are included in the board members' Counterclaim in his state case. These show the advice of his attorney brother, telling him how to discredit the 3 board members. Many of these suggestions were followed, resulting in the PR nightmare that one board member says the superintendent threatened her with if she didn't get the board to give him a good evaluation - despite ongoing problems - and a year extension on his contract.

There are also emails from the superintendent to the retiring board member, telling her what to say and do to assist him in guiding public opinion against the 3 board members.

There is much more information about the background of this controversy on the website associated with my profile (click on the 612).

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

Jolie2, (12/26/2009 11:54:07 AM)

*** These are my words ***

The TW has a full interview with Mr. Jarod Mendenhall. If type in the TW's website address and then /jarodmendenhall it will pull up the full article for you.

There is also a full interview article with the other finalist. Type in the TW's website address and then slash firstname and last name to bring that up. (The TW website filter won't allow me to publish a comment with the other finalist's last name, stating "Please refrain from using inappropriate language in the comment field." I apologize for the inconvenience of the reader, who will have to refer to the article here itself to find her name.

Both of the full interview articles list a resume of positions held and dates of each at the top of the page, for each candidate.

It appears that Mr. Mendenhall worked with Jim Sisney at both Bartlesville HS and at Broken Arrow Public schools in administration, based on his work resume dates on the fuller interview article.

He was assistant principal from 1997-1998 while Sisney was principal at Bartlesville HS and left Bartlesville after Sisney was promoted to a higher administrative position within the district as executive director of secondary education in 1998.

Mendenhall worked at Union Public Schools after that until 2003, when he was hired by Broken Arrow Public Schools as executive director of curriculum design and school improvement. Jim Sisney was hired by BAPS in 2000 as assistant superintendent of instructional services, which directly supervised the position of executive director of curriculum design. Sisney was chosen to be superintendent in March 2003. I am not able to find documentation as to Mendenhall's exact hire date for BAPS, other than the year of 2003. Mr. Mendenhall left Broken Arrow to return to Union Public Schools in 2004.

From that timeline, it appears that Mr. Mendenhall has worked closely with Jim Sisney twice in his career for a very short period of time and left a district twice immediately afterward.

Like cowboyfan, I am also interested in learning more about why Mr. Medenhall left BA after such a short period of time.

I was able to find an organizational chart from 2003/2004 school year for the BAPS district, available online at the official district website. From it, I was able to confirm that the position that Mendenhall held at BA in 2003/2004 reported to the assistant superintendent of instructional services, a position that Jim Sisney held until the end of March 2003, followed by Brian Beagles. Mr. Beagles also worked in the Bartlesville School district at the same time as Jim Sisney and now works again with him in the newly created position of assistant superintendent at Sperry Public Schools, where Sisney is the current superintendent.

Does anyone know the exact date that Mr. Mendenhall began working for BAPS in 2003?

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

Jolie2, (12/26/2009 3:53:48 PM)

I believe that Mr. Mendenhall was hired after Sisney became Superintendent. Brian Beagles was the district's executive director of school improvement and accountability services, according to an August 2002 BAPS press release. Beagles then moved into Sisney's old position as assistant superintendent of instructional services, and, I

think Mendenhall took Beagles' old post, albeit with a change in the job title.

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

Till Recently, Broken Arrow (12/26/2009 11:03:34 PM)

"Interested Citizen" gives me the impression that he is trying to influence public opinion with his authoritative-sounding-without-really-saying-anything posts.

On the recently-invented rumor that Dr. Gerber wants to continue working as an assistant superintendent, "Interested Citizen" says, "I have it from only one inside source."

Only one inside source? Is that all? Are we supposed to shake our heads in disapproval now, at this enviably well-informed revelation?

Is that all it takes to get a rumor started? Someone claiming to have an "inside source"?

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

Jolie2, (12/27/2009 8:59:45 AM)

Yep, that's pretty much all it takes. That, and having a username that implies civic mindedness.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/27/2009 9:08:43 AM)

Just noticed I was accidentally logged in on my retired account - you probably knew the "till recently" comment was me anyway.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/27/2009 10:23:16 AM)

Glad someone else responded to Interested Citizen. I couldn't possibly know what Dr. Gerber really wants, but I think it's unlikely that the rumor has anything to do with his wishes.

I also think, even if the rumor existed before it showed up in that comment, it was inappropriate to post it on the article about the two finalist candidates. More reason for me to believe Interested Citizen is more like a Persistent Agitator.

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

Jolie2, (12/27/2009 11:48:56 AM)

I did think it was you, but was too polite to mention it. I just thought perhaps you got tired of just 'talking' to me on this thread.

I just posted the following on the same Ledger article this morning:

*** These are my words ***

I'm sure that everyone in Broken Arrow is looking forward to putting the Sisney vs. the Board controversy behind us. However, until that can be done, the issues that caused it must be resolved and understood. Recognizing what happened and taking steps to rectify any wrongs are essential to healing and moving forward in unity.

I expect that to happen once the OSBI and State Auditor investigation results are released and the litigation Sisney initiated comes to a conclusion.

I hope once that happens, members of our community will come forward to make amends to any of those people who have been wrongly accused and abused by their fellow citizens during the past year and a half.

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/27/2009 12:44:19 PM)

I wanted to post this one on the Ledger article. I posted it on the "BA superintendent finalist sees culture of collaboration" TW article in response to the comment made by flyingtheo. A practically identical comment was made on the Ledger article by Ted A. McElroy.

I'm not going to post it because I don't want to have to see the same old lame attempts to deflect from the significant evidence of bad behavior by the superintendent 'n' friends, with insignificant and misleading nitpicking.

Right on, flyingtheo. A good rapport between the superintendent and board is important. A good rapport should probably not include things like hijacking board meetings, trying to force the board to ignore problem behaviors in evaluations, threatening retribution if the contract is not extended, using other board members, newspapers, and

politicians to spread lies about them, and suing them!

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

612, Broken Arrow (12/28/2009 1:58:46 PM)

That's right, Jolie, like He Who says, we should stop ignoring obvious things,. Like:

- Board business manipulated and meetings hijacked by the superintendent
- Recovered deleted emails showing a conspiracy to smear board members, with the cooperation of other board members
- Attempts to get bad behavior ignored on evaluations
- Blackmailing a board member in order to get a contract extension
- Libel and slander against an HVAC vendor, eye doctor, and law firm
- Using the press and politicians to spread rumors
- Providing confidential information to politicians to attempt to show wrongdoing where there was none
- Setting up situations only to point to them later as evidence of persecution (suggesting the apology to the HVAC vendor only to claim "harrassment" later; suggesting meeting with the HVAC vendor 2 at a time only to claim "conspiracy" later)
- Using school resources and work time being paid by the District to wage a personal war against board members
- Bringing meritless lawsuits based on lies and rumors against board volunteers and the District
- Conspiring with citizens to bring legal actions against the District and board members
- Continuing to direct board members to steer public opinion and generate distrust by misrepresenting the facts