

Date: May 31, 2019

To: WPCS School Board of Directors

Re: Policies and Procedures Related to Allegations as Cited in Executive Session, regarding code 74-206 (b)  
Board of Directors,

To begin I would like to address two items: 1. The alleged accusation of "electioneering" as stated by the Board Chairperson, 2. The election process in its entirety. I feel that there has not been due process, a proper chance for this to be addressed and/or explained. I also feel that if proper procedures were followed with the complaint/allegation there would have been the opportunity to have the appropriate conversations. It is appalling to me that board members would jump to seek legal investigation before personally asking and finding out through proper policy and procedure as to what events transpired. The board mentioned in executive session on May 30, 2019 that they wanted this to be handled internally and quietly. This to me would mean following our policy and procedure before taking it to legal council and making it more public.

In review of the policies and procedures pursuant to the accusation and complaint levied against me, by currently an unknown individual, I have found numerous inconsistencies with the board's handling of the situation; the policies that the board has a responsibility to uphold and abide by. It is by policy review that at this time I submit that all investigations, allegations and complaints be dropped by the board and that we continue to move forward with the pressing matters of WPCS and WPSA. To begin, there is actually no grievance or accusation of wrongdoing, but rather as stated by the anonymous grievant, this is a "concern."

If you will recall, I brought the election process to the board during our regular meeting on February 26, 2019. The anticipated timeline as well as procedure was given to all board members. Not one board member raised concerns over any of the election specifics. The document included the plans to have an online election and to have voting prior to the board meeting as well as carpool or other times the PFA deemed fit. There were no concerns raised over the security of the election, nor suggestions offered. Joni Larsen and Ethan Huffman were invited to be on this committee; only Joni responded to any email or text. The election process was also brought up at the regular meeting on March 26<sup>th</sup>, 2019. Again, no concerns.

Concerns were brought up by Stan Warner during the application process. Stan personally and openly came to the Board Meeting on April 30, 2019 and "accused" the board of having a "good old boys club," and that this to him was concerning, wrong and un-democratic. At that time, the Board Chair thanked him for his input. Very few board members were concerned enough to inquire about more information about his very public complaint. Stan was one of nine applicants who submitted an application for review for potential candidacy. The governance committee met, and decided that nine was too many for an appropriate vote, which was also approved by our Board Chairperson. Stan did not turn in a letter of intent with his resume, ultimately this caused him to not be in the running from the lack of information he provided. After approval from the administrator and the Board Chairperson, I sought legal counsel to ensure that policy and procedure and laws were being followed to disqualify candidates and to be selective in who was placed on the ballot. At this point I notified the candidates who did not make it onto the ballot. Stan inquired on why he was not selected and conversation was held regarding policy, the inadequate documentation. He did not like that we could be selective on the ballot; however policy, bylaws and the legal counsel all matched and that this was within the governance committees rights and responsibilities to do this, and was upheld by the Board Chairperson.

Stan came to give us his input to explore the process better and then gracefully accepted policy and procedure and the board's final position. He even made it a point to vote in the election as his motives are to better the school and to continue to be involved in a positive manner.

The election proceeded. As approved by the Board and as found in policy the election was run by the PFA. Guidance was given through the process but ultimately the election was run by the PFA. Several different ballot and election options were pursued, and several were not chosen due to various concerns which were brought to the governance committee and discussed. PFA in the end chose to use Google Forms as this has been a popular choice in the school for surveys, information gathering and familiarity to stakeholders. Information and bios for each candidate was placed on the website, and emailed to stakeholders more than one week prior to the opening of the election. This was done on April 21, 2019. Giving more than a week notice of bios, information, the board election process as well as candidate meet and greet times would appear more than sufficient for an individual to learn about the candidates. No other concerns were ever brought to the administration or board in its entirety regarding timeframes. There was a reminder text that went out about an hour prior to the board meeting, and due to administration duties being taken care of, this was sent later than expected.

It was reported by the PFA president that turnout from teachers and other stakeholders in person was up from previous years. The inconvenience of times was actually the opposite for majority of individuals involved, and was convenient to have it immediately following school hours. The day that the PFA was at the school doing in person voting she announced over the intercom that she was present for voting, and that while it was written that she would be there until 3:40, she was in fact there longer to accommodate all stakeholders, especially the teachers who may have been in car pool, which ends by 3:30pm. I know this because I volunteered to run car pool for an entire week and it was never later than 3:30pm. The PFA president was present and did not leave until after all willing individuals had come to vote. She even made an announcement before she left to give time for anyone else to vote if they so desired. The governance committee agreed to having elections both prior to the school board meeting and the PFA meeting to encourage stakeholders to attend one or both meetings. The PFA has continually encouraged attendance and participation at both meetings. This is not unreasonable.

While the PFA may not have had a checklist, and it may have been a good idea, our school and the amount of teachers and stakeholders who actually are active and involved in the voting was such that she could easily remember for a three day period who voted and who did not.

At the board meeting, just hours after the election process went live, I overheard conversation among two board members about the security of the election. I interjected and found that voting multiple times was possible. At this time Jakob Miller stated that he could get on and set it up to vote multiple times every hour for the elections entirety. He proceeded to explain more of how this could happen when I stopped him and told him to not do this. This would be unethical and would be "just wrong." This board member said he wouldn't, but he knew how to do it. I took this information to the PFA as soon as I could. It was found at that time that there was simply a preference box that needed to be checked to allow only one vote per email. She did what she could at this time to secure the election. She monitored the election, the votes, and voter emails as they came in to be aware of any discrepancies or issues that may arise, such as a Tony Lima claiming that he could have his children all vote because they have their own personal email addresses. I explained to this board member that they are not stakeholders as children/students, and that they could do so if they chose, but it would be in poor taste and skew election results. The board member said he would not do this.

Votes that were clearly not from stakeholders, such as a vote from a “test email” address were removed by the PFA and not counted in the election results. No other concerns were raised to my knowledge or the PFAs knowledge for the rest of the election process, nor after results were given to the governance committee. The results were given to the board on Wednesday May 8, 2019 with my stated intent to make it public on Friday. Two days later on Friday May 10, 2019 at 9:50am, Jakob Miller questioned the integrity of the election and votes, specifically the online voting system. This was taken by myself to the PFA who investigated the election further. Nick Burrows wrote that the PFA is to determine how to handle this. The PFA in an attempt to satisfy potential concerns, decided to not count the electronic votes. Jim Seamans brought up a concern that voices of stakeholders would not be heard if electronic votes were not counted. PFA addressed this concern by removing the electronic votes however as removing the electronic votes did not change any of the election results. Both electronic and paper ballots that were tallied (together or separate) indicated that Amber Beck, EmmaLee Robinson, and Jim Seamans still held the majority of votes and would be director-elects.

There was no more discussion about this process until after the results were made public two days later on May 16, 2019. I withheld exact numbers out of respect of our board chair, feeling that the loss would be difficult and did not want others knowing the performance. The official results as given to me from the PFA were as follows (this has always been listed in alphabetical order):

Name	Total Combined Votes	Online Votes	Paper Votes
Amber Beck	58	30	28
David Gerritsen	23	15	9
Tony Lima	22	13	9
Jakob Miller	36	26	10
EmmaLee Robinson	60	36	24
Jim Seamans	38	15	23

On May 10, 2019 I received a phone call from State Representative Wendy Horman regarding the newly received Bluum Grant as well as concerns about Tony Lima not being re-elected to the board. The election results had not been made public yet, so I was quite shocked to hear this from her. It was relayed to her by me, that not only was he not re-elected, but that he actually finished last and that stakeholder confidence in him was low. She indicated that while that may be true, he had the ties politically and with entities that would be necessary for expanding to WPSA. She specifically said that not having him on the board would be detrimental to further funding and grants from the Bluum foundation. I explained to her that I thought Tony would be well suited to lead a committee specifically designed for the expansion and building of the new high school. Wendy Horman told me that was not good enough and he needed to be on the board as chair. She suggested that we increase our board numbers from 7 to 9 so as to appoint and include Tony. I informed her that I did not feel that this was the voice of the stakeholders and that increasing the board to fit him in, would not look and feel right ethically. She agreed that it is a tricky situation but that I needed to make this happen. Tony and I then had a conversation this same day about this phone call and he informed me that I should make the rest of the board aware of Representative Horman’s concerns and her feeling that we should make room for Tony on the board. I had previously chosen to not disclose this information because I was questioning the idea of it putting our Bluum funding in jeopardy. I have heard before on several accounts, by Adam Fugoli, Nick Burrows and Jeremy Clarke that we have received grants previously and there is a relationship that already exists between WPCS and Bluum. The board of directors is fluid with changes expected. It did not feel right to me that by not having Tony as chair we would not receive funding. There also

has not been a proper opportunity or place share this phone call yet. Executive session is absolutely not the time or place to discuss election results and/or resolutions as found in open meeting law.

On May 28, 2019 we went into executive session under code 74-206(a). "This is in consideration for hiring a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent, wherein the respective qualities of individual are to be evaluated to fill a particular vacancy or need, unless a vacancy in an elective office is being filled." We discussed the staff members and then the room quieted. I assumed were done because agenda items were complete. I motioned to end executive session. At this time, Tony Lima announced that there was one more item. He looked around the room and then Ethan Huffman agreed. At that time Ethan handed out papers to the board regarding the election resolution. As soon as I looked over this I stated that I didn't think it was appropriate for executive session. Tony Lima stated that it was appropriate as we were still discussing personnel.

I would like to point out that this was a violation of open meeting law. Discussion of elections, elected officials, or board members not re-elected does not qualify under the previously mentioned code.

Election policies have not been broken, policies regarding procedures of grievances, ethical standards, duties and responsibilities of board members have been and will continue to be shown as errant and misguided. It is my hope and my continued passion to work for the success of every student and to move forward.

Since the grievance, allegation and complaint is going to be dropped because of the boards willingness to adhere to policy, I also wish to make known that I do not want to know who made the allegation or complaint unless it is absolutely necessary. It is my desire to continue to serve on the WPCS school board, to continue to serve the teachers in the numerous ways as I have for years, for my children to attend WPCS and WPSA for years to come and I do not want to harbor any negative or hard feelings against anyone involved.

As I made known in the executive session on May 30, 2019, I have never told anyone how to vote, who to vote for, and did not in any cognizant way try to persuade, influence or alter the ballots, votes or results in any way, shape or form. I would also like to disclose my relationship with EmmaLee Robinson, the board-elect who I allegedly "electioneered" for; I met her for the first time at a board meeting a couple of months ago and we spoke for less than 2 minutes. This meeting was an introduction. I then spoke to her twice on the phone in regards to the election process and a couple of times via email, again regarding the election process. This is my relationship with this director-elect. I do not personally know her, but through her letter of intent and resume the governance committee deemed her a valuable candidate for the school board. I do not know anything else about her to have advocated, "electioneered," or interfered with the school board election in any way. "I think he/she will be a [great] addition to the board." This is the same generic statement that I used in discussing and describing all candidates who were up for election.

As found in policy GBK, the board's number one goal is to ensure that the grievance be solved between the aggrieved parties. This was never undertaken and instead was kept a secret and anonymous the entire time. The board is also responsible to ensure that the administrator establishes and abides by grievance policies to ensure that it is resolved at the earliest time possible and at the base level. Instead, this complaint is nearly a month later, and taken directly to the board chair, rather than the base level which would have been the administrator.

In addition to the base level and earliest time possible, the board would only consider the grievance if the administration was unable to resolve the conflict and then would do so only if the grievance was in writing, specifically indicated which policy was not adhered by, and what remedy they were seeking. None of this was followed this time around. This I believe was in blatant disregard of policy as the board and board chair had

previously addressed complaints of much more serious matters regarding a teacher. Please recall Erica Johnson's complaint against Rob Lang. The board's decision was to follow policy and to empower the administrator in handling the situation. Discussion was had at that time about what proper etiquette of board members and ensuring that we followed this policy to the letter. Guidance and options were given to the administrator as to possible or potential outcomes, but it was for the administrator to handle per policy GBK (see policy GBK below, highlights for emphasis).

### *GBK—Staff Concerns, Complaints, and Grievances*

#### *Effective Communication*

*Effective communication between School employees, the Administration, and the Board is essential for proper operation of the school. It is the Board's goal that grievances be solved first between the aggrieved parties. Tolerance of opinions, professional courtesy, and a healthy respect for the diversity that exists among the staff are ideals that all employees are reminded to develop and maintain. Nevertheless, the Board authorizes the Administrator to establish a grievance procedure for employees as the prescribed means of resolving grievances at the earliest date and the lowest possible level.*

#### *Procedural*

#### *Requirements*

*Such procedure shall provide for Board review of any grievance that cannot be resolved at the Administrative level. In such instances, the affected individual may request that the Board review the situation. Such requests shall be in writing and shall contain the basis for the appeal, including the act or acts out of which the grievance arose, identification of the Board policies and/or administrative regulations involved, and the remedy sought. Within five (5) working days following notification of the Administrator's decision, any written request for appeal shall be submitted to the Administrator for transmittal to the Board. The Board shall review the grievance and issue a response within thirty(30) working days following such review.*

#### *Board Commitment to the Process*

*The Board shall not review the grievance if the complainant has not sought resolution at the administrative level. This shall not apply to situations wherein the grievance is filed against the Administrator. In such instances, the grievant may request that the Board review the situation.*

#### *Board Decision Final*

*In all cases, the decision of the Board is final within the scope of the School's environment. The conditions of this policy shall not preclude an individual's right to seek legal redress.*

Below is the GBK1 Grievance procedure. I ask that everyone read and become familiar with the actual procedure that should have taken place, but that was disregarded. Not only were timelines (original 10 day deadline for reporting such grievances) not adhered to, but the various levels of informal and formal actions were not taken. It is very clearly defined that because such grievances, accusations or allegations were not handled by the grievant, the administration or the board according to their own policy that the grievance is to be waved. What this means is that there is actually no complaint, accusation or grievance and that there is actually no need for legal council, legal investigation, private investigation or further pursuit of any wrongdoing on behalf of myself or the accused administrator. This is not my opinion, this is policy that the board is to uphold according to their oath, duties and responsibilities. I have also included several other

policies and commentaries about other missteps, disregarded and violated policies and procedures by the board (see policy GBK1 below, highlights for emphasis):

### *GBK1—Grievance Procedures*

#### *Definitions*

*A grievance is a complaint by a School employee alleging a violation or misinterpretation, as to the employee, of any School policy or regulation that directly and specifically governs the employee's terms and conditions of employment. The term grievance shall not apply to any matter for which the method of review is prescribed by law, or the Board is without authority to act.*

*Assignment or reassignment of an employee to another position or duties is not grievable beyond the Administrator unless there is a reduction in compensation or the Administrator requests that it goes to the Board.*

*A grievant shall be any employee of the School filing a grievance.*

*The phrase "terms and conditions of employment" means the hours of employment, the compensation thereof, including fringe benefits, and the employer's personnel policies directly affecting the employee. In the case of professional employees, the term does not include educational policies of the School. A day is any day during which the School conducts business. The immediate supervisor is the lowest-level administrator having line supervisory authority over the grievant.*

#### *Informal Level of Grievance*

*Before filing a formal written grievance, the grievant must attempt to resolve the matter by one or more informal conferences with the immediate supervisor. The first of these informal conferences must be conducted within ten (10) days after the employee knew, or should have known, of the act or omission giving rise to the grievance. A second or any subsequent conference must occur within five (5) days after the initial informal conference, or any subsequent conference.*

#### *Formal Levels of Grievance*

*Level I. Within fifteen (15) days after the employee knew, or should have known, of the act or omission giving rise to the grievance, the grievant must present the grievance in writing (Policy GBK2) to the immediate supervisor. The grievance shall be a clear, concise statement of the circumstances giving rise to the grievance, a citation of the specific article, section, and paragraph of the policy or regulation that directly and specifically governs the employee's terms and conditions of employment that are alleged to have been violated, the decision rendered at the informal conference, and the specific remedy sought. The immediate supervisor shall communicate a decision to the employee in writing within five (5) days after receiving the grievance. Within the above time limits either party may request a personal conference to attempt to resolve the matter.*

*Level II. In the event the grievant is not satisfied with the decision at Level I, the decision may be appealed to the Administrator within five (5) days after receipt of the decision. The appeal shall include a copy of the original grievance, the decision rendered, and a clear, concise statement of the reasons for the appeal. The Administrator shall communicate a decision within five (5) days after receiving the appeal. Either the grievant or the Administrator may request a personal conference within the above time limits.*

*Level III. If the grievant is not satisfied with the decision at Level II, the grievant may, within five (5) days, submit an appeal in writing to the Administrator for consideration by the Board.*

### *General Provisions*

*Failure at any step of this procedure to appeal a grievance to the next step within the specified time limits shall be deemed an acceptance of the decision rendered at that step, and there shall be no further right of appeal. Failure to file a grievance within fifteen (15) days after the employee knew, or should have known, of the circumstances upon which the grievance is based shall constitute a waiver of that grievance. The filing or pendency of any grievance under the provisions of this policy shall in no way operate to impede, delay, or interfere with the jurisdiction of the Board or the Administrator. The above indicated time line may be extended by mutual consent of the employee and the administrative representative, providing it is agreed upon prior to the original specified dates.*

There is a procedure that should be followed so that Board Directors and any other individuals involved are not “blindsided” in executive session or any other session or meeting with the board or in a public meeting. While I agree that issues such as this should be addressed in executive session, our board did not follow the proper procedures to handle the employee complaint and accusation (which is actually only a concern based on the concerned teacher’s letter). Also, as part of this policy the board will not consider any complaint that is anonymous. This ensures that the complaint is valid, and not hearsay or unreliable information as well as ensuring that the complaint is handled by the proper policies (see policy BHC below, highlights for emphasis):

#### *BHC—Board Communications with Staff Members*

*Official communication between the Board and employees will occur as follows:*

- *An employee will first communicate school-or employment-related matters at the administrative level. Any employee who exhausts the opportunity of discussing a matter at the administrative level may then communicate in writing with the Board on the matter. No anonymous communication will be considered by the Board.*
- *Any employee who wishes to address the Board in the employee's capacity as a parent, local resident, or individual, rather than as an employee, may do so by following the procedures in Policies BEDH and BHD.*
- *Official communications, policies, directives, Board concerns, and Board action(s) will be communicated to employees by the Principal. Board members shall not address concerns directly with employees.*

As I have emphasized our code of ethics in recent months, I am going to re-emphasize the code of ethics and standards that were not adhered to in this most recent executive session and previous interactions.

By seeking legal counsel about potential complaints and accusations before approaching the administration and board members, as well as failing to inform the accused, decisions and independent judgement was compromised. Insight and input from another individual (lawyer) and group (law firm) was put ahead of the board and the school. Independent judgement was not only surrendered, but was sought after by the board chair.

Again, the simple and very clear procedure found in policy BHC is emphasized in the code of ethics. It was not adhered to and disregarded completely.

Board policies regarding the election, the accusations and complaints that were made were not communicated in the correct way as indicated once again in policy BHC and code of ethics. Instead, the information was suppressed until the last possible moment, even though I asked specifically on more than one occasion for more information regarding the executive session. While I understand that all of the details of the accusations and complaints would not be made available until executive session, it is ethically responsible to inform the accused (me) and the administrator who was also accused to be made aware that they would be a topic of discussion in that session. To my knowledge the administrator accused has yet to be made aware of the accusation against them, and did not have the opportunity to respond or to defend themselves against such accusations. Once again, communication and appropriate protocol were disregarded and brought up at the last possible minute to prevent such defenses or responses from occurring. (see policy BCA below, highlights for emphasis):

*BCA—Board Member Code of Ethics Standards of Ethics*

*Every Board member shall comply with the ethical standards of conduct applicable to public officials including, but not limited to, those established in Idaho Code §7-59. The exception to those actions proscribed in the previous mentioned code is section 59-704A of Idaho Code which allows for Board members to have an interest in a contract made or entered into by the Board under certain specified conditions. Board members will strive to improve public education, and to that end will:*

- *Attend all Board meetings insofar as possible, and become informed concerning the issues to be considered at those meetings;*
- *Recognize that decisions should be made only after discussion at publicly held Board meetings;*
- *Render all decisions based on the available facts and independent judgment, and refuse to surrender that judgment to individuals or special interests groups;*
- *Speak truthfully and openly, yet fully support the final, official Board action;*
- *Encourage the free expression of opinion by all Board members, and follow established communication protocols between the Board and students, staff, and all elements of the community;*
- *Work with other Board members to establish effective Board policies and to delegate authority for the administration of the School to the Administrator;*
- *Communicate to other Board members and the Administrator expressions of public reaction to Board policies and school programs;*
- *Be informed about current educational issues by individual study and through participation in programs providing needed information, such as those sponsored by state and national school boards associations;*
- *Support the employment of persons best qualified to serve as school staff members, and insist on a regular and impartial evaluation of all school administration and personnel;*
- *Avoid being placed in a position of conflict of interest, and refrain from using the Board position for personal or partisan gain;*
- *Take no private action that will compromise the Board or administration, and respect the confidentiality of information that is privileged under applicable law; and*
- *Remember always that a Board member's first and greatest concern must be the educational welfare of the students attending the School.*

As found in the following “board member authority and responsibilities policy,” multiple policies were not adhered to. First, in seeking legal counsel without board approval, vote or common consent, there was no



such authority delegated at that time. Again, individual and board independent judgement was relinquished to an outside party (lawyer and law firm). It was also my responsibility and delegated authority as a board member to become aware of any and all issues that are brought up in meetings. This is not just for board meetings, but special meeting, executive sessions or other board approved meetings. I asked more than once for clarification and to become aware of the issue for executive session but was denied that information. It is my responsibility to become informed and that was withheld from me.

As I indicated in the executive session when the allegation and complaint was made known, this was a complete surprise to me, the administration and the board members. It is more than clear that withholding this type of information and surprising the accused and the board should not have occurred according to policy BBAA which states “the board meeting is not the place to grandstand or spring surprises” and this was intentionally disregarded. When I brought up the blindsided and perceived personal attack to the board it was received with silence. It was made known that this was the appropriate time to bring this concern and issue for discussion. I agree that this would be the time for the entire board to discuss it, but the administration and accused should have been made aware prior to the meeting as indicated in our own policy and procedure manual, as well as the grievant being made known to the board and myself. Once again, the necessary steps and actual procedure that all board members should have known and been aware of (part of our responsibilities as a board member to know policy) was disregarded, and instead the accusation decided to be “investigated.”

As also found in policy BBAA, the complaint was not given to the proper authority/administration and individual counsel should not have been sought. This would include the seeking of individual legal counsel. Instead, the administrator should have been the one to handle the complaint (had the complaint fallen within the 10 time frame) as will be found in BBAA and the other previous and future policies.

#### *BBAA—Board Member Authority and Responsibility*

##### *Limits of Authority*

*All powers of the Board lie in its action as a public body. A member of a board of directors is a public officer, but has no authority or power individually. Individual Board members exercise authority over School affairs only by way of votes taken at a legal meeting of the Board. An individual Board member has authority only when and to the extent that the Board, by vote, has so delegated such authority. Such authority shall not supplant the administrative and supervisory functions of the School Administrator. The Board shall not be bound in anyway whether by action or statement made on the part of an individual board member except when such action or statement is pursuant to specific action and authority from the respective board.*

##### *Responsibilities*

*The duties and responsibilities of an individual Board member include, but are not limited to:*

- *Become familiar with Idaho’s school laws, the State Board of Education’s and Charter School Commission’s administrative rules, and the School’s policies.*
- *Carry a general knowledge of the educational aims and objectives of the School.*
- *Work harmoniously with other Board members without neglecting a proper share of the work or trying to dominate the Board.*
- *Remember that my first and greatest concern must be the educational welfare of all children attending our schools.*
- *Respect the confidentiality of privileged information.*
- *Work with other members to establish and support effective policies.*
- *Delegate authority for the administration of the schools to the superintendent and staff.*

- *Encourage ongoing communications among board members, the board, students, staff, and the community.*
- *Render all decisions based on available facts and my informed, independent judgment rather than succumbing to the influence of individuals or special interest groups.*
- *Make every effort to attend all board meetings.*
- *Become informed concerning the issues to be considered at each meeting.*
- *Understand that the board meeting is not the place to grandstand or spring surprises.*
- *Improve boardmanship by studying educational issues and by participating in professional development.*
- *Avoid conflicts of interest or the appearance thereof.*
- *Refrain from using the board position for the benefit of myself, family members or business associates.*
- *Express my personal opinions, but once the board has acted, accept the will of the majority.*
- *Refer complaints to the proper school authorities, refraining from individual counsel and attention.*
- *Represent the Board and the School to the public in a manner that promotes both positive interest and support.*
- *Perform other appropriate duties that may arise.*

I feel that I have now disclosed everything in it's entirety. If this had been a single event or single incident of the board and the chair not following policy I could understand and forgive mis-steps or misinterpretations of policy. However these are repeat offenses and patterns of behavior in not following policy and open meeting law and a strong arming of the board, this is something I believe that needs to be addressed further. I invite the board to follow policy and procedures and open meeting law as we proceed. This would include the dropping of the investigation, the concern (as there is actually no formally written accusation of policy being broken), and continued discussion. While I would like to continue handling this internally, I also have no concern about making this more public so as to do what is best for WPCS and WPSA.

Sincerely,

Joanna Stark