


[←](#) **Back to article**

Join the Conversation

Please keep comments respectful and on-topic [per our guidelines](#) .Personal attacks, threats, hate speech, advocating violence and other violations may result in a ban. You can notify us about problematic comments using the "Report" links.


Comments


My Profile

Signed in as

David_K. Not you? [Sign Out](#)

Post a comment

B *I* “ ☰

1,500 characters remaining

SUBMIT

All Comments (22)

Newest

– **David_K.** [SUBSCRIBER](#) | 10 minutes ago

Even in the newspaper comment section this horrid little man cannot be quite.

👍 Respect

↩ Reply

🚩 Report

– **John_B.** [SUBSCRIBER](#) | 2 hours ago

The article was based on an interview with Director Daily without input from other school board members. See Director Berg's comments on the meeting at <https://skschools.info/meeting-comments-2022#c4cfb8bc-fdcf-445e-a407-de369da03e46>. That website, www.skschools.info has more information on Director Daily's dealings with the board.

David_K. will undoubtedly bash the www.skschools.info website as being full of lies, but he has yet to point out any specific false facts therein, much less prove any of them. The readers can judge for themselves.

Every deliberative assembly has a process for limiting or closing

debate. Nearly nothing passes the U.S. Senate unless there is first a 60% vote to close debate. Such a vote to close debate is not an illegal infringement upon an elected official's freedom of speech. The article failed to mention that Director Daily did successfully have an item removed from the consent agenda and it was discussed by the board elsewhere in the meeting. It was only the remaining items on the consent agenda that were approved without debate.

Just because Director Daily was elected to the SK School Board with 52% or 8,658 votes, he does not have an unlimited right to speak whenever he wants at board meetings, such as interrupting and speaking over board members who may have the floor at the time. The rules protect him from being interrupted when he is speaking but he does not act as if the rules apply to him when others are speaking.

👍 Respect [↩ Reply](#) [🚩 Report](#)

– **I_mModerate_U.** [SUBSCRIBER](#) | 12 hours ago

Wow. Not my district, but for a representative to be told to sit in a corner, shut up, and color is truly something. I want to hear what my representatives, even if they are in the minority, do -- it's why votes are public, debate is public. I want them to speak to the press and elsewhere regarding the positions they took and why. And I expect the prevailing vote to be able to clarify how they considered alternative viewpoints and how that vote is helpful to all constituents. A position that incorporates the concerns, if possible, of the many, including the minority view, is a stronger position for the community -- and easier for a community to move forward in healthy, constructive ways. United fronts often translate into stonewalling to the electorate, for whom all work. I know we got used to double-down secrecy with the inappropriate suspension by Inslee of the Open Public Meeting laws during COVID, but they're there for our benefit. Roberts Rules were never intended as a sword to silence but to provide a fair vehicle for all sides to be heard.

👍 Respect 1 [↩ Reply](#) [🚩 Report](#)

– **I_mModerate_U.** [SUBSCRIBER](#) | 10 hours ago

↩ In reply to I_mModerate_U.

https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/21pdf/20-804_j426.pdf

I would have to understand better the facts on the ground and what may or may not be going on in the timeline -- to silence Mr. Daily from the get go, as opposed to having some respectful two-way debate. The complainant in the above recent case engaged in some pretty interesting behavior, but debate wasn't quelled from the get go. If any of you read this case, do understand that.

👍 Respect 1 [↩ Reply](#) [🚩 Report](#)

– **David_K.** [SUBSCRIBER](#) | 6 hours ago

↩ In reply to **I_mModerate_U.**

The case of the board director failed on the issue of censure, not exclusion. Currently the SKSD Board continues to enforce a policy that forbids debating or talking about consent agenda items. In fact, the list of those consent agenda items just keep growing and growing. Not allowing a director to speak is certainly an exclusionary act.

👍 Respect [↩ Reply](#) [🚩 Report](#)

– **I_mModerate_U.** [SUBSCRIBER](#) | 6 hours ago

↩ In reply to **David_K.**

David - the facts are certainly not on all fours but I thought the context and discussion useful. The case is also expressly limited to its bizarre facts (see one of the last paragraphs). There is dictum in the case that, depending on what is happening in SKSD, will be very difficult for other members of the board to navigate in consonance with the First Amendment. Whatever is going on there, it sounds profoundly dysfunctional. I worry, seeing the quips between I believe you and a Paul N. in this and other other articles, that the dysfunction is not limited to the school board. I think everyone needs to take a deep breath and re-think what is going on, both in policy setting for the Board, and for ongoing operations. I gather from William's schooling of me that Mr. Daily is the sole conservative voice on the board. What everyone needs to appreciate is that there is a continuum of voters in every district -- those who voted for the other candidate and those who voted for you. It sounds like Mr. Daily is giving voice to the conservative viewpoint of all voters in SKSD. Likewise, the other 4 members give voice to the

more liberal voters in Mr. Daily's district. If the Board can find someone to have a retreat to mediate, that may help everyone.

 Respect [↩ Reply](#) [🚩 Report](#)

– **I_mModerate_U.** [SUBSCRIBER](#) | 6 hours ago

↩ In reply to David_K.

David -- one last observation -- this is one of those tragedies that, if the parties can't work it out on their own, as is best, there will be a prevailing party in the lawsuits, but no one will win. Perhaps the Court has a panel of trained arbitrators who could put the fear of loss in the scope of all parties and encourage them to find a better way forward without a trial. Frankly, in my view, having everyone put on their adult attire and seek out a mediator to do this without Court involvement would be the best odds for a difficult but constructive outcome. Lots of hurt, blame, accusations to go around, I'm sure.

 Respect [↩ Reply](#) [🚩 Report](#)

[READ MORE OF THIS CONVERSATION >](#)

David_K [SUBSCRIBER](#) | 1 day ago

Advertisement

[Help](#) • [Terms of Service](#) • [Privacy Notice](#) • [Your California Privacy Notice](#) • [Mobile Apps](#) • [Cookie Settings](#)

© Copyright Gannett 2022