

I_mModerate_U.

Member since: April 14, 2022

John - it's not my district, and I should keep my nose out of it, but I see nothing constructive in anyone's recitations or quips that will help anyone move forward. Perhaps my comments will unite everyone as a vector of common detestation. . .and that may be a start. Neither the battering ram nor the blame game has worked thus far. Lawsuits won't produce any winners, either - prevailing parties, yes; winners, no.

I haven't read the website. I don't doubt that Mr. Graham didn't interview other board members as story sources. I trust that there is plenty of justifiable complaint on all sides and that folks are entrenched; I gather all of that is getting worse, not better. I observe that having this website at all seems to violate the guidelines or policy of presenting a "united front," as clearly, it's not reflecting unanimity but appears, rather, a means to fight these battles in the court of public opinion. I'll agree that bodies need to have some mechanism for moving past debate and taking a vote. I'll agree that talking over one another isn't constructive or ideal - the board may need a "talking stick."

I'll also note that quelling a minority viewpoint fails to leverage a great benefit to the board -- working to assure that the minority among us can "see themselves" in the decisions of the board or appreciate the rationale even if it disagrees. I thought that to be a huge part of the philosophical underpinnings of diversity, equity, inclusion. No one elected to any of these positions garnered 100% of possible votes or even votes cast. Another tactic, should the directors be really hearing alternative viewpoints, which I doubt, that I've seen courts use is to give the likely non-prevailing point all the opportunity it desires to present its perspective.

The challenge with that is that they really have to make an attempt to consider and rationally address the issues raised, as resultant court findings using this approach do, and the directors may not have the temperament to do that. I'll note that many bodies take comment as something to be endured and counted as participation, not heard and addressed - from our Commissioners, to DCD, to the Redistricting Commission this year, to Congress, etc., and that's not what I'm suggesting. The thing is, this board and all across our State are likely to face confrontation in the coming months even from those who voted for their candidacy. It behooves this board, makes it stronger, to get into a habit of actually considering constructively and addressing the concerns raised by this minority, even if they think them lies, misperceptions, or worse -- I can assure you that whether the majority thinks them grounded, there are voters in your district who think they are. Perception precedes reality. Just a few ideas; whatever you all are doing isn't working. Ready for incoming, now.

David K.

As a matter of fact Mr. Graham, who wrote the story did contact the SKSD Board President, Mr. Wilson. What I was told was that Mr. Wilson declined to give any comments. I assume he is following protocol by not discussing ongoing litigation. Since I am not a litigant in any of the three appeals, and since I have a bit more knowledge as a degreed Para, I fully understand the what going out of bounds means to discuss litigation if you are a litigant. And to post on a private website? As long as one stays within civil discourse, you can say pretty much anything you want as a private (non-elected. This seems to be the challenge that Mr. Berg still struggles with. You might read what Mr. Berg said to understand what an example of an honest broker looks like. He said: ***"The article was based on an interview with Director Daily without input from other school board members"***. Verbatim from Mr. Bergs first sentence in his.. so far first post.. I'll leave it at that and hope for the paper closing the comment section on this story sooner, than later.