

Board Meeting Statement – I want to address the newest anonymous letter sent to our Chief Business Official Ana.

To be honest, when reading this letter, I did not know whether to **laugh, cry, or just get angry. I chose to laugh because this letter is full of inaccurate information as are most of their correspondence has always been.**

Our CBO did the appropriate thing and shared the letter with me, and I am now sharing it with the Board and to the public.

I will reference the statements made in the letter and provide the District's response immediately following. This will be available in the minutes once the meeting is completed and minutes are approved.

If anyone has any questions or comments, please wait until the end to ask and I will address all questions at that time.

I apologize in advance for the length of this report but it is important that the correct information is put out to the public and not just this continued attack on District employees.

Grants / Audit Allegations

Letter states:

Attached find information about some grants that are currently being audited. To our knowledge, the audit has not yet been completed. While one of Wheatland's worst kept secrets for more than a year, you can be sure that very few people who actually need to know this information have been brought into the loop. One of the community donors gave tens of thousands, now sits on the Board, and likely has no idea that the funds were misappropriated. Stipends have been paid out from that grant money to multiple district employees who didn't deserve them, especially given they weren't even the original grant writers. Despite providing some pretty incredible opportunities for students, the people responsible for those programs have engaged in some questionable activities, thus triggering the audit. It has been reported that some of the grant money was allegedly funneled through Bear River non-profits (FFA Alumni & Renaissance, which seem to use the same EIN# for tax purposes?) and then paid out to a few individuals with specific account access to those funds. It is important that you learn more about their involvement because at least one of them is a site

admin (Gouker) and has long been interested in the superintendent position (in fact, if you ask us, she'd be worse than Guensler, if that's even possible).

District response –

Thank you for sharing your concerns and the attached information regarding our grants. I want to clarify several points, correct misinformation, and provide accurate context regarding district grant funding and the ongoing audit.

Grant Stipends

Stipends are built into grants at the time they are written and then awarded and are not for specific individuals. They are set up for actual positions, meaning that as staff change roles over time, the stipend may shift to the person currently serving in that position. The stipends are intended for the additional work added to an employees workload because of the grant.

Additionally, I, the Superintendent, have never received a stipend from any grant the district has received during my time here.

Audit Status and Background

The audit being referenced has been ongoing for multiple years. The Butte College group previously hired an auditor who found nothing and reported that to Butte College.

After that, they decided to hire a different auditor, one they could influence and direct, and who had been used previously in efforts targeting Sutter County Schools.

It took at least two years for this second auditor to compile findings. We worked very hard getting them the information request. Unfortunately those findings were never sent to the district to respond to which is required and is protocol.

The District later received a letter from Butte College regarding the report and the district responded in September with documentation addressing multiple discrepancies in their letter. No further communication or results have been provided since September 2025, and to our knowledge, the audit has not been concluded.

Allegations of Funds Being “Funneled”

Claims that grant money was funneled through Bear River non-profits (including FFA Alumni or Renaissance) and then paid out to individuals with account access are simply NOT true. Also the community members that give money to the programs is much appreciated but please know that the money given never goes to staff pay or stipends. It goes to the students and the program. So again this is a false statement in the letter.

Comments About Staff/Leadership

The statement suggesting that Mrs. Gouker would be “worse” as Superintendent than Mr. Guensler, if that’s possible does not merit any response given this is just an attack with no facts. However I will say that Mrs. Gouker has not sought the Superintendent position over the years that I have been here. I personally hope she might be willing to serve in this capacity if it were in the district’s best interest following Mr. Guensler’s retirement on June 30, 2026.

Grand Jury Complaint / Nepotism Allegations

Letter states:

It is likely you have discovered by now that contracts favorable to very particular conditions for a select few and generous pay/benefits have bought loyalty in certain circles for the better part of the last 7-10 years. Nepotism and favoritism have been common practice.

Below highlights what we have submitted to the Yuba County Grand Jury as a formal Complaint. We filed this Complaint after receiving advice to do so from a retired judge as well as multiple retired and current superintendents. The Grand Jury will of course determine the scope of their investigation, but we wanted to inform you of the existence of our Complaint on the chance they hadn’t contacted you and you wanted to reach out to them on your own.

Our complaint cited more than 40 violations of Ed Code, Brown Act, CCR, CALPERS/STRS policies, Board Policies, etc....

District Response –

Thank you informing us that you have submitted a formal complaint to the Yuba County Grand Jury. Was it anonymous? We understand you believe contracts, compensation, favoritism, and alleged violations of various laws and policies warrant investigation.

That said, we want to provide the following clarification and context:

Employment of Family Members / “Nepotism” Claims

Wheatland is a small community, and the school district is one of the largest employers in town. As a result, it is not unusual for multiple family members to work in the district, and this has long been the case. The same thing is present at Wheatland High School.

We currently have married couples, children of employees, cousins, and other relatives working here. This is a reality in small towns and does not, by itself, indicate any wrongdoing.

Many people apply to work here and remain employed because of the positive working environment and the competitive pay and benefits the district provides. If the district were as dysfunctional as this group has suggested, it would be reasonable to ask yourself why people continue to apply and choose to stay.

Grand Jury Complaint

Regarding your report to the Grand Jury. We have no concerns about any complaint filed and can back up any accusations with facts. The district is an open book and will cooperate fully if we are contacted. You have made other complaints to the state etc. and each time we have responded to the allegations. However it is my understanding that the Grand Jury will not investigate anonymous complaints.

At this point, we have not received any communication from the Grand Jury, but if we do, we will respond promptly and with transparency to any concerns raised, especially given that many of the accusations being circulated are false or fabricated.

Board Benefits

Letter states:

Board Members receive a more generous benefits package than teachers and staff. They receive more in benefits in 1 year than some paraprofessionals (who aren't allowed enough hours to receive benefits) spending 5.5 hours per day/5 hours per week ever will. The benefits have caused the Board to be self-motivated and driven by selfish reasons. For

years, the Board has been composed of local ranchers and business owners who ran for the position so they could have access to health benefits. Primarily their allegiance is to themselves and to the Superintendent, supporting him and keeping him happy since he has been the one controlling their purse strings. The Board Members with family members/spouses who are employees have been especially loyal. They should all be embarrassed by their conduct and for allowing things to get this far and more needs to be done to expose their lack of action and accountability over the years.

Response -

Thank you for raising these concerns yet again regarding Board Member benefits. While we understand the frustration expressed in your statement, several key claims need clarification and context.

Board Member Benefits

Board Member benefits have been part of Wheatland School District for many, many years and predate my employment as well as any sitting board member. In fact, prior to my arrival there was no cap on Board benefits.

After Superintendent Guensler began his tenure, a cap was established and brought more in line with other employee groups.

The reason the Board cap is currently higher than some other groups is not because of misconduct, favoritism, or “purse-string control,” but because Board Member benefits have received three COLA percentage increases in the last 16 years, while employee groups have received many more COLA opportunities over the years, and those employee groups overwhelmingly chose to apply their COLA increases to salary rather than benefit caps.

That difference in bargaining priorities over time is what produced the current gap—not secret decisions or self-serving manipulation. All increases have been publicly voted on at Board Meetings.

Legality and Ethics

There is nothing illegal or immoral about Board Members receiving health benefits. Many school districts across California provide Board benefits, and this is not unique to Wheatland.

The narrative that Board Members ran for office “only to get health insurance” is speculation and this rhetoric is repeated by the same anonymous group, and it does not represent verified factual information.

Allegations of Self-Motivation and Lack of Accountability

The accusations that the Board has been “self-motivated,” “loyal only to themselves,” or “supporting the Superintendent to protect benefits” are broad statements with no evidence presented.

The district remains committed to transparency, but repeatedly circulating inflammatory claims—especially without documentation or evidence—does not help resolve any real concerns.

Paraprofessional Hours and Benefits

Regarding paraprofessionals:

The paraprofessional job in this district are mostly 5-hour positions and not full-time positions.

Historically, these positions were 3-hours, but the district increased those hours using COVID relief funding, and more importantly the district has not reduced the hours since, even after those funds ended.

Many paraprofessionals choose these hours because they value being part-time and having time off when their children are out of school.

While we understand that some staff may want additional hours, which we do provide through our After School Program, not many take us up on that opportunity.

Additionally, Wheatland’s paraprofessionals are paid competitively to other districts, and the district continues working to maintain competitive compensation.

Bottom Line

Board member benefits are longstanding, capped, and consistent with practices utilized by numerous school districts throughout the state. Assertions that these benefits are the result of corruption, self-dealing, or improper motive are unsupported by any factual evidence.

The benefits at issue were established well before the tenure of the current Board members and the Superintendent and therefore cannot be attributed to their actions or intent.

Opposition to these benefits has been raised periodically over many years by the same group of individuals. While differing opinions may exist regarding the appropriateness of such benefits, the existence of a disagreement does not render the practice improper, unlawful, or unethical.

Likewise, paraprofessional hours were expanded and maintained as a district investment in employees and students—not reduced or withheld for improper reasons.

The district will continue prioritizing transparency, fiscal responsibility, and fair treatment of all employee groups.

Classified Contracts

Letter states:

Classified Contracts - There is a clause in their contracts that allows for them to turn down health benefits for cash-in-lieu monies if they were part-time. This clause was added for a specific few (Bogdanoff, Crabb, Clark and several others). The 2 with board member spouses turned down their benefits in favor of going on their spouse's board benefits. The 3rd is a family member of the superintendent. Both Bogdanoff and Crabb have publicly confirmed they do this, yet their maintenance employee spouses maintain full-time, year-round positions.

District Response:

The classified contract includes language allowing eligible employees to decline district health benefits in exchange for a cash-in-lieu payment. This provision was not created for any specific individuals—it was agreed upon through the proper collective bargaining and negotiation process, just like other contract terms.

In fact, many employee groups across the district have negotiated some form of in-lieu language in their agreements. This is a common and legitimate benefit option for employees who do not need district-provided insurance for any reason, including those who may have coverage through

a spouse or another source. With the exception of the certificated union, all employee groups have some type of in-lieu language in place. Cash-in-lieu does not create additional cost to the district. It simply changes how benefit dollars are distributed—either toward insurance coverage or as a negotiated payment to the employee when coverage is declined.

Claiming this language was put into place for a small group of individuals is inaccurate. Trying to frame it that way misrepresents the negotiated agreement and unfairly targets employees who are using a benefit option that is allowed under the contract.

Waltz

Letter states:

Waltz - She only ran for the Board for the health benefits. As soon as she is age-eligible for Medicare at 65 she will not seek reelection. In her place, her son will run. He is the husband of the "District Nurse" who had that job created for her by her Board Member mother-in-law when their daughter was diagnosed with diabetes. No one at any of the school sites gets better medical attention than her kid and the kids of her friends. Meanwhile, staff are behind on updating TB records, her Health Aides do not like her and she's skipping daily IEP-mandated nurse care in favor of not missing lunch time with her kid. Staff at Lone Tree have stated they do not like having her at their site because she is rude, snide, and lazy. To be honest, all of the school sites are happy when she is not at their site. Her salary is outrageous for a person in her position and unnecessary in a district of this size.

District Response:

The claims being made here are not supported by any facts, and they go far beyond reasonable criticism into personal attacks and speculation.

Stating that Board Member Waltz "only ran for the health benefits" is a false assumption. No one can credibly claim to know anyone's motive, except their own, for running for any office unless that person has personally stated why they are running—otherwise it is just speculation with no factual basis. You obviously do not know Board Member Waltz because she does this job for the betterment of the students and this community that she lives in and supports.

Second, the suggestion that her son is “taking her place” and will run is also speculative. Board seats are not even open yet, and until a candidate files, anything about who is running is guesswork. However I would say that he does run and is elected by the community, he would be a great addition to an already amazing board.

Regarding the district nurse position: districts our size do, in fact, need a district nurse. The nurse’s salary is not “outrageous” or unusual—it is comparable to similar professional roles such as OTs and psychologists, and consistent with what district nurses are paid in other districts. The comments about her child receiving “better medical attention” than other students, or that staff are behind on TB updates, health aides “do not like her,” she is “rude,” “lazy,” or skipping IEP-mandated duties are all subjective, inflammatory statements and lack any evidence.

If there are legitimate concerns about compliance (IEP services, records, staffing), those should be addressed through formal channels with documentation—not through gossip, insults, or attacks on someone’s character.

Bringing a child into the conversation and making comparisons about a child’s medical condition is highly inappropriate and should never be used as ammunition in adult disagreements.

People can disagree on policies and leadership, but spreading personal accusations and unverified claims about staff and board members is not productive and does nothing to support students or the district.

Lastly attacking someone and their job because of a disagreement on the softball field is petty and juvenile. Just my opinion

McDonald

Letter states:

McDonald - When she was hired by her father, it was temporary, and he used that loophole to make the position full-time and simply give it to her. It was never posted. No one else was allowed to interview for it. He hired her when her only experience was working at Yankee Candle.

District Response:

The claim that Ms. McDonald was given a full-time position through a “loophole,” that it was “never posted,” and that “no one else was allowed to interview” is being stated as fact, but it is not supported by what actually occurred.

Ms. McDonald has been a district employee for over 10 years. She initially came in as a sub to be the District Office receptionist because our district fully believes in answering parents phone calls and not allowing a machine to answer and redirect people. Her previous job experience was customer service, which directly aligns with front office receptionist duties.

Over time, as retirements occurred and responsibilities shifted, she moved into accounts payable. When she transitioned from substitute status into the permanent position, I was not involved in that hiring decision. The decision was made through administrative leadership, including HR (Paula Kesterson), the admin executive at the time (Connie Walczak) and Board Member Nikki Crabb.

Additionally, when Melissa Bowles, who was the Accounts Payable person at the time, was on maternity leave, Ms. McDonald stepped up and took on the roll along with her front office responsibilities. So naturally when the position became available, she was a natural fit. We often will promote from within instead of going through a posting process. This is not unusual and an appropriate way to handle openings. The only reason the position was available was because Melissa Bowles was moved to payroll upon a retirement. We did this as well without opening the position. Staff shift based on needs. Your accusations that Ms. McDonald was treated differently are not founded by any facts whatsoever.

I do believe it is fair for people to ask questions about our hiring processes but targeting specific employees personally—especially with exaggerated or misleading claims—crosses the line. Ms. McDonald has done nothing wrong, and by all accounts has been a strong, reliable employee who has supported the district and its families for 10 years. Nothing has been said about her for the past 10 years. Is she my daughter, yes she is, and I am proud of her and the job she does for this district. Stop going after her to come at me. Grow up. It is getting old, and it is unacceptable.

**Guzman's
Letter states:**

Guzman's - Every single rumor you have heard about them is true. That man had no place even keeping his credentials after what he did as principal at Lone Tree, let alone being allowed to keep a teaching position and rise back up to an admin level job. He might not **be a** part of some of the financial dishonesty and shady practices, but he has benefitted all the same, and runs student discipline in a similar fashion {notably disappearing his own daughter's referrals for bullying while throwing the book at her classmates for much lesser infractions}. Don't trust either of them.

District Response:

Statements like "every single rumor you have heard about them is true" are not facts—they are inflammatory accusations with no documentation provided. Repeating rumors as if they are proven truth is irresponsible and unfair, especially when it involves someone's career, credentials, and reputation.

These concerns about the Guzman's by this group have been previously addressed in public. Continuing to recycle the same claims—without any new evidence—serves no constructive purpose other than to attack individuals personally.

The allegation that student discipline is being handled unfairly, including claims about referrals "disappearing" for one student while others are treated more harshly, is a serious accusation backed by no facts. If anyone truly believes something like that is happening, the appropriate action is to report it through formal channels and allow it to be reviewed properly—not to spread it as gossip online or in public conversations.

At the end of the day, whether a small group of critics "trusts" someone is not the measure of their professional standing. The Administrative team, the board, the staff and me, the Superintendent, continue to trust and support both of these employees, and they are regarded within the district as stellar administrators with the best interests of the students, staff and district at the forefront of their daily work.

Former CBO

Letter states:

Former CBO - She had a contract for 60% work from home, yet lived in Florida full-time while a consulting firm was paid generously to do her job. She was hired the same way the supers daughter was hired, without experience and on a temporary basis till he made her job permanent and with a promotion.

District Response:

The claims being made about the former CBO are not accurate and not based on the facts provided. Also I have no idea why this is even relevant given she is not longer employed with the District.

But to give you the facts - There was no contract allowing 60% work-from-home. If someone believes such a contract exists, then the appropriate step is to produce it—otherwise it's an unsupported allegation and a personal attack.

Ms. Minton did not live in Florida while employed here. Ms. Minton lived locally when she was hired—first in Plumas Lake, then she lived on her ex-husband's property. After that, she moved to a rental in Yuba City near Tierra Buena School, and later lived with a friend in a converted garage. She moved to Florida only after she resigned from her position here.

Owning a home in Florida is not the same as living there. She owns a home there because her mother and daughters lived there, but again she did not live there while employed by the district.

If people want to discuss district operations or staffing decisions, that's fair—but repeating claims that are false (work-from-home contract, living in Florida full-time during employment) undermines credibility and turns the conversation into rumor-spreading attacks rather than facts. This entire letter states no facts and only uses rumor-spreading attacks.

Guensler

Letter states:

Guensler - There is something about his contract that does not add up to the pay listed publicly on Transparent California or what he has self-reported on Public Records Requests. We have sought the opinion of other CBOs, Superintendents, and Payroll Techs who can't make sense of the numbers. Former HR Director has confirmed he has many "perks" written into his contract as well as many more that have never been written in - stipend for not refilling the preschool director, maintenance director, and food services director positions, stipends for grants awarded to the district, his master's degree stipend is higher than what principals and teachers receive, he receives funds into a 493b/457 retirement account (other employees have to pay for this themselves), and his STRS is fully funded by the district (when all other employees have to fund a portion on their own). A detailed review of his annual pay is needed.

District Response:

The accusations being made regarding my contract and compensation are not supported by any facts and in fact they are false and inaccurate.

First, as you all know, my contract is publicly posted on the District website and has always been approved in public by the Board.

There is nothing "hidden" in my contract as is being claimed. If someone believes there is an issue, the contract is available for anyone to read and review directly.

Second, the idea that I receive undocumented "perks" or special treatment is inaccurate:

I spoke directly with Paula Kesterson who was our previous HR person and she indicated she has not talked to anyone so saying you spoke to her is another fabrication.

Here are the rest of the facts

Preschool Director stipend/raise: When the Preschool Director position existed back in 2010/11, that position cost the district over \$100,000 per year. When that employee separated from the District, I took over the

leadership of the preschool program to save the District money. The Board, at that time, approved a \$25,000 increase to my salary in order for me to manage the Preschool Program. This resulted in a savings of more than \$75,000 per year to the preschool budget.

Food Service and Maintenance Director duties: When the Food Service and Maintenance Directors both retired, I absorbed both sets of duties and did not receive any additional pay or stipends. This decision continues to save the district over \$200,000 annually.

The claim that the district funds a 403(b) / 457 retirement account for me is completely false. The district does not provide me with any 403(b) or 457 account funding. If I contribute to any such a plan, I do it with my own money, just like other employees.

Finally, the claim that the district pays my entire STRS contribution is also not factual. STRS and PERS contributions are made through a standard shared structure—with contributions from the employee, the district, and the state. The Employer pays 19.10% of creditable earnings to STRS. The Employee pays 10.25% of creditable earnings to STRS. The State pays 10.828% of creditable earnings to STRS. So yes, I pay 100% of my STRS contribution obligation out of my paycheck monthly, the same as everyone else. My check stubs can prove this if need be. This year I paid over \$30,000 of my income for STRS.

If anyone has documentation that contradicts any of this, they should provide it. But continuing to circulate claims that don't match the contract and payroll realities is not a "detailed review"—it's an ongoing attempt to discredit me through misinformation and lies.

Provide the proof or stop with the false accusations. It is getting tiresome.

"New Superintendent"

Letter states:

A new superintendent should hopefully provide opportunities to right the wrongs and set this district in a more positive direction, both financially and in overall atmosphere. The teachers have been so used to getting whatever they ask for in negotiations due to the superintendent's "me too" clause that they have fallen out of touch with how bad things are financially. That man

has been allowed by the Board to bankrupt this district and retire. If actions aren't taken quickly, there won't be time to hold him accountable. What a sad state of affairs for our children and our community.

District Response:

The statement that I have been “allowed to bankrupt the district” and will simply “retire without accountability” is not based in any facts—it is an opinion framed as truth, but it is flat out false. The district is not bankrupt and continues to be reliant on State and Federal Funds like all districts. The district's reserves are still well above the average for other districts our size. All districts in the state have financial ups and downs because state and federal funding has ups and downs. That will never change no matter who is in charge. Also our students do not go without which is something we are very proud of.

I have been held accountable the entire time I have been employed by the district, including through Board oversight, public budget processes, audits, and the same scrutiny every superintendent faces every day.

Repeating accusations without evidence does not make them true, and it does not help move the district forward. It just shows your ignorance on the subject of school district funding.

I have served this district for 16 years and have done so with honor, integrity, and selflessness. Most employees and community members recognize the work I, along with the admin, all staff and the Board have put into supporting students, staff, and the community, even when decisions were difficult or unpopular.

It is fair for anyone to hope that a new superintendent brings positive momentum and improvements—financially and culturally. I hope so too. But that progress will not come from your continued blaming, exaggerating, or spreading false narratives about the outgoing superintendent or other employees and Board Members. It will come from honest conversations, responsible planning, and a shared commitment to doing what is best for kids.

What is truly sad is seeing a small group of people continue to push misinformation, personal attacks, and a pushing false narratives, when the

majority of employees and community members understand the dedication and service I and this Board have given to this district.

FCMAT / YCOE Superintendent

Letter states:

Have you considered involving FCMAT? We took our concerns to them, but they can only act at the request of a Board Member or employee. The YCOE Superintendent can also request their presence but with a child at Bear River, he will most certainly not do that during an election year.

District Response:

FCMAT is absolutely something that can be considered when there are concerns about a district's fiscal health or practices, but it's also important to be accurate about how and when they can become involved.

It is true that FCMAT typically becomes involved at the request of a governing board, county office of education, or district leadership, and they generally don't "step in" solely based on anonymous community complaints. FCMAT is also a for profit organization and charges a fairly large fee to do exactly what the Auditor and County does all year long.

That said, it's important to recognize that the district already has several layers of oversight in place:

The district undergoes annual independent audits, and there have not been negative audits or significant audit findings raising any concerns for the 16 years I have been here.

The County Office of Education reviews and monitors district budgets, and they are specifically tasked with making sure districts remain fiscally solvent and that nothing improper is occurring.

Those two facts matter, because they reflect that the district is not operating without review or accountability.

As for the comments about the YCOE Superintendent—suggesting he would refuse to request FCMAT involvement because he has a child at Bear River or because of election-year politics is speculation and not supported by any facts. If there were legitimate concerns that warranted

action, it is reasonable to believe he would take a serious look regardless of personal circumstances. Obviously, you do not know Superintendent Gregor as he would never look the other way in order to have favors with the district his student attends or for some political reason. He is a man with high morals, and he does his job well.

Letter states to the CBO:

We appreciate you. We see you. We know it's bad. We know how hard your job is right now and we are so blessed to have you here.

District Response:

This ending message is completely inappropriate. It attempts to use the CBO to legitimize a narrative that relies on false accusations and mischaracterizations regarding District leadership. Phrases such as “we see you” and “we know it’s bad” are not expressions of support; they are an effort to manipulate and influence staff.

That approach is rejected by me. Our focus remains on performing our duties professionally and in the best interests of the District.

It’s also important to recognize and respect the new CBO’s role. Her job is to operate professionally, ethically, and transparently, not to be treated as anyone’s “ally” or “weapon” in a conflict or disagreement. If she were to ever identify something illegal, unethical, or improper, then absolutely, she should and would bring that forward through the correct channels. But messages like this blur the line between support, manipulation, and pressure.

Anonymous Signature

Letter states:

“Signed, A Collective of Current & Former Employees”

District Response:

Signing something as “A Collective of Current & Former Employees” without any names attached makes it very difficult to take anything you say seriously. If the concerns are legitimate, specific, and backed by facts, then the people raising them should be willing to stand behind them—especially when the letter includes serious allegations about employees, leadership, and operations. Anonymous claims invite doubt, fuel rumor, and make it

impossible to verify credibility or intent. I find it somewhat funny, but not surprising, that this anonymous group asks questions in their correspondence, but we have no idea who to send the answers too. I am sure that is by design to be able to say you ask but we do not respond.

If individuals truly want accountability and some sort of change, the appropriate path is to bring concerns forward through proper channels with documentation and identified sources. Not anonymous accusations that have no basis except to slander and try to discredit people that work hard for this district and the students.

In Closing

I will be retiring on June 30, and it is my sincere hope that these false and unfounded statements will come to an end so that whoever follows me in this role can begin with a fresh start—without having to navigate misinformation or ongoing negativity directed toward me and others in the District.

While I am certainly frustrated by the continued spread of inaccurate claims, I do not wish to respond in a way that escalates the situation or diminishes the professionalism I have always tried to uphold. Instead, I will simply say this: my door is open, and it has been open throughout my 16 years here. If anyone would like to have an honest, respectful, and productive conversation, I welcome the opportunity to meet and talk. If not, there is little I can do to change minds that are not open to the facts.

I am extremely proud of the time I have served in this District, and to my knowledge, I am the longest-serving Superintendent in District history. Superintendents do not remain in one district for 16 years—and staff do not spend their careers in one district—unless we are doing something right.

I will truly miss being here, and I hope the culture of being a family and working for the right reasons continues to be the way this District operates.

Thank you.