

CAMERON R-1 SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION
FORMAL PRE-MEETING SUBMISSION

Submitted in Advance of the Regular Board Meeting

June 16, 2026

Submitted by: Heath Gilbert

Date: June 15, 2026

Re: Documented Pattern of Retaliation by Board President Andi Lockridge — Request for Board Investigation and Corrective Action

I. PURPOSE OF THIS SUBMISSION

This document is submitted to provide additional information that Mr. Gilbert was unable to include in his request to address the Board of Education at the June 16, 2026 regular board meeting. The incidents described below are indirectly related to that request and are being brought to the board's attention because, taken together, they indicate a pattern of willful and intentional retaliation in defiance of board policy.

The two incidents documented here are factually separate and must be evaluated independently of one another:

- The May 2026 incident concerns the denial of Mr. Gilbert's public comment request on the basis of a 'viewpoint neutral requirement' — a justification that does not exist in board policy, does not appear on the supplemental sign-up form, and was never explained when repeatedly requested.
- The June 2026 incident concerns the initial placement of Mr. Gilbert's public comment in executive session rather than open session, and the circumstances surrounding that placement and the subsequent revision to the agenda.

These are separate events with separate facts. They are presented together solely to document the broader pattern of conduct — a pattern that, cumulatively, has had the effect of chilling Mr. Gilbert's First Amendment right to petition his government.

It should be noted that prior complaints regarding separate incidents of denied public comment have previously been submitted to the board secretary and, subsequently, to the district's compliance officer. Those prior complaints are distinct from the two incidents documented in this submission. They are referenced here because they establish a track record of repeated policy violation and intentional retaliation that predates and contextualizes the incidents described below. Mr. Gilbert initially directed these complaints to the board secretary in an effort to obtain compliance with policy. It was only after it became apparent that those efforts would not produce results that formal complaints were submitted to the compliance officer. Those prior complaints have likely not been transmitted to individual board members, and this document is intended to serve as direct notice to the board of their existence.

II. INCIDENT ONE: DENIAL OF PUBLIC COMMENT — MAY 2026 BOARD MEETING

A. Compliance with Policy C-140-P

Prior to the May 2026 board meeting, Heath Gilbert completed every requirement necessary to address the Board of Education as a member of the public, including:

- Submission of the request at least five (5) days in advance of the meeting, as required by Policy C-140-P;
- Provision of all information required under Policy C-140-P;
- Completion and submission of the district's supplemental sign-up form — a form which has not been approved by the Board of Education and does not appear in board policy — prior to the arbitrary deadline communicated by the board secretary.

Despite full compliance with every stated requirement, Mr. Gilbert was not placed on the agenda and was denied the opportunity to address the board. He received no communication from Board President Lockridge — or from anyone acting on her behalf — informing him that his request had been denied or explaining why. As discussed in Section II-D, that failure of notification is itself a violation of board policy.

B. The 'Viewpoint Neutral' Pretext

When Mr. Gilbert inquired as to the reason for his exclusion, the explanation provided was a vague reference to a 'viewpoint neutral requirement.' This explanation is legally and factually deficient for the following reasons:

- There is no 'viewpoint neutral requirement' imposed on members of the public seeking to address a governmental body. Viewpoint neutrality is a constitutional constraint on the government, not on the speakers addressing it.
- The supplemental sign-up form that Mr. Gilbert completed contains no reference to any viewpoint neutral requirement.
- No written policy of the Cameron R-1 School District imposes such a requirement on public speakers.
- When Mr. Gilbert repeatedly requested a specific explanation of what 'viewpoint neutral requirement' he allegedly failed to meet, no answer was ever provided.

The failure to provide a definitive, policy-based reason for the exclusion — when compliance or non-compliance with a legitimate requirement would be easy to document — strongly suggests the true reason was discriminatory or retaliatory in nature. A decision-maker acting on prejudice toward Mr. Gilbert's known viewpoints, rather than applying neutral criteria, would produce exactly this result. The invention of standards that do not exist in policy — applied without notice, without explanation, and without any meaningful opportunity to comply — is precisely the kind of conduct that chills speech. When a citizen cannot know in advance what is required of him, or why he was excluded after meeting every stated requirement, the natural result is uncertainty about whether participation is worth attempting at all.

The subject matter of Mr. Gilbert's request provides an additional basis for that conclusion. Mr. Gilbert sought to address the board regarding a current board member who allegedly disclosed

to a member of the public information about a district employee — information that would have been available only to a board member and that in all likelihood originated in executive session. That board member named the employee specifically and stated definitively that policy violations had occurred. Mr. Gilbert has a record documenting this and had expressed his intent to share it with the board. A decision-maker aware of the content of that request would have independent reason to prevent it from reaching the board — a reason entirely separate from viewpoint, but equally improper as a basis for exclusion.

C. Policy Remedy Not Honored — Automatic Carry-Forward Requirement

Policy C-140-P contains an explicit carry-forward requirement. Where a resident's agenda item cannot be heard at the scheduled meeting, the policy provides that it 'will be placed on the agenda of the next subsequent regularly scheduled meeting.' Rule 2 of that same policy further provides that when a requested item is delayed, 'the delayed agenda item will be moved to the next regularly scheduled meeting.' Rule 3 assigns responsibility directly to the Board President, stating that she 'will make the decision on whether to delay or refuse an agenda item and will communicate that decision to the resident and the other board members.'

This carry-forward obligation is not discretionary. The policy does not require a resident to ask for it. It is an automatic requirement triggered by the delay itself. Beginning in or around January 2025, the district failed — repeatedly — to honor this requirement. Mr. Gilbert's requests were not carried forward to subsequent meetings as policy mandates. As detailed in Section II-D below, Mr. Gilbert has never received any communication from Board President Lockridge notifying him of a denial or the reason for it, as Rule 3 explicitly requires.

With respect to the May 2026 denial specifically: Mr. Gilbert met every stated requirement for public comment. Under the plain language of Policy C-140-P, the district was obligated to place his item on the June 2026 agenda. It did not. That failure is an independent and willful violation of board policy — one that required no request from Mr. Gilbert to trigger, because the policy imposed the obligation on the district automatically. It is this pattern of failures — the district's repeated refusal to carry requests forward as required — that is the subject of the prior separate complaints submitted to the board secretary and the compliance officer and referenced in Section I of this document. Each refusal compounded the chilling effect: not only was Mr. Gilbert denied in the moment, he was denied the policy-mandated path to try again.

D. Repeated Violation of Rule 3 — Failure to Notify Resident of Denial

Rule 3 of Policy C-140-P imposes a specific and unambiguous obligation on the Board President: she 'will make the decision on whether to delay or refuse an agenda item and will communicate that decision to the resident and the other board members.'

Heath Gilbert has never once received notification from Board President Lockridge — or from anyone acting on her behalf — that his request to address the board was denied, delayed, or refused. He has never been informed of the reason for any such denial. In every instance, Mr. Gilbert learned he had been excluded only by discovering his absence from the posted agenda. No explanation accompanied that discovery. No communication followed it.

Whether Board President Lockridge communicated her decisions to other board members is not known to Mr. Gilbert and is not asserted here. That is a matter the board itself is in a position to investigate. What is known, and what is documented, is that the notification obligation to the resident has never been met. Every denial without that required notification to Mr. Gilbert is a

discrete and independent violation of Rule 3 — separate from, and in addition to, whatever violation is represented by the denial itself.

The board is asked to determine how many times Board President Lockridge made a decision to delay or refuse Mr. Gilbert's agenda requests, and in how many of those instances the required notification to Mr. Gilbert was provided. Mr. Gilbert's answer is zero.

The practical consequence of this total absence of communication cannot be overstated. Not knowing whether a request was denied, not knowing why, and having no explanation to respond to or correct left Mr. Gilbert in a state of perpetual uncertainty about his standing to participate. That uncertainty — the product of Board President Lockridge's failure to fulfill a basic, written policy obligation — directly contributed to the chilling of Mr. Gilbert's speech. A citizen who is never told why he was excluded, and who has no way to know what if anything he could do differently, is a citizen who has been effectively, if not explicitly, discouraged from trying again.

III. INCIDENT TWO: AGENDA MANIPULATION — JUNE 2026 BOARD MEETING

A. Sequence of Events

The following sequence of events occurred in connection with the June 2026 board meeting agenda and is documented with screenshots attached as Exhibits A-1 through A-4 and an email attached as Exhibit B:

- The initial posting of the June 2026 board meeting agenda listed an unnamed member of the public as scheduled to address the board in executive session. No corresponding public comment by Mr. Gilbert was listed in the open session agenda. (See Exhibits A-1 and A-2: June 2026 Agenda, Friday version.)
- Mr. Gilbert filed a formal complaint regarding this arrangement on Friday, June 12, 2026, following the agenda posting.
- Following that complaint, the agenda was revised: the unnamed individual was removed from the executive session listing, and Mr. Gilbert was added to the open session agenda. (See Exhibits A-3 and A-4: June 2026 Agenda, Saturday revised version.)
- Also on June 13, 2026, Board Secretary Kelly Walker sent Mr. Gilbert an email stating: 'Your request has not been denied. You will speak to the board in Open Session under Patron Agenda Items.' (See Exhibit B: Email from Board Secretary Kelly Walker, June 13, 2026.)

Mr. Gilbert draws the following conclusion from the board secretary's response: the email does not state that Mr. Gilbert was absent from the agenda and has now been added. It states that his request 'has not been denied' — language that is a direct response to the implicit accusation that it had been. If the executive session listing had been an unrelated individual and Mr. Gilbert simply had no placement on the agenda, the natural response would have been to explain that and confirm his addition. Instead, the response defends against a denial. That choice of language strongly supports the conclusion that the unnamed executive session listing was Mr. Gilbert's request, routed to closed session rather than open session.

Mr. Gilbert acknowledges that the district may offer a different explanation. He does not assert this conclusion as established fact — he presents it as the most reasonable inference from the documented sequence of events and the specific language of the board secretary's response. The board is asked to investigate and determine what actually occurred.

B. Concerns Regarding Executive Session Placement

Board members are not identified in Missouri's open meetings law as parties whose conduct may be shielded from public discussion in a closed session. The district's own policy does not identify complaints against a board member as a basis for executive session. There is no apparent policy basis for routing a member of the public's complaint about a board member's conduct to executive session rather than the open meeting.

Mr. Gilbert's complaint — the subject of his public comment request — is directed at Board President Lockridge's conduct in her official capacity as a board officer. If there was no concern about the nature of the complaint, there would be no reason to place it anywhere other than the open session, where public comment has always been heard.

The board secretary's own words — 'your request has not been denied' — confirm that Mr. Gilbert's request was recognized and active at the time the agenda was posted. The question of where that request was placed, and by whom, goes directly to whether the executive session listing was an error, a deliberate decision, or something else entirely. That determination belongs to the board.

The initial placement in executive session, followed by its removal after Mr. Gilbert's formal objection and the board secretary's clarifying email, raises questions the board should investigate: who made the decision to place the item in executive session, on what basis, and whether that decision was connected to the content of Mr. Gilbert's complaint against Board President Lockridge.

IV. DOCUMENTED PATTERN OF DENIAL UNDER BOARD PRESIDENT LOCKRIDGE

The incidents described above are not isolated. Mr. Gilbert has been repeatedly denied the opportunity to address the Board of Education under the leadership of Board President Andi Lockridge. Each instance has been:

- Documented by Mr. Gilbert at the time it occurred;
- Challenged in writing as inconsistent with district policy;
- Reported to the board secretary and, subsequently, to the district's compliance officer by formal complaint.

To Mr. Gilbert's knowledge, no response to those complaints has been provided that offers a legitimate, policy-based justification for any of the denials. The pattern is consistent with a decision-maker who has exercised discretionary authority over agenda placement to suppress or punish speech she finds objectionable — an exercise of authority that is retaliatory and viewpoint-discriminatory in effect, if not in stated intent. The cumulative result of this pattern — shifting requirements, invented standards, unexplained exclusions, and ignored remedies — is a textbook

chilling effect on First Amendment activity. That effect is not merely theoretical. It is documented in the record.

Mr. Gilbert is also aware that at least one other community resident, Dan Landi, has experienced similar frustrations in attempting to address the board under Board President Lockridge's leadership — including a comparable lack of communication and response regarding his requests. The board is asked to investigate whether the treatment documented in this submission is limited to Mr. Gilbert and Mr. Landi, which would further support a conclusion of targeted retaliation, or whether it extends to other members of the public as well. If the latter, the problem is not retaliation against specific individuals — it is a systemic failure of the Board President to administer public comment in accordance with policy, affecting the entire community's access to its elected representatives.

C. Measurable Decline in Public Participation Following Form Implementation

Prior to December 2024, Heath Gilbert addressed the Cameron R-1 Board of Education at nearly every regularly scheduled meeting for approximately two years. His participation was consistent, timely, and conducted in full compliance with the requirements that existed at the time. The board's own agenda records will confirm this frequency.

In December 2024, the district began requiring use of a supplemental sign-up form as a condition of addressing the board. That form has never been approved by the Board of Education, does not appear in board policy, and has been enforced inconsistently and with requirements that shift without notice or policy basis. In the approximately twelve months following the form's introduction — December 2024 through December 2025 — Mr. Gilbert successfully addressed the board on only three to four occasions — a dramatic and documentable decline from his prior pattern of near-monthly participation.

Mr. Gilbert does not attribute this decline to a loss of interest or a lack of topics to raise. He attributes it directly to the confusion, unpredictability, and repeated unexplained denials that have accompanied the form's implementation and enforcement. When a citizen cannot determine what is required of him, cannot obtain a straight answer when he believes he has complied, and cannot rely on the policy remedy he is owed when he is denied, the rational response is to stop trying. That is not a choice made freely. It is a choice made under compulsion — the compulsion of a process deliberately or negligently designed to discourage participation.

The board's agenda archives are the authoritative record of this pattern. Mr. Gilbert requests that the board review those records as part of any investigation into the matters raised in this submission.

V. REQUESTS FOR BOARD ACTION

Mr. Gilbert respectfully requests that the Board of Education take the following actions:

- Direct that an independent investigator from outside the district be retained to conduct a thorough investigation into the conduct described in this submission. The board's ability to investigate this matter impartially is not assumed. If Board President Lockridge communicated her reasons for denying Mr. Gilbert's requests to other board members —

and if any of those reasons were pretextual, policy-deficient, or otherwise illegitimate — then board members who accepted those explanations without question may bear some degree of responsibility for the resulting pattern of conduct. The board cannot credibly investigate itself under those circumstances. An outside investigator, with no reporting relationship to the district and no interest in the outcome, is the only means by which a credible and impartial determination can be made. Upon completion, the findings of that investigation shall be released in full as a public record, available to any member of the community who requests it. The public has a right to know the outcome of an investigation into the exercise of public authority over a citizen's constitutional rights;

- Vote immediately to have the Board Vice President assume the duties and responsibilities of the Board President on an interim basis, for the duration of the outside investigation and until a determination has been made as to whether Board President Lockridge's conduct violated board policy. This is not a finding of wrongdoing. It is a prudent and necessary precautionary measure to protect the integrity of the investigation. So long as Board President Lockridge retains authority over agenda placement and public comment decisions, she remains in a position to continue the conduct alleged here — and in a position to influence the very process the investigation will examine;
- Formally request and review all written complaints previously submitted to the board secretary and to the district's compliance officer by Heath Gilbert regarding denial of public comment and related retaliation, recognizing that complaints were directed to the board secretary first in an effort to obtain policy compliance, and to the compliance officer only after those efforts did not produce results;
- Direct the outside investigator to specifically examine the May 2026 denial, the June 2026 agenda matters, all prior documented instances of denial, and all communications between Board President Lockridge and other board members or district staff regarding Mr. Gilbert's requests to address the board;
- Determine the scope of the conduct described in this submission — specifically, whether the denial of public comment and failure to provide required notifications under Rule 3 has been limited to Heath Gilbert and Dan Landi, or whether other members of the public have been subjected to the same treatment, and report those findings to the community;
- Investigate whether Board President Lockridge complied with Rule 3 of Policy C-140-P in each instance where a resident's request to address the board was denied or delayed — specifically, whether she communicated that decision to the resident and to other board members as the policy requires, and identify each instance in which that notification was not provided;
- Determine whether Board President Lockridge exercised decision-making authority over agenda placement in any of these instances, and if so, whether that authority was exercised in a viewpoint-discriminatory or retaliatory manner;
- Take appropriate corrective action, up to and including the removal of Andi Lockridge from her position as Board President, in light of the documented pattern of conduct;
- Conduct a formal review of Policy C-140-P and the supplemental public comment sign-up form currently in use, with the specific objective of identifying all instances in which the form's requirements, deadlines, or enforcement practices conflict with or are unsupported by the written policy. The form and the policy must mirror one another. Where they are presently in opposition, the form must be brought into alignment with

board-approved policy — or the policy must be formally amended through the proper board process before any form purporting to enforce it may be used;

- Implement procedural safeguards to ensure that agenda placement decisions for public comment are made pursuant to documented, board-approved criteria and are not subject to unilateral discretionary override by the board president;
- Issue a public apology from Board President Lockridge to Heath Gilbert and to any other members of the public who were subjected to the same conduct documented in this submission; and
- Obtain from Board President Lockridge's successor a stated, public commitment that the retaliatory and discriminatory practices documented here will not be repeated, and that all members of the public will have their rights under Policy C-140-P honored without exception.

VI. CONCLUSION

The First Amendment protects a citizen's right to petition his government — including the right to criticize those in positions of public authority. Repeated denial of access to public comment, grounded not in neutral policy criteria but in a decision-maker's distaste for the content of a speaker's criticism, is not a procedural irregularity. It is a constitutional violation.

The conduct documented in this submission also implicates a distinct and equally serious First Amendment concern: the chilling of protected speech. A chilling effect occurs when government conduct — even short of an outright prohibition — makes the exercise of a constitutional right so uncertain, so unpredictable, or so burdensome that a reasonable person is deterred from attempting it. The government need not silence a speaker directly. It is sufficient that it create conditions under which a speaker cannot know whether his participation will be permitted, cannot obtain a straight answer about why he was excluded, and cannot rely on the remedies his own government's policy promises him.

That is precisely what has occurred here. Mr. Gilbert has been subjected to requirements that do not exist in policy, denied explanations he was entitled to receive, refused the carry-forward remedy policy mandates, and forced to file formal complaints simply to be placed on an agenda he had every right to appear on. The impact is not abstract. Before the supplemental form was introduced in December 2024, Mr. Gilbert addressed this board at nearly every meeting for approximately two years. In the twelve months that followed — December 2024 through December 2025 — he has done so only three to four times. That before-and-after record — verifiable in the board's own agenda archives — is the chilling effect made visible. Each individual denial might be characterized by the district as an isolated administrative decision. Taken together, they describe a pattern that would cause any reasonable person to question whether addressing this board is worth the effort — and that question, itself, is the constitutional harm.

Mr. Gilbert has pursued every available administrative remedy in good faith. He requests that the board exercise its independent oversight authority to address this matter fully and transparently — not only to remedy the specific violations documented here, but to restore the conditions under which any member of this community can exercise their right to address their elected representatives without fear, confusion, or manufactured obstruction.

Respectfully submitted,

Heath Gilbert

June 15, 2026

Exhibit A-1 & A-2: June 2026 Board Meeting Agenda (Friday posting)

Exhibit A-3 & A-4: June 2026 Board Meeting Agenda (Saturday revised posting)

Exhibit B: Email from Board Secretary Kelly Walker, June 13, 2026