

PLEASE POST - NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

Essex North Shore Agricultural and Technical School District  
**District Policy Subcommittee**

Essex Technical High School  
565 Maple Street  
Hathorne, Massachusetts 01937  
Media Center Conference Room (Upper Level)  
Thursday, December 14, 2017

5:30 p.m.

**APPROVED MINUTES**

**Members Present:** Gene Demsey, Esther Johnson, Jeffrey Delaney, Ed Armstrong, Bill Lannon, Mark Strout, Alexandra Liteplo, W. Lupini/Superintendent

**Others Present:** Sandy Goldstein/Guidance, Shannon Donnelly/Admissions Coordinator, Brad Morgan/Principal

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at: 5:40 pm by: Ms. Liteplo. There is a quorum.

**2. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Strout made the motion to approve the minutes from the October 12, 2017 meeting. Mr. Delaney seconded the motion. All in Favor.

**3. Review By-Laws Governing the Operation of the Essex North Shore Agricultural and Technical School District.**

Ms. Liteplo addressed the group regarding the need to revisit the by-laws and will go section by section. There was discussion from the past minutes, bylaws, goals and the issues that need to be removed or changed. Ms. Liteplo reviewed page one and paragraph one. Part one regards the district name and the seal. None of the language is controversial, but section 2.4 is struck out because the order of sections was switched. She requested group thoughts on this section. Section 2.2 is struck out. It discusses appointments and terms. There was discussion about succession of members.

Dr. Lupini: stated that it has been happening. They will be asking about this.

There has to be some set up of member rotation. It could be revised explaining how the representatives come about. It was not addressed because it may not need to be changed. Maybe there should a sentence at the end of the section regarding representatives and succession?

This should explain exactly how the rotation would continue in the future.

Ms. Teixeira: suggested that the sentence is specific on term lengths.

Mr. Strout made a suggestion of what should be left in or taken out. Strike out the first paragraph and say members serve on a three year basis to preserve institutional history or refer back to the original by-laws.

Ms. Liteplo: questioned the group if they were okay with the suggestion and then brought up vacancies. She feels it is generally correct. We can leave it alone until we know further. She went on to section 2.4 and weighted votes for the school committee.

There was group discussion about sub-committees and weighted votes.

Dr. Lupini: remarked that subcommittees cannot function with weighted votes. Since subcommittees only recommend to the school committee one vote per member works.

Dr. Lupini: stated that this should be for subcommittees or Ad Hoc committees.

There was discussion on how to structure the sentence regarding votes.

Mr. Strout: reminded how the subcommittees vote to bring to the school committee for a full vote.

Ms. Teixeira: brought up one of the sub committees when the committee votes it is a recommendation to the full committee, but what if the vote fails? Does the full committee still get to consider it? Is it in this language?

Mr. Strout: stated that it should be in the language. Reminded of a former vote that did not pass and it never came to the full committee because it was voted down.

Ms. Teixeira: said the by-laws should address votes that pass or fail in subcommittees.

There was discussion on how to write the by-laws and what does not pass in sub committees.

Does the full committee know that a vote failed? Yes, and if they want to revisit the vote they can.

Ms. Teixeira: suggested that when a vote doesn't pass, or does not get a recommendation that the full committee is aware of the vote.

Mr. Strout: suggested that if the subcommittee votes; their vote should be respected by the full committee. We trust the subcommittee to be fair and do their due diligence.

Ms. Liteplo: made suggestions of how the sentence should be structured regarding recommending to the school committee for further action and failed votes. It is important to keep it positive.

There was more discussion on weighted votes and how to describe them in the sentence.

Ms. Liteplo: discussed section 2.5 and feels there is nothing to get rid of.

Ms. Teixeira: suggested that they reword it to add flexibility in case the date needs to be changed.

There was discussion about the superintendent acting as the designee until the chair of the school committee is voted on. There was also discussion on whether to call the position as "chair" or "chairperson"?

Ms. Teixeira questioned Dr. Lupini about what kind of votes have to have  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the vote? Is the  $\frac{2}{3}$  by majority or weighted vote?

Ms. Liteplo moved on to point B. Section B talks about a quorum. She asked if there were any issues with this. The word any is struck out and the capitalization of the committees.

Mr. Strout: suggested that they were talking about weighted votes and the need for clarity if the ex officio can vote or participate in the discussion.

There was discussion on how to word this section and the capitalization of the committees. Also, on how to make a distinction between the committees.

Ms. Liteplo: brought up that a quorum is the same in both.

Ms. Teixeira: made the suggestion to make it two paragraphs.

Ms. Liteplo described subsection C.

Ms. Teixeira: questioned about the attendance of the chair at every meeting and whether the chair can vote?

There was discussion among the group regarding if the ex-officio can vote at all meetings? The school committee has to decide how they want their chair to vote and participate in sub committees.

Ms. Liteplo: questioned if there is any official word on this decision?

There was more discussion and examples given of when an ex officio would vote or not vote.

Mr. Strout: commented that 99% of the time what comes out of the subcommittee goes to the full committee.

Ms. Johnson: told the group that the ex officio should have a vote as a representative of their community.

Ms. Teixeira: questioned why the chairperson should have to give up their right to vote.

Mr. Strout: reminded that the ex officio sits on every subcommittee and has the opportunity to vote at every subcommittee.

Mr. Lannon: stated that the experience the ex officio brings to each subcommittee is valuable.

Dr. Lupini: made suggestions on how to write the voting policy and what to leave in or leave out.

There was more discussion on how to word the paragraph regarding the chair vote.

Mr. Strout: feels that “ex officio” is confusing to most people.

Mr. Delaney: questioned how to designate the sub committees and Ad Hoc committees.

Dr. Lupini: described Ad Hoc committees and standing committees and not using the word “special”.

Ms. Liteplo read back the suggested wording to the group and moved on to section D.

The group felt section D was fine.

Section E is without suggestions.

Ms. Teixeira: questioned what is the secretary?

Dr. Lupini: described what a secretary is and what a recording secretary is.

Mr. Strout: spoke to the difference between secretaries.

There was discussion about the duties of the secretary and recording secretary and where the records are kept.

Ms. Liteplo: questioned if the committee can change this based on Mass General Law?

Ms. Teixeira: described what she does not like about this paragraph and the description of the secretary.

There was discussion of who keeps the minutes and what that means, and the responsibilities of the secretary.

Ms. Liteplo: made the suggestion to contact the MASC regarding the difference between recording secretary and secretary.

Ms. Teixeira: described where the actual minutes are on file and how the public request would be handled.

Mr. Strout: questioned how long the minutes have to be kept on file?

Ms. Liteplo: stated that section E would be left as a question mark. Section F pertains to district treasurer.

Ms. Teixeira: reminded that there was a job description when this position was posted.

Ms. Liteplo moved on to section G and stated it was not controversial.

Section H did have language added to it. There was discussion around the open meeting law.

Ms. Liteplo: described section I and mailing.

Ms. Teixeira questioned what  $\frac{2}{3}$  votes are and what majority vote is? If it can be either do we want to change it?

Ms. Liteplo felt that the sentence regarding special meetings is confusing.

Mr. Strout: explained what he thought the sentence meant between five member and a special chair calling a meeting.

Ms. Teixeira: explained to the group that she feels you don't need the chair's permission if you have a certain amount of members that want a meeting to be held.

Ms. Liteplo: questioned how many committee members are needed to call a special meeting.

There was discussion regarding how many members are needed and the chair's responsibility and how the meeting is called. There was also discussion regarding written or formal request.

Ms. Liteplo: discussed section J and K. She asked if the school committee had a special bulletin board?

There was discussion about where school committee bulletin boards are located. It was felt that the district website would serve as an official bulletin board.

Ms. Teixeira: suggested to check the open meeting law to see if it still contained "bulletin board".

Dr. Lupini: agreed that they check the open meeting law to be sure what is required of a bulletin board.

Mr. Delaney: wondered if the group still needs a section K based on Robert's Rules of Order.

Ms. Liteplo: wondered if it should be stated that the district website is the bulletin board.

Ms. Liteplo read section L to the group and questioned the wording "not inconsistent", and recommended changing not inconsistent to consistent.

Ms. Liteplo: brought up powers and duties and points 1-5.

Dr. Lupini: suggested that the superintendent would have the gavel during the election of the chair.

There was discussion on what language to use regarding the temporary chair.

Ms. Liteplo asked if the group was okay with section 2.7.

Dr. Lupini stated that they would start would start with this section at the next meeting.

**3. *Discussion Items That Were Not Reasonably Anticipated by the Chairperson (M.G.L., Chapter 30A – Section 18-25)***

**4. *Adjourn***

Ms. Liteplo made the motion to adjourn at 7:53pm. Ms. Teixeira seconded the motion.  
All in Favor.

*\*All documents on file in the Superintendent's office.  
Respectfully submitted by the Recording Secretary*

*The listing of matters includes those reasonably anticipated by the Chair in accordance with M.G.L., Chapter 30A, Section 18-25, which may be discussed at the meeting. Not all items listed may in fact be discussed and other items not listed may also be brought up for discussion to the extent permitted by law.*