



THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
ONE ASHBURTON PLACE
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02108

ANDREA JOY CAMPBELL
ATTORNEY GENERAL

(617) 727-2200
www.mass.gov/ago

July 23, 2026

VIA EMAIL ONLY

Ryan Sax
[REDACTED]

RE: Open Meeting Law Complaint

Dear Ryan Sax:

This office received a complaint from you on December 2, 2025,¹ alleging that the Sudbury School Committee (the “Committee”) violated the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §§ 18-25. The complaint was originally filed with the Committee on October 16, and the Committee responded by letter dated November 4. The complaint alleges that the Committee 1) posted insufficient notice of a meeting it held on October 6, 2) failed to allow for legal counsel to review a proposal that was before the Committee, and 3) violated G.L. c. 71. For the following reasons, we decline to review your complaint.

DISCUSSION

The Open Meeting Law was enacted “to eliminate much of the secrecy surrounding the deliberations and decisions on which public policy is based.” Ghiglione v. Sch. Comm. of Southbridge, 376 Mass. 70, 72 (1978). A public body must post notice of every meeting at least 48 hours in advance, not including Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays. G.L. c. 30A, §20(b). Notices must include “a listing of topics that the chair reasonably anticipates will be discussed at the meeting.” Id. The listing of topics shall have sufficient specificity to reasonably advise the public of the issues to be discussed at the meeting. 940 CMR 29.03(1)(b).

Notice of the October 6 meeting included as a topic the establishment of an LGBTQ+ Parent Advisory Council (“PAC”). At the meeting, the Committee discussed and voted to establish the PAC. The complaint alleges that notice of the October 6 meeting was insufficiently specific on the grounds that the vote to establish the PAC was not listed on the notice. Although it is good practice for a notice to specify that a vote will be taken when a vote is anticipated in advance, the Open Meeting Law does not require that the notice separately indicate the

¹ All dates are in 2025, unless otherwise stated.

possibility of a vote. See OML 2022-239;² OML 2015-66.³ It is reasonably foreseeable that a public body may take action and hold a vote following discussion of a topic listed on a meeting notice, even when such meeting notice indicates only a “discussion.” See OML 2022-239; OML 2021-153; OML 2019-36; OML 2017-48; OML 2015-66. Because an allegation that a public body failed to indicate the possibility of a vote on a meeting notice, even if true, would not constitute a violation of the Open Meeting Law, we have declined to review such an allegation. See OML 2026-2. Likewise, we decline to review any such allegation here.

The complaint further alleges that the Committee failed to allow a request for legal counsel to review the LGBTQ+ PAC proposal, and that the Committee exceeded its authority under Committee Policy and G.L. c. 71⁴ when it approved the LGBTQ+ PAC proposal. Even if true, these allegations would not constitute a violation of the Open Meeting Law. The Division of Open Government’s review concerns compliance only with the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §§ 18-25. See OML 2026-80. We have previously declined to review allegations that a public body violated G.L. c. 71. See OML 2023-130; OML 2020-41. Likewise, we decline to review any allegation that the Committee violated G.L. c. 71 here. Moreover, to the extent the complaint alleges the Committee failed to allow a request for the LGBTQ+ PAC proposal to be first reviewed by counsel, we decline to review this allegation as well, as the Open Meeting Law does not govern counsel’s role in a public body’s actions.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, we decline to review your complaint. We now consider this matter closed. This declination does not address any other complaints that may be pending with the Committee or with our office. Please feel free to contact our office at (617) 963-2540 if you have any questions regarding this letter.

Sincerely,



Matthew Lindberg
Assistant Attorney General
Division of Open Government

Assisted by Ian Harvey, Legal Intern

² Open Meeting Law determinations may be found at the Attorney General’s website, <https://www.mass.gov/the-open-meeting-law>.

³ We note that notice of the October 6 meeting does list a “Possible Vote For Liaison Assignment” and “Discussion/Action” within the topic of the LGBTQ+ PAC.

⁴ Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 71 is the primary statutory framework governing public schools within the Commonwealth. Chapter 71 establishes foundations and obligations of towns, school committees, and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education with respect to the operation, governance, staffing, curriculum, and student welfare of public schools. See G.L. c. 71, §§1-101.

cc: Karen Jones; Chair, Sudbury School Committee (via email: karyn_jones@sudbury.k12.ma.us)
Jennifer F. King, Esq. (via email: Jennifer.King@VDHBoston.com)
Sudbury School Committee (via email: school-committee@sudbury.k12.ma.us)
Sudbury Town Clerk (via email: townclerk@sudbury.ma.us)

This determination was issued pursuant to G.L. c. 30A, § 23(c). A public body or any member of a body aggrieved by a final order of the Attorney General may obtain judicial review through an action filed in Superior Court pursuant to G.L. c. 30A, § 23(d). The complaint must be filed in Superior Court within twenty-one days of receipt of a final order.