

Possible Timeline for Revision of Article II
Assuming that annual GA's continue

Date	Action	By	Vote Required	Comment	Argument for this Approach	Alternate Approach	Argument for Alternate Approach
April 2010	Amendment to Article XV BOT placed on GA agenda		Majority	Do we have until April, or must this be voted in January?			
June 2010	Amendment to Article XV GA receives initial approval		Majority	15.1 is a C bylaw, so approval by two GA's is required			
June 2011	Amendment to Article XV GA receives final approval		Two-thirds				
February 2012	Proposal to begin process to amend Article II placed on GA agenda	Current list (see 15.2): BOT, GAPC, Comm on Appraisal, 15 congregations, or district	See 15.2	Is any amendment language needed at this stage, or is this just a procedural step?	Either option should be possible; there may be a short, specific revision that is being proposed, or alternately, just a proposal to start the study commission process.		
June 2012	Motion to refer proposal to Study Commission (SC)	GA	Majority	If Article II language has been proposed, is it subject to amendment? By what vote?	If language is being considered, delegates should have a chance, by two-thirds vote, to amend it.	No amendments at this stage	No reason to spend time on language before SC begins its work.
June 2012	Motion to dispense with SC	GA	Four-fifths	Should a three-fourths margin be sufficient? Regardless of the margin needed, what will happen if this vote prevails? Presumably, if there is to be no SC process, GA must be considering some specific language, which will then receive preliminary approval at this GA, subject to whatever amendment procedures are in place for first-year consideration of a proposal.	We shouldn't be hasty about amending Article II; 4/5ths vote allows quick action if almost everyone agrees a change is needed; otherwise, SC approach should be used.	Three-fourths vote	Three-fourths vote should be sufficient to make a change in Article II.
October 2012	SC appointed	BOT	Majority				
June 2013	Workshops on possible Article II changes held at GA	Study Commission					
February 2014	Draft Article II language placed on GA agenda	Study Commission	Majority				
June 2014	Committee of the whole to consider changes to draft language	GA	Majority	Result will still be a draft, for further consideration by SC, BOT, and subsequent GA's	This step may alleviate concern that GA delegates are not part of the process		

Possible Timeline for Revision of Article II
Assuming that annual GA's continue

Date	Action	By	Vote Required	Comment	Argument for this Approach	Alternate Approach	Argument for Alternate Approach
October 2014	Proposal to amend Article II submitted to BOT	Study Commission	Majority	Should SC have longer (3 years instead of 2?) to complete its work?	Two years is plenty of time	Allow up to three years.	Better to give SC discretion to complete work in either 2 or 3 years.
November 2014	Review of SC proposal	UUA counsel					
January 2015	Approval (including consideration of amendments) of SC proposal	BOT	Majority	BOT cannot reject proposal and thus end the process. If BOT amends proposal, the original SC proposal appears on GA agenda along with BOT's proposed amendment.	SC process should be respected, and SC's work should be presented to GA.	BOT can reject SC proposal. If BOT amends proposal, only the BOT-amended version appears on GA agenda.	The board directs and oversees the work of the SC and, therefore, has the obligation to ensure that the work of the SC is appropriate, sufficient and legal.
February 2015	Amendments to SC proposal (or BOT amendment to it) submitted to GAPC for printing in Agenda	15 congregations or a district		Should others be allowed to submit amendments?	No	Yes, any congregation should be able to submit an amendment.	Why make this so restrictive? As long as advance notice is given in this way, what is the harm?
June 2015	Consideration of amendments to SC proposal or BOT amendment that were printed in GA agenda	GA	Two-thirds	What majority is required?	SC/BOT language should be given considerable weight, requiring a 2/3rds vote to change.	Simple majority vote on amendments printed in agenda	Why not allow majority rule if advance notice has been given?
June 2015	Consideration of amendments from the floor to SC proposal or BOT amendment, or to amendments that were in the agenda	GA	n/a	No floor amendments permitted.	Allowing consideration of language that delegates haven't seen before they get to GA undercuts the entire SC process.	Yes, floor amendments should be allowed, subject to a two-thirds vote.	We need some other vehicle, besides the "committee of the whole" process at the start of the SC's work, to get important ideas included in a way that drafters must pay attention to. The Commission on Appraisal held hearings in Ft. Lauderdale, but some delegates felt that their input was ignored when the final language was drafted.
June 2015	Vote on BOT amendment (if any) to SC proposal	GA	Majority	This vote is to accept the BOT's proposed changes to the SC proposal.			
June 2015	Initial approval of proposal to amend Article II, as amended	GA	Majority				
June 2016	Final approval of proposal to amend Article II	GA	Two-thirds	No amendments may be considered.	Too hard to distinguish between substantive and non-substantive. Delegates and congregations should know exactly what is being voted on in advance.	Non-substantive amendments permitted.	If some minor language problem is noted that everyone agrees should be fixed, why not allow a change?