

2026

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE MTA STANDING RULES

Name of Proposed Amendment: Rule 6: Order of Business and Debate, Sections 6 and 15

PRESENT TEXT:	PROPOSED AMENDED TEXT:
<p>Indicate Rule Number and Section/s:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">RULE 6: Order of Business and Debate, Sections 6 and 15</div> <p><i>Cite here all articles, sections, and lines of the Standing Rules that are to be changed or affected.</i></p> <p>Section 6. Delegates who wish to speak or make a motion shall follow this color-coded system: Yellow for a question or point of order, Green to speak in favor, and Red to speak against. Points of order pertaining to a violation of the rules shall also be recognized and shall take priority over other matters. No member shall speak in debate more than twice to the same question during the same meeting, nor longer than two (2) three (3) minutes at one time, unless permission is granted by majority vote of the meeting(s). No delegate shall speak using a yellow card position for more than one (1) minute at one time unless permission is granted by majority vote of the meeting(s). Upon recognition, all delegates shall identify themselves by stating their name and local association, student or retired member. A delegate debating a motion may not conclude their remarks by moving to close debate.</p> <p>Section 16 Points of personal privilege shall not be recognized until the conclusion of the adopted order of business.</p>	<p>Indicate Rule Number and Section/s:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 5px;">RULE 6: Order of Business and Debate, Sections 6 and 15</div> <p><i>Use this column for your proposed language: Underline amended or added language. Enclose in parentheses language to be deleted. Indicate the location of completely new language.</i></p> <p>Rule 6</p> <p>Section 6: Delegates who wish to speak or make a motion shall follow this color-coded system: Yellow for a question or point of order, Green to speak in favor, and Red to speak against. Points of order pertaining to a violation of the rules shall also be recognized and shall take priority over other matters.</p> <p>Section 16: Points of personal privilege shall not be recognized until the conclusion of the adopted order of business, <u>except when necessary to address conditions affecting a member's ability to hear, be heard, or participate safely in the proceedings.</u></p>

Impact Statement

Briefly state what would be the result of your change, addition, or deletion:

Delegates would have a clear understanding that all points of order will be recognized and take priority over other matters. Delegates' ability to participate in the meeting would not be compromised by an inability to hear or be heard, or by issues of personal safety, as such circumstances would be able to be addressed immediately.

Give rationale for your change, addition, or deletion:

Regarding Rule 6, Section 6: A Point of Order is always a violation of rules, and is always meant to be heard immediately, as it is addressing an issue that cannot wait. Saying that only points of order that pertain to a violation of rules will take priority over other matters is confusing and only serves to confuse delegates. A delegate may wonder: is a person who is breaking group norms violating the rules? Are group norms rules? What about an NBI that I think conflicts with policy - is that breaking rules though? Can I be recognized ahead of others and call it out of order? You see, having extraneous language does nothing but confuse people and make it harder for them to participate to their fullest capacity in this assembly. Therefore we need to strike out what we don't need. A point of order is a violation of rules - don't add extra words that will just make things murky.

(continued on reverse)

Regarding Rule 6, Section 16: A Point of Personal Privilege exists for urgent moments when a member's ability to participate is being compromised—when they can't hear, are being targeted, or face conditions that affect their dignity on this floor. These are not optional interruptions; they are safeguards of equal participation. This rule would force members to sit silently while their rights are violated. Procedure should protect people, not silence them. If someone's access, safety, or ability to participate is at stake, delay is denial. Vote to amend his Rule to allow for exceptions in these cases.

Submitter:

Full Name: Elizabeth Goldberg

Address: 20 Wendell Street, North Providence, RI 02911

Phone: 401-275-3453

Email: egoldberg@bod.massteacher.org

Member ID#: 2930550

Local Assoc: Norwood Teachers Association

Fill in all fields, save the PDF and then email to:

MTAGovernance@massteacher.org