

CNH Kiwanis Realignment Committee
Meeting Agenda

May 1, 2017
6:00PM

Type of Meeting: Teleconference

Meeting Facilitator: Rich Fuller

Invitees: Committee Members, et al

- I. Call to order
- II. Roll call
- III. Welcome/Etiquette for teleconference
- IV. Open issues
 - a) Recommendation for CNH Board on 103
 - b) Recommendation updates for CNH Board on any additional new Divisional Realignment
 - c) Recommendation updates for CNH Board on any current Divisional Realignment
- V. Adjournment

103. Committee on Realignment

103.1 Function

To study the boundaries and sizes of the divisions and regions which make up the California-Nevada-Hawaii District and recommend to the Board of Trustees any necessary changes in boundaries, which will create new or realigned divisions or regions so as to conform to the Bylaws and Policies of the Cal-Nev-Ha District. Geographical factors and number of members should be taken into consideration. (3/08)

103.2 Composition

The Realignment Committee shall be composed of from ten to sixteen members including the Governor, Governor-elect and the District Secretary. Of the remaining members, no less than four members shall have served on the Realignment Committee within the last two years and one must be a Trustee. The Governor-elect shall make the selection of the chair from the current committee. (3/08)

103.3 Term and Appointment

The Realignment Committee shall be appointed by the Governor-elect for one year term beginning on the following October 1.

103.4 Meetings

The Realignment Committee shall function during the entire year and will meet at such time and place as the Chair of the committee may designate, with a minimum of one (1) meeting per administrative year.

103.5 Proposals

Prior to submitting a change or realignment of divisions or regions in the District to the Board of Trustees, the Committee on Realignment shall study and consider the following factors: (3/08)

A. The number of clubs in each division or divisions in each region and its membership resulting from the proposed realignment. However, the minimum number of Kiwanis clubs a division shall be nine or the minimum membership shall be 250 or 9 clubs. (3/08)

B. Relative strength or weakness of each club or division resulting from the proposed alignment. (3/08)

C. Past participation of each club or division in proposed realignment in division, District and International functions. (3/08)

~~D. Past participation of each club in division leadership or each division in regional leadership. (3/08^[MF1])~~

103.6 Preference for Realignment

To retain a reasonable number of divisions and regions in the District, and to minimize the financial cost incurred by the District for each division and region that exists, preference will be given to the realignment of clubs within existing divisions rather than creating a new division or region. (3/08)

Should there be a break in the numerical order of divisions or regions in the Cal-Nev-Ha District and a new division or region is created, then the new division or region shall be assigned the lowest division or region number not presently used in the numerical structure. (3/08)

103.7 Effective Dates of Changes for Realignment of Divisions or Regions

A. Any change which creates a new division or region, or realignment of clubs or divisions with existing divisions or regions shall become effective as set forth by the Board of Trustees, but no sooner than the October 1st following the approval of such realignment. (3/08)

B. After the approval of a new division, the Office of Lieutenant Governor-elect shall be filled for the next administrative year. Such election shall be in accordance with the Bylaws, Article XIII, and the election shall be by the representatives of the clubs in the new division. Similarly, the representatives of the clubs in the division to be retained shall elect their Lieutenant Governor-elect. The chair for such conference shall be the Immediate Past Lieutenant Governor who is a member of one of the clubs in the new division or the division to be retained.

C. After the approval of a new region, the Office of Trustee from said region shall be filled for the next administrative year. Such election shall be in accordance with the Bylaws, Article XI, and the election shall be by the representatives of the clubs in the new region. The chair for such conference shall be elected by the current Lieutenant Governors of the region. (3/08)

103.8 Cause for Dissolution and Realignment (1/00)

A. Any time the membership of a division falls below nine (9) clubs ~~and~~^[MF2] or less than two hundred and fifty (250) members, it shall be considered cause for dissolving and realigning that division.

B. When a division does not meet the minimum membership requirements as provided in subsection A above, the Realignment Committee shall cause a notice to that effect to be sent to the Governor with a copy to the current Lieutenant Governor of that division. Such notice shall contain a provision advising said division has been placed in a

probationary status for a period of six (6) months, commencing with the date of the notice. At the end of the said six (6) months, if the membership of said division has not been brought either to nine (9) clubs or two hundred and fifty (250) members, the committee shall recommend to the District Board of Trustees a realignment plan for said division.

C. If at any time during the administrative year a region does not have a Trustee or Trustee-designate, it may be considered cause for dissolving or realigning that region. (3/08)

D. If at any time during the administrative year a division does not have a Lieutenant Governor-elect, it may be considered cause for dissolving or realigning that division.

103.9 Division Geography and Realignment (2/07)

A. If a club can be serviced better by a neighboring division than the one the club is in currently-due to geographic constraints, the Realignment Committee may consider moving the club to a neighboring division.

B. When a division is being considered for realignment, the Realignment Committee should consider local geography and may elect to not realign a division if the geographic considerations warrant no action.

[Richard Fuller].....Policy 103 'update suggestion'

Maintaining the 250 member and 8 club minimum threshold is invaluable as a tool to help ensure; leadership succession and a financially viable Division.

The variety and current style of our Kiwanis clubs ie...321, Golden K, Traditional, Young Professionals, Corporate, ???, to name a few, provide vision, service ideas and club 'personality' from which our future leadership flows.

To deny this important 'baseline' foundation for a Division's future successes can and most certainly will negatively impact a Division's health.

With the goal in mind to encourage first and foremost a proactive use of 103, rather than reactive, the following enhanced language is proposed.....

* quarterly review of CNH membership and divisional club totals by District Secretary

*When a Division Club total falls below '8', a FORMAL WRITTEN NOTICE will be generated by the District Secretary or designee and signed by the current CNH Governor. Contained within will be the most current 103 policy/procedure "...not being complied with..." and that said Division is subject to Realignment.

Additional language will state the Division has one (1) calendar year from the date of the notice to reach the '8' Club minimum. If on that one year date the Division has not complied, the

current CNH Governor will formally task the Realignment Committee to bring before the assembled CNH Board of Trustees, and within 120 days, a Realignment recommendation for the Boards consideration.

- When a Division membership total reaches less than 300, a FORMAL WRITTEN NOTICE will be delivered to the current Lt.Governor, and signed by the CNH Governor. It shall contain the most current copy of Policy 103 (250 member minimum).

Additional language within that notice will ask for a written acknowledgement of the approaching ‘...membership minimums...’ and signed by the Lt.Governor and all Division Club Presidents.

- If after said Formal Written Notice, the Division membership total falls below 250, the current CNH Governor will formally task the Realignment Committee to submit a recommendation within 120 days to the CNH Board of Trustees a recommendation for their consideration.
- No further FORMAL WRITTEN NOTICE need be given that Division.

[MICHEAL FIELDS]

I don't really have a lot of problem with the current realignment policy. I do think the we need to clarify some of language relating to whether the policy means that Division need 250 members and 9 club or 250 members or 9 clubs. I have a revision to Policy 103 that I think clarifies the intent of the policy.

I am not in favor of lower the requirement for 2 reasons.

1) We have been actively engaged in realignment for the past 4 years. If we change the minimums now, it may bring into question why we didn't do it sooner to save soon of the division that have subject to realignment.

I know changing the minimums to 200 members or 8 clubs would stop the realignment of Region 3. That would leave Region 3 with one very weak Division (41) of 230 members and 5 clubs and no leadership. If change it 200 members and 8 club the change would have no effective.

2) If we make any changes to policy relating to minimums, it will just look like we did it to quiet some division that just want to complain the loudest and don't really care about the needs of the District nor do they want to make any real changes.

If we really are intent on changing the minimums, I would say let's make it 200 members and 8 clubs (remove the "o"r option). That change would actually put more division under review for realignment.

In addition, we need to come up with a policy that defines when a Division becomes to large and should be broken into 2 divisions. In option that should also be based on minimums say double the the minimum?

I hope this gives you a good idea of where I stand.

Mike

April 25, 2017

To: Rich Fuller, Realignment Committee Chair

RE: Policy 103 “Committee on Realignment” Policy Review

As requested as a committee member I have reviewed, as requested the District Policy on Realignment. I have also included comments as well as summarized some important statistics upon the conclusion of the policy review.

For most sections of the policy I have, what I felt, emphasized the major topic of the respective section. I have included notes, key points, and/or personal thoughts from time to time that may be material to club/division realignment. These are emphasized with either *Italics*, **boldness** and/or underlining.

Policy review:

103.1 Function:

Study the boundaries and size of the divisions and regions.

Create new or realign divisions or regions so as to conform to the Bylaws and Policies of the District (*Bylaws do not set any guideline and only refer to the Policies*)

Geographical factors and number members should be taken into consideration.
(*emphasis added*)

(Policy amended March 2008)

.

103.2 Composition:

Committee to consist of 10 to 16 members; to include 3 District officers, 1 Trustee, minimum of 4 individuals who have served within the two years + up to 8 additional members, not to exceed 16 total members

(Policy amended March 2008)

Recommendation – *Invite a rep from underperforming divisions to be a part of and/or participate on the committee.*

103.5 Proposals:

Prior to submitting a change or realignment to the BOT, the Committee shall study and consider the following factors

- a) The number of clubs in each division or divisions in each region and its membership resulting from the proposed realignment

Thought: *Has any strong division(s) (i.e. already meets minimum definitions of a division) been further strengthened by realignment vs. adjusting both affected divisions to help a third or more divisions with a redistribution of clubs? Are we creating super divisions? See analysis of Divisions/Clubs at the end of this review.*

- b) Relative strength or weakness of each club or division resulting from the proposed alignment. *(Is this done? See above comment.)*
- c) **Past participation of each club or division in proposed realignment in division**, District and International functions. *(See Committee Composition discussion above.*
- d) **Past participation of each club in division leadership or each division in regional leadership**. *(Is this specifically tracked by the District, or is it more subjective with knowledge of recent activity or participation?)*

(Amended March 2008)

103.6 Preference for Realignment

To retain a reasonable number of divisions and regions in the district.

Question/Thought: *What is, and who determines what a “reasonable number” is, and when was/is it done? Has there been a material change to the number of Divisions in the District reflective of the membership changes over the years? See discussion at the end of this review.*

Minimize the financial cost incurred by the District for each division and region that exist.

Realignment of clubs within existing divisions rather than creating new divisions or regions.

(Amended March 2008)

103.7 Effective dates of changes.... (Nothing)

103.8 Cause for Dissolution and Realignment

A) Any time the membership of a division falls below nine (9) clubs **and** less than two hundred and fifty (250) members, it shall be considered cause for dissolving and realigning that division. *(Emphasis added)*

B) When deficient (of para. A), Realignment Committee (RC) shall cause a notice to that effect be sent to the Governor with a copy to the current LTG of that division. Such notice shall contain a provision advising said division has been placed in a probationary status for a period of six (6) months, commencing with the date of the notice. At the end of the said six (6) months, if the membership is not been brought up to "A" the committee shall recommend to the District BOT a realignment plan for that division.

Question/Thought: *How, where, why is the RC allowed to place probationary status without BOT notification? Should this not be a BOT function since a material effect could result. All parties should be involved all along the way, not just final determination.*

103.9 Division Geography and Realignment

- A) If a club can be serviced better by a neighboring division than the one the club is in currently – due to geographic constraints, the RC may consider moving the club to a neighboring division.
- B) When a division is being considered for realignment, the **RC should consider local geography** and may elect to not realign a division if the geographic considerations warrant no action.

(End of policy review)

Policy Review & District / Division observations:

- 1) This policy was last amended in **March 2008**, since that time a lot of characteristics of the District have changed, including the following:
- a) Membership over the last 10 administrative years has declined by approximately 30%, yet we continue to operate with a similar amount of divisions.

Membership 01/2017 = 12,173
Membership 09/2007 = 17,211
Difference = <5,038>

Average loss of membership per year = -3% with no growth year since then.

- b) Number of Clubs

Number of clubs 2007-2008 = ? (To be researched)

Number of clubs 2016-2017 = 457 (42 /divisions) -12 clubs CS/CR

- c) Change in the Number of Divisions over this same time period:
- Consider when divisions 1, 9, 17, 25, 40 were eliminated? (1 & 25: 2016-2017?)

2) Analysis and Breakdown of CNH's current 42 divisions (as of 1/2017):

a) 22 of 42 divisions within policy (required 9 clubs and 250 members) (Div. 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 42, 44, 46)

- Minimum number of clubs within this group of divisions is 9, while the largest two have 19 clubs each.
- Minimum membership in any one division is 264, maximum is 602

1) Furthermore, 12 of these 22 Divisions (5, 8, 12, 18, 19, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 42, 44, and 46) could be classified as disproportionately large when compared to all other divisions due to:

- Minimum number of clubs within each division is 13, and up to 19 clubs, compared to an average of 9 to 12 clubs for the other divisions listed above.
- Minimum membership in any one of these divisions is 334, while the largest having 602 members.
- Within this group of divisions, they all overly exceed the minimum requirements of the policy defining a division.
- *This group of divisions, on average, has at minimum of 2 more clubs per division than the next group, and 5 more clubs than the third categorized group. (See below).*
- *This group could be categorized as "Super Division(s)" due to their disproportionate number of clubs and respective membership.*
- The geographically composition of these divisions could be largely classified as being located in Urbanized Areas (50,000 people or more) with some distinctive diversity in division size (square mileage).

b) 8 of 42 divisions do not meet one of the two required criteria, and they ALL happen to be in *number of members*. (Div. 10, 20, 22, 28, 30, 38, 43, 47)

- Minimum number of clubs in each division is 9, maximum is 11 clubs

- Minimum division membership is 154, maximum is 233 (***under requirement***)
- The geographical composition of these divisions could be largely classified as being located in Urban Centers (2,500 to less than 50,000 people) to Rural, with varying distinctions of diversity in division size (square mileage).

c) 12 of 42 divisions do not meet either requirement of the policy. (Div. 2, 6, 7, 14, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 39, 41, 45)

- Minimum number of clubs in a division is 5, maximum is 8 clubs
- Minimum membership in any one division is 115, maximum is 239
- The geographical composition of these divisions could be largely classified as being located in Urbanized Centers (2,500 to less than 50,000 people) and Rural with very distinctive diversity in division size (square mileage).

In summary, 20 of 42 divisions are out of compliance with the policy concerning number of clubs and minimum membership requirements.

- 3) Policy should be amended to extend committee participation to LTG's of non-compliant divisions in order to gain retrospect of the division and the best course of action.
- 4) Policy should continue to recognize geographical considerations and review special considerations to LTG's as incentives to work their areas.
- 5) Policy should be updated to reflect the changes in membership and number of clubs today in the District. At what point is 42 divisions too much?

Additional questions to ponder:

- 1) These policy guidelines are 10 years old. Do they reflect the membership numbers and demographics of the District today considering the loss of membership over time. Also look at the size comparisons of the divisions and geography of the District.
- 2) Looking at the cost of supporting LTG and Trustees, are we over staffed for the number of members in the District? Is it time to eliminate multiple divisions and realign (balance) the remainder, and/or change the system in other ways.

- 3) Is it time to look at the rate of reimbursement of LTG's to visit clubs for their required contact visits? In consideration of there being a change in the number of divisions through realignment or elimination this potential could create larger territories to cover. The size of some divisions creates barriers in finding LTG's. If you eliminate divisions you could be creating territories that no wants to administer, creating an endless cycle of realignment.
- 4) Use LTG knowledge, i.e. their knowledge of their divisions' communities. Involving each of them in discussions as to demographics, commuting and social economic factors of each community and there effect on the division.
- 5) Geography and commutability must be factors in division structure. We have to deal with the territory of the District.
- 6) Balance the Divisions
 - With 42 Divisions and 12,173 members each division could be balanced with an average of 289 members under the current system.
 - With 42 Divisions each division should consist of 10.8 clubs
 - At 10.8 clubs and 289 members per division that averages 26-27 members per club in theory, if all clubs were created/operated equally.
- 7) Outside the box thinking about district membership management is necessary in order to move forward.

Regards,
Tom Leahy