

## MEMORANDUM

10 August 2015

Subj: District Split Committee Team Members- Notes from Conference Call on 5 August 15

Conference Call participants: Jeanne Cassidy, Dan Cossack, Colette Gardner, Alfred Herzing, Bob Hudack, Siri, Payakapan, Linda Ulrich

Thank you to those who were able to join us on the call on Wednesday night. (5 August). As we discussed, we all agreed that our mission is to provide a complete, well researched, and well-publicized proposal to the membership for a vote at the Fall Conference Business meeting.

Included in this memo is a recap of both the conference call and follow up comments from participants:

1. First on the agenda was to determine whether TI would split Founder's District if Founder's District leadership doesn't do it. Alfred corrected us - it is not "TI", it is the Board of Directors, that has that option. Alfred initially believed that the Board of Directors would not split the district; it would be left up to District leadership. However, in recent months, he learned from a very reliable source, that the Board of Directors did indeed split another District and it was poorly executed. This valuable discussion led to the consensus that we have ONE more shot at dividing the District ourselves. "We had the opportunity – we swung and missed." If WE don't take action now, people outside the District will do it. Although we don't know the timing, we do believe that it WILL happen if we don't vote on it at the Fall Conference.
2. What happened last time? It seemed that several key items were not addressed, including:
  - a. Proposal was unclear and incomplete. Members didn't know what they were voting for.
  - b. Not everyone was convinced it needed to be done at all.
  - c. Benefits to members weren't clear.
  - d. Members' motional connection to "Founder's District" was down played.
  - e. Concern that new District (100) would be left at a disadvantage and might under-perform.
  - f. District Split Committee didn't have equal representation from all divisions.
  - g. No buy-in from all stakeholders; allow all voices to be heard
  - h. Effective communication to all members was lacking.
  - i. The proposed split at the 22Freeway was an issue.
3. What can we do differently? What is our go forward plan? We agreed to this top level schedule:
  - a. Shoot for a vote in the Fall – at the business meeting on 7 Nov.
  - b. Mitigate/address major concerns
  - c. Engage District members
  - d. Implement schedule:

Finalize district split plan	Sept
Publicize plan	Oct
Vote at Business meeting	Nov

4. Action Items. Here is an initial list for review, agreement and tasking.

#	Action Item	Due Date	Assignee
1	Add members to this committee who came up through the ranks in the potential D100 to ensure equal representation. Recommendations needed.	31-Aug	
2	Develop District Communication Plan to reach out to members.	31-Aug	
2a	Prepare FAQs or other presentation for communicating with members		
2b	Start visiting Division meetings to give all a heads up on the plan. Specifics to be provided by late Sept. Consider Ambassador approach.		
2c	Develop comments section for input from members - part of Communication plan????	28-Sep	
2d	Explain clearly that if Founder's district team doesn't do this, the Board of Directors will.		
2e	Ensure we are honest and up front about challenges faced and what some will sacrifice		
2f	Explain how ordinary clubs & members will benefit from the split (part of FAQ?).		
3	Develop/modify proposal to be clear (see Alfred's comments).	10-Oct	
3a	Modify proposed borders to take into account balancing weaker clubs.	25-Sep	Bob Hudack

Please note: After the call, Pan Kao contacted me to urge us to consider postponing the vote until the spring. He doesn't want us to be rattled by the threat of the Board of Directors taking action if we defer to spring, as long as we can show them a plan.

Conference Call: Wed, Aug 19, 2015 7:15 PM - 8:45 PM Pacific Daylight Time  
 Phone dial-in: United States: +1 (571) 317-3122 - Access Code: 224-348-229

Feel free to provide input to the action items, make recommendations and accept tasking prior to the meeting. Meeting on the 19<sup>th</sup> will discuss/agree to a schedule/plan of action, review the action items and update status. Attachments to these minutes are the post-conference call emails I received from some of you.

Thank you for your service to the District and fellow Toastmasters.

Warm regards,

jc

Jeanne Cassidy, DTM

949-444-9310

On Aug 6, 2015, at 4:45 PM, **Pan Kao** <pankao2@yahoo.com> wrote:

Please note that Lauren Kelly and Bob Hudack are Nominating Committee Co-Chairs this year. I prefer they are assigned the responsibility of recruiting DD, PQDs, CGDs, as well as Division Directors for both Districts. All of you are welcomed to pitch in to help Lauren and Bob.

---

From: **Alfred Herzing** <alfredherzing@yahoo.com>

Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2015 4:24 PM

Subject: District Split Proposal

Jeanne,

Thank you for organizing the call last night.

Team,

Here are my thoughts about the proposal.

1) The proposal to split Founder's District needs to be clear.

A. We are voting NOW to split Founder's District into two Districts. The District with Club #1 in it will remain Founder's District. The other District will have a number of 100 if we act now.

i.) The benefits of splitting are: More leadership opportunities for Senior District Leadership, smaller Districts to manage, etc...we need to build this out and make it COMPELLING.

ii.) Other than the District they are in, there is no change for Clubs, and Areas. Some Divisions will be redrawn so as to not go between Districts.

(Depending on how the lines are drawn.)

B. Here are the boundaries between the Districts. (The details of this need to be worked out as our first priority. Thank you Bob!)

C. Here is a list of clubs that will be Founder's District; here is a list of clubs that will be in District 100.

D. IF this proposal passes - in the Spring we will elect one District Director and two Club Quality Growth Directors (1 for Founder's and 1 for District 100),

and two Club Growth Directors (1 for Founder's District, and 1 for District 100) for the 2016-2017 term. Here are potential candidates for those positions:

Founder's District Director: Siri Payakapan

Founder's District Club Quality Director: Daniel Cossak      District 100 Club Quality Director:

Need a name

Founder's District Club Growth Director: Need Names      District 100 Club Growth Director:

Need names

E. The split would be completed on July 1, 2017

2) Keep it simple. The less complicated it is, the easier it is to understand and then there is less fear about passing it.

The Board has now shown that when a District is not capable of doing a split themselves, the Board will step in and the results the last time were not good.

"We" need to approach current and past Division Governors to see who is interested in the Quality and Growth Director positions next year for each District. These people don't have to commit to doing it, but

we need to know that they are considering it. If someone makes a list of names, I am happy to help make the calls. Linda, Pan, Siri - who have been the stars over the last few years that we should approach?

I think that if we do this and Bob provides a split that keeps the number of low membership clubs fairly equal between the Districts (why wasn't it clear that last year's proposal was not a fair distribution?!), AND the dividing line is fairly easy to follow, then I think we have a winning proposal.

Best Wishes,  
Alfred

---

From: **Colette Gardner** <coletteg@sbcglobal.net>;  
Sent: Sun, Aug 9, 2015 9:59:50 PM

Maybe I should not reminisce but it seems that if we speak openly about the split and accumulate comments now, we could have a better support from the members.

I know that I may be prejudice. What we did before is have Division Governors part of the team discussing it and the information was flowing down to members. and not strictly for a few members of the team. Our team was larger and we publicized advantages and analyzed the comments as they came. I know that Bob Hudack is working hard at changing the borders but maybe comments from some clubs or areas might help him up front instead of after he has done all the work.

Could one of us involve the critical clubs and see if maybe we can find leadership for the solutions.

Sorry. I keep thinking that members are important and getting them involved will make them feel part of the solutions.

Colette

---

From: **Alfred Herzing** <alfredherzing@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Sunday, August 9, 2015 4:29 PM

I'm all for your approach Colette. Who would involve the clubs and not make too big of a deal about it?

Regards,  
Alfred

---

On Sun, Aug 9, 2015 at 5:09 PM, **Colette Gardner** <coletteg@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

May I offer to go to the Division meetings and simply mention it. I bet I would have reactions. I can try Division A and F and see what happens.

Colette

---

On Aug 10, 2015, at 8:07 AM, **Bob Hudack** <hudacktm@gmail.com> wrote:

Colette, I completely agree. The first proposal was not close to passing, and I have spent time asking people why.

We need a communications plan for the district.

We should add members to this committee who came up through the ranks in the potential D100.

We need to explain how ordinary clubs & members will benefit from the split.

We need to be honest and up front about challenges faced and what some will sacrifice.

Giving short shrift to the last two items above is likely what caused the first proposal to fail.