Suffolk County General Service Redistricting Ad Hoc Committee (SCRC) Chair Report and Recommendation 3/22/24

Committee:
- Scott M. (SCRC Chair),
- Jane E. (A49/P69 Delegate),
- Kimberly L. (seated SCGS DCMC),
- Michelle E. (ADCMC SCGS Panel 71),
- Tom B. (A49/P71 Delegate)

Trusted Servants we spoke with:
- David V. (former SIA Treasurer, former SIA Web Chair)
- Ray W. (SENY Technology & Communications Officer)
- JoAnn M. (A49/P73 Delegate; P69 Queens County DCMC)
- Raj (seated Queens County DCMC)
- Cathy C (seated Nassau County DCMC)
- Paola A (seated SENY Chair)
- Matt C (A11/P71 Delegate)

Other Resources:
- Excel Workbook entitled, "Suffolk Printed Meeting List"
- Background Material for Queens County Redistricting
- Excel Workbook entitled, "GSO Lookup" showing a sampling of group information that GSO has for Area 49 (SENY)
- Document entitled, "Strategic Planning Report to Area 50 – A Mission for the Groups and Membership in Area 50: Turning the Lights on in Our Area"
- Email from the Area 49 (SENY) Archives re: the development of the county structure in the Area.
- Fellowship Connection User Guide
- Excel Workbook entitled, "Suffolk Comprehensive 2023.09.04.xlsx" showing group information on the Area Shared Database.
- Area 11 District 1 Redistricting Packet

We recommend that:

- SCGS update all the Suffolk Groups' information in the Area Shared Database through cooperation with SIA.

  Rationale/Background:

  1. From 7/18/23 meeting with Past Intergroup Web Chair.
     a. At this point, General Service does not have accurate group data.
     b. Further explore how to update SCGS data utilizing SIA information.
     c. SIA has current data, is generously willing to cooperate/share the data so SCGS data can be updated (and ease the workload of the SCGS Registrar).
     d. Not all groups are registered with General Service, when they are not, they have no district, (some that are registered are in an incorrect geographic district).
  2. From 8/15/24 meeting with Area 49 TCO.
     a. Most counties have inaccurate group information
     b. These inaccuracies are reflected in the SENY database – if SENY has inaccurate info, so does GSO
     c. Have accurate data before making any changes to the county structure ex. changes after restructuring would impact group distribution in a new district.
     d. Avoid Clustering
  3. From 9/19/24 Meeting with Delegate.
     a. Currently most counties' data is inaccurate because it has not been updated, factors: Split between online/in person; New groups; Lack of knowledge by the Body about the process and the rationale for data.
     b. If SENY doesn't know GSO doesn't know
     c. When redistricting avoid clustering as it causes disorganization

- SCGS develop a redistricting Committee to report back to SCGS. We recommend 6 geographic districts and 1 virtual district. We strongly recommend against clustering.

  Rationale/Background:

  1. From 10/17 Meeting with Queens DCMC – 15 districts including clusters redistricted 8 districts, no clusters. 3 of the 8 have active DCMs
  2. From 9/19 Meeting with Delegate - When redistricting avoid clustering as it causes disorganization
  3. From 8/15 Meeting with TCO - Recommendation: Avoid Clustering
  4. From District 1 Redistricting Packet – Area 1 redistricted into 6 districts

- SCGS meet on the odd months to conduct business and on even months conduct a sharing session and district meetings.

  Rationale/Background:

  1. From 9/19 Meeting with Delegate - Manhattan meetings
     a. County – Meets on odd months.
     b. District – Meet every month, one or two meet every other month.
     c. Some meetings focus too heavily on business - maybe separate with
        i. Sharing Sessions and Workshops
  2. From 12/12 Meeting with Nassau DCMC - Nassau's practice:
     a. meets every other (even) month, hybrid,
     b. odd months are for workshops by the County

- SCGS DCMC make a motion at the Area 49 SENY Committee meeting to form a committee to explore reorganization of the Area 49 structure. Does the County structure still serve SENY?

  Rationale/Background:

  1. From 12/12 Meeting with Nassau DCMC – Nassau has only 1 DCM
  2. From 1/9 Meeting with Area Chair - Lack of DCMs is not limited to Suffolk
  3. From 2/13 Meeting with Area 11/Panel 71 Delegate:
     a. Problems with old structure:
        i. Sharing Leadership (District Chair (DCMC) + DCM) muddied the waters
        ii. No clear leadership roles
        iii. Too many cooks spoil the broth
        iv. DCMs had no accountability (they were not directly responsible to the groups they served)
        v. DCMs were not able to serve in true leadership capacity
        vi. Too many meetings in some parts of Area 11
     b. Benefits of the new structure
        i. Increased engagement by GSRs and DCMs
        ii. While it's too soon to measure an increase in numbers, the quality of GSR participation at the Area has increased
        iii. GSRs show up to assemblies informed and prepared to participate