



This edition of *Realignment News* includes a brief report on the 2006 Board Chairs and CEOs Work Session, a report about councils that stepped forward as early adopters in Orlando, and an article about the next steps in mapmaking. The questions included in the Q & A section were generated at the 2006 Board Chairs and CEOs meeting.

With this edition, *Realignment News* will begin an every-other-week schedule. The next edition will be emailed to councils on Monday, March 27. Beginning in April, you can expect a new monthly newsletter reporting on progress in other areas of the Core Business Strategy.

Questions on realignment can be sent to [vwright@girlscouts.org](mailto:vwright@girlscouts.org) or to [jverhage@girlscouts.org](mailto:jverhage@girlscouts.org). Questions or suggestions related to other aspects of the Core Business Strategy can be sent to [strategyfeedback@girlscouts.org](mailto:strategyfeedback@girlscouts.org).

---

## ITEMS OF INTEREST ➤

### **Report on Orlando Work Session — Next Steps in Realignment**

Nearly 700 colleagues and friends gathered in Orlando to work together on our journey from Good to Great. The focus of the meeting was our Core Business Strategy — with many hours devoted to the challenge of realigning Girl Scout council boundaries to build high capacity jurisdictions.

The demographer team presented a resource map that was built using the criteria prioritized by councils. Councils met together to discuss possible jurisdictions; many groups met individually with one or both demographers to discuss various options; and early adopters met to review next steps. During our stay in Orlando, four additional groups of councils stepped forward to join the early adopter group.

In the days ahead you can expect a PowerPoint presentation that integrates all the information presented in Orlando. This presentation will be tailored for use with policy-making groups and/or staff. We know this is a high priority for you — it is a high priority for us, too. Also, in the days ahead, expect confirmation of your contact at GSUSA regarding realignment discussions in your area. Our highest priority is providing skilled facilitators at meetings that are scheduled in March. We also want to connect councils groups with the facilitators who will work with them throughout the process. If you have an urgent need and have not received direct communication by the end of this week, please contact Sol Magay at [smagay@girlscouts.org](mailto:smagay@girlscouts.org).

---

### **Additional Early Adopters**

Councils groups who had maps that were closely aligned with the demographers' resource map and had full agreement of the 2006 Board Chairs and CEOs arrived at the meeting as early adopters. Four new council groups stepped forward at the work session, bringing the total of early adopters to 10, representing 36 councils. Other council groups developed maps in close alignment with the resource map but have chosen to delay their "start-time" until later in the process. New early adopter councils are:

### **New Council 8 – Maine – 2 Councils**

Abnaki, Kennebec

### **New Council 9 – Lower Hudson Valley – 5 Councils**

Dutchess County, Rockland County, Westchester Putnam, Sarah Wells, Ulster County

### **New Council 10 – Central Indiana – 4 Councils**

Hoosier Capital, Sycamore, Treaty Line, Wapehani

### **Next Steps in Mapmaking**

We were pleased with the progress that was made by all councils in exploring possibilities for new jurisdictional boundaries. As we reviewed status reports at the conclusion of the meeting, it seemed that council groups fell into one of the following categories:

- Those in full agreement with the resource map.
- Those in close (but not full) agreement with the resource map, meaning that some but not all councils are in agreement.
- Those who are ready to realign but would like to discuss alternative boundaries.
- Those who are still in the early stages of conversation.

We are currently working with our demographers to develop an intermediate step in map development that will make it possible for councils to receive feedback on alternative proposals before June 1. This will keep the conversation going — and make it possible for councils to consider additional alternatives if that is needed. As part of this process, we will also be reviewing the non-early-adopter proposals that were submitted by councils prior to the Orlando meeting.

Details about this intermediate process will be included in the next edition of *Realignment News*.

---



## **1. How was the “number of councils” determined by the demographer?**

**Answer:** A number was not determined in advance of the process. The demographers went through their process of applying the criteria throughout the country and when their work was done, the result was 106 councils.

---

**2. When will the issue of “asset redistribution” be addressed and how will it be applied to realignment?**

**Answer:** Some guidelines on asset distribution will be provided to local councils, though the ultimate decisions will always reside with local boards of directors. This challenge will arise only when realignment results in dividing a council’s current jurisdiction into two or more parts.

**3. I was delighted to meet Stephanie, our new pro bono lawyer. How do we submit questions to her?**

**Answer:** For the time being, while Stephanie works to get the processes and systems in place at her firm, please submit your questions to Jan Verhage ([jverhage@girlscouts.org](mailto:jverhage@girlscouts.org)) or Vicki Wright ([vwright@girlscouts.org](mailto:vwright@girlscouts.org)) at GSUSA and we will make sure they get into Stephanie’s hands.

**4. Will any states have their own stand-alone council?**

**Answer:** Remembering that the map is a resource map, there are eight “stand-alone” states: Maine, Connecticut, Arkansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Utah (with the exception of some Indian Reservations), Alaska, and Hawaii. Of this group, Maine and Connecticut are early adopters and Hawaii and Utah do not have changes in their jurisdictions.

**5. The demographers map proposes that we join with four other councils to form a new jurisdiction and all but one council is eager to begin the process. What can we do?**

**Answer:** Our suggestion is that you begin conversations and planning with the other councils making sure that all parties are invited to the table. The jurisdiction will not be finalized until the National Board takes action, but if you are aligned with the demographers resource map you can feel free to begin some general conversation now.

**6. The proposed change for our council will be limited to adding a county from one of our neighbors and transferring one of our counties to another neighbor. Will a vote of the membership be necessary?**

**Answer:** When portions of a jurisdiction move from one council to another, a vote of the Board of Directors is required; however, a vote of the membership is not required.

---