Achieving Quality Council

"Predicting Quality Status by Analyzing Performance Indicators"

How do you know you are in trouble?

A thesis in fulfillment of the

Doctorate of Commissioner Science, BSA

In cooperation with Middle Tennessee Council

Area VI Commissioner - Southern Region, BSA

Harley Doug Ferguson

513 Echo Valley Rd.

Knoxville, TN 37923

Cell 865-661-8269

October 4, 2010

Achieving Quality Council

"Predicting Quality Status by Analyzing Performance Indicators"

How do you know you are in trouble?

Abstract:

By analyzing performance indicators and trending progress, a Council, Area, and Region can predict if a Council is making adequate progress toward achieving Quality Council status long before year-end. Indicators to be analyzed and compared to actual results of ten various size Councils will include the following parameters: camping activities, Commissioner ratios, Commissioner College participation, retention results, progress towards membership growth, UVTS participation, stack chart performance, etc. The comparative results will summarize performance and look for threshold indicators and compare ratings to two years past success of achieving Quality Council status for the ten Councils. In summary, a set of axioms will be developed which will provide a level of understanding as to, *are we in trouble?*

Table of Contents

* Note: Due to the sensitivity nature of identifying a specific Council's performance; good or bad and spotlighting issues that could be embarrassing, the identity of the 10 Councils has been shielded from view in completing the write-up of this thesis. In addition, specific Appendixes, while referenced and documented, have also been omitted so that backtracking results can be avoided and possibly lead to the identification of a Council. All information is sourced back to BSA data, and distribution is often controlled on a need to know basis. The inclusion or lack thereof referenced data was discussed prior to thesis approval and Doctoral Thesis permission was granted knowing that hard sourced data would be omitted from the final report.

PREFACE

My Scouting career started as a senior in high school at 18 years of age when my parents moved to Knoxville and I made several new friends that were Eagle Scouts that had great Scouting experiences, of which I was envious. Two of the new friends lived a few houses from ours and I spent a lot of time there after school and on weekends hanging out and as young men do growing up. Their fathers had been Unit Leaders of the Troop and Ship they had grown up in. I learned much and formulated most of who I am today from those social interactions. As my friends moved out of town to college (and I attending college locally), I assumed the role of Explorer Leader in the Ship and for the next 10 years was the Skipper of the Unit. I moved on to District responsibilities and eventually became Scoutmaster of my son's Troop for an additional 10 years. One of my greatest accomplishments was serving as Scoutmaster for 36 Eagle Scouts including my son. I look back on those Scouting formative years and can see the hand replayed that my first found friends had, and I attribute a lot of those experiences to the relations I had with them and their fathers.

For the next 20 years, I served the District, Council, Area, and Region in numerous adult leadership positions. Today I serve on our Council's local Executive Committee and on the Southern Region's Executive Board as

well as Area VI's Commissioner. During the last 10 years or so, I've spent a lot of time debating, analyzing, discussing, and trying to figure out how we as leaders can forecast when organizationally we are in trouble, i.e. not on the right track to serving our youth to the greatest of our abilities. Our metrics for success today are measured with the tool of "Quality Council".

Hopefully, this thesis will provide some insights into this process of obtaining "Quality Council" and offer a tool for understanding early when a Council is in trouble and provide guidance for remapping plans to be more successful in serving our registered youth. And by measuring these indicators and by analyzing the performance results and trending progress, a Council, Area, and Region can predict if a Council is making adequate progress toward achieving Quality Council status long before year-end, which should result in a better-delivered program for youth enhancing retention in Units.

Chapter 1 – Introduction

The "Quality Council" evaluation process takes place in a two-step goal setting and performance review analysis over a year time period with no required formal reviews in the 12 months (see appendix A, Quality Unit Award Objectives, metrics and appendix B, Quality Commitment and Achievement Form for Council Award, metrics). The Quality evaluation process has uniquely different criteria for a Unit, District, and Council to achieve Quality status; however, this discussion and metrics evaluation is limited to the Council Quality Award. But the methodology and performance results could be extended with some minor variations to the Unit and District levels as well. The purpose of this Commissioner College Doctoral Thesis is not to say that a Council, Area, or Region does not track and monitor progress. They do. However, the metrics to keep a finger on the pulse of performance may not always be visible, well defined, or frequently analyzed for predicated potential performance.

What is needed is a simple set of metrics that is BSA Four Functions driven and allows indicators to be measured to provide insight as to real progress being made or not made toward a Council's Quality status. The indicators to be analyzed and compared to actual results could be any number of metrics. In fact, hundreds of metrics could be identified and evaluated. Selecting the right family of metrics to be evaluated is critical to this thesis

and will be born-out when tested for actual recognition of achieving Council Quality status. Determining which metrics to use was based on several factors. First, BSA raw data had to be available to allow data formulation and analysis; for example, Council comparative training data, advancement data, and activities and civic data is not globally available. Second, past experiences of the author played a big role in selecting indicators that sometime show forward leadership within a Council; for example, using a metric for Venturing could reflect utilization in a Council of a normally untapped opportunity. And third experiences gained during numerous Council Charter Reviews provided insight as to what type of metrics to select.

Ten metrics have been selected, and using various sources of BSA Council, Regional, and National data, will be scaled and a total score will be summed for the metrics so that a comparative evaluation will be possible. The final score will be tested against real results for the years 2008 and 2009. If the selected metrics do in fact validate the process, then there is no reason this process would not be usable for future evaluations to identify and target Councils that are not making adequate progress during the course of the year. Subsequent discussions could highlight areas for improvements and/or mid course corrections. A suggested information exchange could be during Annual Charter Reviews or at Area Council Cluster Meetings. It goes without saying that there are anomalies to any

data set and extenuating circumstances are always there and do not and may not label a Council as doomed and not able to achieve Quality status. However, with the right set of metrics and a subsequent set of low values in a significant number of the test data sets, the case is harder to overcome.

The evaluation will be made for ten different Councils of various sizes and the identity of the Councils will be hidden from view. In all cases, the data source will be identified but the real data set may not be included in the Appendix, so that a back track of data cannot be done to identify a Council's identity. Each Council will be assigned a random Council number from 1 to 10. The metrics chosen for comparison are as follows:

1. Membership Growth – M01

2. Retention – M02

3. Commissioner Ratio 3:1 – C01

4. Utilization of Unit Visit Tracking system (UVTS) – C02

5. District Membership – C03

6. Participation in Commissioner College – C04

7. Scout Camping – P01

8. Cub Camping – P02

9. Venturing Camping – P03

10. FOS % Goal – F01

As noted earlier, BSA Four Function metrics would allow data indicators across the Council's breath of operations and hopefully will balance one weak attribute with a strong attribute. However, weak attributes across several BSA Four Function indicators may in fact point out real issues that need to be addressed. If this is the case, a root cause evaluation may need to be done to assist a Council with troublesome operational issues. And, if this is the case, validity to the thesis will be borne out with low scores coupled with failure to achieve Quality Council status. From the list above; items 1 and 2 addresses *Membership* function (M01 and M02), items 3-6 addresses *Service to Units* function (C01-C04), items 7-9 addresses *Program* function (P01 and P02), and item 10 addresses *Finance* function (F01).

Test Panel: M01
Evaluated Data: Yearly Membership Growth
Source of Data Set: BSA National Year End Membership, Appendix C
Date of Data Set: 2008 and 2009
Date of Analysis: February 24, 2010
Indicators: Recharter % Youth and % Units (Comparison of year end results)

How Indicator(s) relates to ability to achieve Quality Council: With growth of youth and units, the Council will be increasing membership, and more youth will be served. This is a main pillar of achieving Quality Council.

Measurement Criteria: Positive growth is excellent, flat growth is not moving forward, and loss of membership is a negative factor.

Rule for Scoring: Positive = +1.0, Flat = 0, and Negative = -1.0

Data:

Council	2008 % Youth/Units	2009 % Youth/Units	2 Year Trend	Score
1	7.4/2.5	2.1/3.4	Positive	+1
2	1.4/-3.2	-7.4/-12.4	Negative	-1
3	.9/1.4	3.1/1.1	Positive	+1
4	1.3/4.8	2.0/.5	Positive	+1
5	1.8/.2	-4.4/1.5	Flat	0
6	5.7/3.1	2.1/1.0	Positive	+1
7	-5.6/-12.1	.2/-2.8	Flat	0
8	.6/.3	-1.7/-5.7	Negative	-1
9	-12/-4.1	-3.7/-4.8	Negative	-1
10	-8.5/-8.1	1.3/.7	Flat	0

Discussion: With a two-year growth excellent progress is being made. With only a one-year growth the question is raised as to whether a problem exist or a real adjustment is being made to right size membership numbers. With a two-year reduction this is indicative of a potential real problem.

Chapter 3 – Retention

Test Panel: M02
Evaluated Data: Yearly Retention of Youth
Source of Data Set: Area Report – Collected Data, Appendix D
Date of Data Set: 2008 and 2009
Date of Analysis: February 24, 2010
Indicators: Youth Retention % Youth Actual and % Goal (Comparison of year end results)

How Indicator(s) relates to ability to achieve Quality Council: With youth retention, units are stronger, and indicate better BSA processes served. This is a main pillar of achieving Quality Council.

Measurement Criteria: Positive retention is excellent, flat retention is not moving forward, and loss of retention is a negative factor.

Rule for Scoring: Positive = +1.0, Flat = 0, and Negative = -1.0

Data:

Council	2008 % Actual/Goal	2009 % Actual/Goal	2 Year Trend	Score
1	61.8/104.7	58.4/99.0	Flat	0
2	67.7/114.7	58.0/83.0	Negative	-1
3	60.1/95.4	62.4/99.0	Negative	-1
4	62.6/109.8	58.7/102.6	Positive	+1
5	61.7/112.2	58.5/97.5	Flat	0
6	62.5/99.2	63.8/101.3	Positive	+1
7	67.3/112.2	65.6/107.5	Positive	+1
8	55.0/87.3	60.6/98.9	Negative	-1
9	59.0/98.3	59.0/98.3	Negative	-1
10	47.5/74.2	60.0/96.7	Negative	-1

Discussion: With a two-year increase in retention or meeting goal excellent progress is being made. With a one-year increase in retention followed by a decline in retention the question is raised as to whether a problem exists or not. With a reduction in retention and/or not making goal in either year this is indicative of a potential real problem.

Chapter 4 – Commissioner 3:1 Ratio

Test Panel: C01
Evaluated Data: Yearly (year end) Unit Commissioner Service Ratio
Source of Data Set: National Year End Commissioner Report, Appendix E
Date of Data Set: 2008 and 2009
Date of Analysis: February 24, 2010
Indicators: Commissioner Service Ratio - Number of Units divided by
Number of Unit Commissioners

How Indicator(s) relates to ability to achieve Quality Council: With meeting
National 3:1 ratios adequate service can be provided to Units. Also with
significant increase in numbers of Unit Commissioners the Council has an
excellent plan in place to provide better service to Units. This is a main
pillar of achieving Quality Council.

Measurement Criteria: Meeting 3:1 ratio is excellent, achieving growth in
numbers of Unit Commissioner is moving forward, and little to no progress
in meeting 3:1 ratio is a negative factor.

Rule for Scoring: Positive = +1.0, Flat = 0, and Negative = -1.0

Data:

Council	2008 Ratio	2009 Ratio	2 Year Trend	Score
1	49.5	6.2	Negative	-1
2	6.3	6.0	Negative	-1
3	4.1	3.4	Flat	0
4	6.2	4.4	Flat	0
5	3.5	2.9	Positive	+1
6	3.3	3.1	Positive	+1
7	2.5	2.8	Positive	+1
8	2.8	2.4	Positive	+1
9	3.7	5.3	Negative	-1
10	7.5	6.8	Negative	-1

Discussion: With a 3:1 ratio excellent progress is being made. With some
progress made but not at National standards the question is raised as to
whether adequate Unit service is being provided. With a reduction in the
ratio or no progress made this is indicative of a potential real problem.

Chapter 5 – Unit Visit Tracking System (UVTS)

<u>Test Panel</u>: C02
<u>Evaluated Data</u>: Unit Visit Tracking System (UVTS)
<u>Source of Data Set</u>: UVTS record set – end of year analysis, Appendix F
<u>Date of Data Set</u>: 2008 and 2009
<u>Date of Analysis</u>: February 24, 2010
<u>Indicators</u>: Council using System Y/N and Number of Logged Visits

<u>How Indicator(s) relates to ability to achieve Quality Council</u>: With Council wide use of UVTS adequate logging of data indicates service is being provided to Units. With a yearly increase usage and/or some usage the Council has a plan in place to provide better service to Units. This is a secondary pillar of achieving Quality Council.

<u>Measurement Criteria</u>: Council Wide usage is excellent. With an increased usage the Council is moving forward, and little to no usage/progress is a negative factor.

<u>Rule for Scoring</u>: Positive = +1.0, Flat = 0, and Negative = -1.0

<u>Data</u>:

Council	2008 UVTS Using/Visits	2009 UVTS Using/Visits	2 Year Trend	Score
1	N/0	Y/24	Flat	0
2	N/0	Y/9	Negative	-1
3	Y/8	Y/36	Flat	0
4	N/0	Y/13	Flat	0
5	Y/14	Y/177	Positive	+1
6	N/0	Y/7	Negative	-1
7	Y/27	Y/70	Positive	+1
8	Y/1	Y/718	Positive	+1
9	N/0	Y/16	Flat	0
10	N/0	Y/9	Negative	-1

<u>Discussion</u>: With a "significant number" of visits excellent progress is being made. With "some progress made" but not Council wide use, the question is raised as to whether adequate Unit service is being provided. With "little to no usage" this is indicative of a potential real problem.

Chapter 6 – District Membership

Test Panel: C03
Evaluated Data: Yearly (year end) Average District Committee Persons
Source of Data Set: BSA National Year End District Committee Report,
Appendix G
Date of Data Set: 2008 and 2009
Date of Analysis: February 24, 2010
Indicators: Average Committee Persons per District

How Indicator(s) relates to ability to achieve Quality Council: With a large number of average District Committee member's adequate 4-function district service can be provided to Units. Also with significant increase in numbers of average District Committee members, the Council has an excellent plan in place to provide better 4-function District support service to Units. This is a main pillar of achieving Quality Council.

Measurement Criteria: A large number of average District Committee numbers is excellent, achieving growth in numbers of average District Committee members is moving forward, and little to no progress is a negative factor.

Rule for Scoring: Positive = +1.0, Flat = 0, and Negative = -1.0

Data:

Council	2008 District Committee	2009 District Committee	2 Year Trend	Score
1	2.2	5.8	Negative	-1
2	8.4	8.3	Negative	-1
3	16.2	22.8	Positive	+1
4	8.5	8.8	Negative	-1
5	12.4	13.3	Flat	0
6	35.1	35.5	Positive	+1
7	14.6	13.2	Flat	0
8	40.1	44.6	Positive	+1
9	20.0	13.7	Flat	0
10	8.5	6.8	Negative	-1

Discussion: With a number > 20 excellent progress is being made. With a number >10 but < 20 some progress is made but the question is raised as to whether adequate District Service is being provided. With a number <10 this is indicative of a potential real problem.

Test Panel: C04
Evaluated Data: Participate In or Provide Council Commissioner College
Source of Data Set: Survey of Councils Support of Commissioner College,
Appendix H
Date of Data Set: 2008 and 2009
Date of Analysis: February 24, 2010
Indicators: Support Commissioner College and/or Provide for
Commissioner College or course work in house

How Indicator(s) relates to ability to achieve Quality Council: With
providing advanced training for Commissioners, the Council will be able to
better provide the necessary and required Unit Service to its Units. This is
a secondary pillar of achieving Quality Council.

Measurement Criteria: Council sponsoring, in house, a Commissioner
College is excellent, supporting a local/cluster Commissioner College is
moving forward, and not providing for advanced training for its Unit
Commissioners is a negative factor.

Rule for Scoring: Positive = +1.0, Flat = 0, and Negative = -1.0
Data:

Council	2008 Participation	2009 Participation	2 Year Trend	Score
1	N	Y	Positive	+1
2	N	N	Negative	-1
3	Y w/UOS	Y w/UOS	Flat	0
4	Y w/AAC	Y w/AAC	Flat	0
5	Y w/cluster	Y w/cluster	Flat	0
6	Y w/UOS	Y w/UOS	Flat	0
7	Y	Y	Positive	+1
8	Y	Y	Positive	+1
9	Y w/cluster	Y w/cluster	Flat	0
10	N	N	Negative	-1

Discussion: By providing an in house Commissioner College is excellent.
With supporting a local/cluster Commissioner College some progress
made but does not allow for Council focus and the question is raised as to
whether adequate training is being provided. With no advanced training
available, no progress is made, and this is indicative of a potential real
problem.

Test Panel: P01
Evaluated Data: Yearly Long Term Boy Scout Resident Camping Report
Source of Data Set: BSA National Year End Camping Reports, Appendix I
Date of Data Set: 2006, 2007 and 2008 (2009 Data not compiled)
Date of Analysis: February 24, 2010
Indicators: Total Percent of Council Youth in Long Term Resident Camp
Compared to three year results and expressed as Percent

How Indicator(s) relates to ability to achieve Quality Council: Boy Scout
long term resident camping results over time (3 year review) reflects how
well Scouts in the Council support their Council's long term resident camp
and usually also provides an indicator of how they are advancing. With
quality camping, the health of the Council's Program efforts is reflected.
This is a secondary pillar of achieving Quality Council.

Measurement Criteria: An increase in support of a Council's long term
resident camp is excellent, maintaining participation is stable density, and
a decline in results is a negative factor.

Rule for Scoring: Positive = +1.0, Flat = 0, and Negative = -1.0

Data:

Council	2008 % in Camp	3 Year % Departure	Trend	Score
1	68.8	-20.3	Negative	-1
2	38.4	-19.3	Negative	-1
3	44.4	-18.6	Negative	-1
4	43.9	-10.7	Negative	-1
5	55.4	-4.7	Flat	0
6	41.6	-10.3	Negative	-1
7	63.6	-12.8	Negative	-1
8	60.3	+.3	Positive	+1
9	43.3	-1.0	Positive	+1
10	59.9	+21.8	Positive	+1

Discussion: With a growth excellent progress is made. With some
reduction the question is raised as to whether adequate Camping services
are being provided. With a significant reduction in the results this is
indicative of a potential real problem.

Chapter 9 – Cub Camping

<u>Test Panel</u>: P02
<u>Evaluated Data</u>: Yearly Long Term Cub Scout Resident Camping Report
<u>Source of Data Set</u>: BSA National Year End Camping Reports, Appendix I
<u>Date of Data Set</u>: 2006, 2007 and 2008 (2009 Data not compiled)
<u>Date of Analysis</u>: February 24, 2010
<u>Indicators</u>: Total Percent of Council Youth in Long Term Resident Camp
compared to three year results and expressed as Percent

<u>How Indicator(s) relates to ability to achieve Quality Council</u>: Cub Scout
long term resident camping results over time (3 year review) reflects how
well Scouts in the Council support their Council's long term resident camp
and usually also provides an indicator of how they are advancing as well as
potential for transitioning into Boy Scouts. With quality camping, the health
of the Council's Program efforts is reflected. This is a secondary pillar of
achieving Quality Council.

<u>Measurement Criteria</u>: An increase in support of a Council's long term
resident camp is excellent, maintaining participation is stable density, and
a decline in results is a negative factor.

<u>Rule for Scoring</u>: Positive = +1.0, Flat = 0, and Negative = -1.0

<u>Data</u>:

Council	2008 % in Camp	3 Year % Departure	Trend	Score
1	0	0	Negative	-1
2	1.6	+.2	Positive	+1
3	11.8	+.1	Positive	+1
4	5.0	-1.8	Negative	-1
5	3.3	-.3	Flat	0
6	6.9	+.7	Positive	+1
7	10.7	+3.2	Positive	+1
8	9.7	+.2	Positive	+1
9	4.4	+.7	Positive	+1
10	18.7	+2.8	Positive	+1

<u>Discussion</u>: With a growth excellent progress is made. With some
reduction the question is raised as to whether adequate Camping services
are being provided. With a significant reduction in the results or not
providing this is indicative of a potential real problem.

Test Panel: P03
Evaluated Data: Yearly Venturing Council Camping Report
Source of Data Set: BSA National Year End Camping Reports, Appendix I
Date of Data Set: 2006, 2007, and 2008 (2009 Data not compiled)
Date of Analysis: February 24, 2010
Indicators: Total Percent of Council Youth in Council Camp compared to three year results and expressed as Percent

How Indicator(s) relates to ability to achieve Quality Council: Venturing Scout council camping results over time (3 year review) reflects how well Scouts in the Council support their Council's long term resident camp and usually also provides an indicator of how they are advancing. With quality camping, the health of the Council's Program efforts is reflected. This is a secondary pillar of achieving Quality Council.

Measurement Criteria: An increase in support of a Council's camp is excellent, maintaining participation is stable density, and a decline in results is a negative factor.

Rule for Scoring: Positive = +1.0, Flat = 0, and Negative = -1.0
Data:

Council	2008 % in Camp	3 Year % Departure	Trend	Score
1	0	0	Negative	-1
2	4.7	-4.2	Negative	-1
3	1.9	+.8	Flat	0
4	0	0	Negative	-1
5	13.4	-3.9	Flat*	0
6	0	-2.0	Negative	-1
7	0	0	Negative	-1
8	4.6	+2.9	Positive	+1
9	10.0	-8.4	Flat*	0
10	9.3	+2.8	Positive	+1

*Scored as Flat due to shear volume of Campers

Discussion: With a growth excellent progress is made. With some reduction the question is raised as to whether adequate Camping services are being provided. With a significant reduction in the results or not providing this is indicative of a potential real problem.

Chapter 11 – FOS % of Goal

Test Panel: F01
Evaluated Data: Friends of Scouting (FOS) Dollars Raised
Source of Data Set: National Stack Chart – November (last yearly issue),
   Appendix J
Date of Data Set: 2008 and 2009
Date of Analysis: February 24, 2010
Indicators: FOS raised % Goal – November Results

How Indicator(s) relates to ability to achieve Quality Council: With raising
100% of budgeted goal by end of November adequate planning/progress is
in place to met criteria as Quality Council. In addition, ability to collect on
pledges is also enhanced. This is a main pillar of achieving Quality Council.
Note: If significant resources are required to raise funds at the end of the
year, this will reduce Councils ability to focus on needed membership
deficiencies.

Measurement Criteria: Meeting or exceeding goal is excellent, coming
close to goal by November end can allow for a big push to raise required
operational funds, and little to no progress in meeting goal by November
end is a negative factor.

Rule for Scoring: Positive = +1.0, Flat = 0, and Negative = -1.0
Data:

Council	2008 FOS % Goal	2009 FOS % Goal	2 Year Trend	Score
1	88	93	Flat	0
2	85	72	Negative	-1
3	125	107	Positive	+1
4	103	102	Positive	+1
5	93	85	Negative	-1
6	107	105	Positive	+1
7	107	106	Positive	+1
8	100	81	Negative	-1
9	99	87	Negative	-1
10	113	111	Positive	+1

Discussion: By exceeding goal by end of November excellent progress is
being made. With some progress made but not at goal the question is
raised as to whether adequate fund raising is being provided. With a trend
of not raising goal by November end (or a great reduction from previous
year) this is indicative of a potential real problem.

Chapter 12 – Summary of Panel Results – Data Scoring

Each Panel's score has been transposed to a summary table and a composite scoring has been reflected, table 1 shows the results. The composite scores ranged from –8 to a +4 for the 10 Councils and only Councils 1, 2, 4, 9, and 10 reflected overall negative rating score with a –8 to –2, respectively. Councils 7 and 8 scored in the highest percentile with scores of +4. And Councils 3, 5, and 6 had a score in the middle percentile with rating scores of a +1 to +3.

This results are as expected and fit a general distribution of ten similar items. Some items (Councils, in this case) will do extremely well, some will be average, and some will have scores below average. Remember this is a composite score and is weighted over time (two years in most cases). The fact that the scores are spread as noted adds to the process and goes a long way to validating the metrics selected, measurement criteria, and rules for scoring with final summed results.

R0 2-24-10

Council Random Number	M01 Membership Growth	M02 Retention	C01 3:1 Ratio	C02 UVTS	C03 District Membership	C04 Commissioner College	P01 Scout Camping	P02 Cub Camping	P03 Venturing Camping	F01 FOS % Goal	Total Sum of Test Panels
1	1	0	-1	0	-1	1	-1	-1	-1	0	-3
2	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	-1	-1	-8
3	1	-1	0	0	1	0	-1	1	0	1	2
4	1	1	0	0	-1	0	-1	-1	-1	1	-1
5	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	-1	1
6	1	1	1	-1	1	0	-1	1	-1	1	3
7	0	1	1	1	0	1	-1	1	-1	1	4
8	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-1	4
9	-1	-1	-1	0	0	0	1	1	0	-1	-2
10	0	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	-1

Table 1: Summary of Test Panel Results – Composite Data Scoring

21

However, it's important to remember specific values are not what are important; it's the general trend that leads us to potential risks that may need to be explored. And that validation process, for this Doctoral Thesis is were any of these Council not Quality Councils over the two year period and did those Councils match the forecasted scored metrics composite results i.e. *The comparative results will summarize performance and look for threshold indicators and compare ratings to two years past success of achieving Quality Council status for the ten Councils.*

Below are the results of the ten Councils for the years 2008 and 2009 and reflected in RED (shaded cells), the Councils that were not Quality Council in one of the two test years.

Council Random Number	Total Sum of Test Panels	2008 Quality Council	2009 Quality Council
R0 2-24-10			
1	-3	N	Y
2	-8	Y	N
3	2	Y	Y
4	-1	Y	Y
5	1	Y	Y
6	3	Y	Y
7	4	N	Y
8	4	Y	Y
9	-2	N	Y
10	-1	N	Y

Councils 1, 2, 9, and 10 scored in the composite negative sum of test panels and do in fact validate the Doctoral Thesis, by having a predictive low score and not earning Quality Council Award in one of the two test years. Note: Council number 7 had an anomaly value in the year 2008 and although their score was extremely high (+4 one of the highest of the 10 Councils), they had an unusually event that kept them from being a Quality Council. This goes to show that evaluation tools can only show general trends and calculated data must be carefully used to forecast expected results. However, the large minus values most definitely cause reason for concern and additional drilling down may be warranted.

As stated in the introduction, what is needed is a simple set of metrics, BSA Four Functions driven, to allow indicators to be measured to provide insight as to real progress being made or not made toward a Council's Quality status. It is the author's opinion, that the 10 metrics identified in this Doctoral Thesis do in fact provide that tool for evaluation and insight into how well a Council is making progress toward achieving Quality Council. The use of the tool will allow a single Council to access its performances with its results and hopefully provide direction for improvements and/or will confirm a job well done.

Chapter 13 – Summary of Test Panel Axioms

As noted in the Doctoral Thesis abstract, a set of axioms will be developed which will provide a level of understanding as to, *are we in trouble?* Listed below are the developed axioms (guidelines) that a Council, Area, or Region could use for an evaluation during the course of the year to better understand if the best possible opportunities for youth are being provided!

M01 – Membership Growth - With growth of youth and units, the Council will be increasing membership, and more youth will be served. This is a main pillar of achieving Quality Council.

M02 – Retention - With youth retention, units are stronger, and indicate better BSA processes served. This is a main pillar of achieving Quality Council.

C01 – Commissioner Ration 3:1 - With meeting National 3:1 ratios adequate service can be provided to Units. Also with significant increase in numbers of Unit Commissioners the Council has an excellent plan in place to provide better service to Units. This is a main pillar of achieving Quality Council.

C02 – UVTS Utilization - With Council wide use of UVTS adequate logging of data indicates service is being provided to Units. With a yearly increase usage and/or some usage the Council has a plan in place to provide better service to Units. This is a secondary pillar of achieving Quality Council.

C03 – District Membership - With a large number of average District Committee member's adequate 4-function district service can be provided to Units. Also with significant increase in numbers of average District Committee members, the Council has an excellent plan in place to provide better 4-function District support service to Units. This is a main pillar of achieving Quality Council.

C04 – Commissioner College - With providing advanced training for Commissioners, the Council will be able to better provide the necessary

and required Unit Service to its Units. This is a secondary pillar of achieving Quality Council.

P01 – Scout Camping - Boy Scout long term resident camping results over time (3 year review) reflects how well Scouts in the Council support their Council's long term resident camp and usually also provides an indicator of how they are advancing. With quality camping, the health of the Council's Program efforts is reflected. This is a secondary pillar of achieving Quality Council.

P02 – Cub Camping - Cub Scout long term resident camping results over time (3 year review) reflects how well Scouts in the Council support their Council's long term resident camp and usually also provides an indicator of how they are advancing as well as potential for transitioning into Boy Scouts. With quality camping, the health of the Council's Program efforts is reflected. This is a secondary pillar of achieving Quality Council.

P03 – Venturing Camping - Venturing Scout council camping results over time (3 year review) reflects how well Scouts in the Council support their Council's long term resident camp and usually also provides an indicator of how they are advancing. With quality camping, the health of the Council's Program efforts is reflected. This is a secondary pillar of achieving Quality Council.

F01 – FOS % Goal - With raising 100% of budgeted goal by end of November adequate planning/progress is in place to met criteria as Quality Council. In addition, ability to collect on pledges is also enhanced. This is a main pillar of achieving Quality Council. Note: If significant resources are required to raise funds at the end of the year, this will reduce Councils ability to focus on needed membership deficiencies.

Appendix A

2009 Guide for Centennial Quality Unit Award Objectives

The Centennial Quality Unit Award was designed as a tool to improve every unit. Commissioners engage with unit leaders in setting reasonable and attainable award objectives that represent improvement in unit operations for struggling units and successful units. By design, the measurements to be used as objectives were left open for discussion; there were no benchmarks published. This has caused some commissioners and unit leaders to ask for guidelines on what constitutes success worthy of award.

Commissioners can use the national standards for quality operations at the council and district levels. These standards can be found on the Centennial Quality Commitments chart (formerly known as the Index of Growth chart) as the basis for some units to determine their progress and success. Reasonable goals can be set based on unit history, with the objective of progress toward the recommended standard and beyond.

Centennial Quality Unit Award criteria and recommended guidelines:

1. *We will have ___ percent of our direct contact leaders complete basic training, and Youth Protection training.*

   The national standard calls for 60 percent trained direct contact leaders. Units should strive to achieve this and more, with the exception of new leaders recruited within two months of the award designation. (The award evaluation period is October 31 through December 31.)

2. *We will provide excellent programs to achieve our goal of ___ percent youth retention, to recharter on time, and will recruit ___ new members.*

   The national retention standard is 70 percent for traditional units. Rechartering on time is self-explanatory. The national standard for gain in traditional youth members is 3 percent. Unit leaders should plan on recruiting enough new members to reach a recommended standard of a net gain in youth membership over the previous year.

3. *In the spirit of the National Parent Initiative, we will recruit ___ new parents/adults to assist our unit program.*

   The number of Scout parents designated on youth membership applications should be the base for setting future objectives. There is no national standard for this item, so it remains for units to set their own

objectives for improvement. (This is an objective that increases in challenge with the size of the unit.)

4.   *We will have ___ percent of our youth earn advancement awards.*

The national standard is 60 rank advancements per 100 youths during the year. Packs, troops, and teams count rank achievements. Crews can consider a member's progress by the achievement of individual rank award core requirements and electives as well as completion of Venturing training courses. Progress toward and beyond the standard based on unit history is the goal.

5.   *We will have ___ percent of our youth participate in at least ___ outdoor experiences or group activities during the year.*

The focus is to measure participation in activities and meetings for packs, outdoor activities for troops, and crew activities. A comparable national standard for this item is camp attendance. Therefore, 70 percent participation can serve as a recommended standard for all unit programs. Additionally, nationally recommended program guidelines call for packs to conduct monthly meetings and group activities throughout the year, for troops to conduct monthly outings, and for crews to conduct monthly activities.

6.   *We will conduct annual program planning and will provide the financial resources to deliver a quality program to all members.*

The national standard is that by September all units will conduct an annual program planning session that includes budget planning for the program year.

The two items listed below are not required to qualify for the award:

- *We received ___ visits from our unit commissioner this year.*
  The national recommendation is that commissioners visit units monthly.

- *We will support the council by participating in Friends of Scouting and the annual product sales.*
  Commissioners should encourage unit participation in these programs.

2010 Centennial Quality Commitment and Achievement Form for Council Award

"To improve the QUALITY of program in every unit in America"

Council _____ Area _____ Region _____

As leaders of our council, we are dedicated to achieving the following criteria for the 2010 Centennial Quality Award:

Criteria for Award	2009 Actual	2010 Goal	2010 Actual	Yes/No Achieved
1. We will have at least 60 percent of our traditional units earn the Centennial Quality Award for this year.	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No
2. We will organize _____ new units in 2010.				Yes/No
3. We will achieve _____ percent growth in traditional membership OR a _____ percent gain in traditional density, PLUS increase or maintain the number of Exploring members.				Yes/No
4. We will increase the districts retention of youth from _____ percent last year to _____ percent.				Yes/No
5. We will achieve a balanced 2010 operating budget with income of $_____ over expenses.				Yes/No
6. Through our district commissioner staffs, we will work to reach _____ percent of the units in our council.				Yes/No
7. We will recruit and train an additional _____ unit commissioners, increase commissioner unit visits per unit by commissioners to _____ per year, and improve the commissioner-to-unit ratio.	_____ _____	_____ _____	_____ _____	Yes/No Yes/No Yes/No
8. We will recruit and train _____ additional district committee members and increase the average number of members per district over last year.				Yes/No Yes/No
9. We will add _____ commissioned youth-serving executives or maintain the approved staff size.				Yes/No
10. Have an active endowment committee, and secure _____ new endowment gifts this year.	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No Yes/No

Reviewed and approved on this date _____ by:

_____ _____ _____
Council president   Council commissioner   Scout executive

_____ _____ _____
Area president   Area commissioner   Area director

Based on our evaluation of the criteria (complete after the year ends December 31):

___ Yes, we have achieved the 2010 Centennial Quality Council Award.

___ No, we did not achieve the award for 2010, but have developed an action plan to accomplish it for next year. The action plan includes:

_____

_____

Reviewed and approved on this date _____ by:

_____ _____ _____
Council president   Council commissioner   Scout executive

_____ _____ _____
Area president   Area commissioner   Area director