

BSA Central Region “Area 2 Project” *Crossroads Recommendation*

An analysis and case against approval

August 26, 2011

Respectfully submitted by

Dell Deaton,¹ Great Sauk Trail Council Executive Board Member
Volunteer, Boy Scouts of America (Michigan)

Following is my review of the *Crossroads Recommendation* (“*CRR*”) as a member of the Boy Scouts of America (“BSA”) Great Sauk Trail Council (“GSTC”) Executive Board.² Candid input was requested from those of us who attended the Central Region Area 2 Project (“A2P”) presentation on July 25, 2011, at Camp Munhacks.

My perspective is that of an outsider to the A2P process,³ and based primarily on attentive review of the 110-page *CRR* “Unit Focused Scouting” document dated August 20, 2011, and the last, 70-page draft just before it, dated July 1, 2011. I have diligently tried to farm additional information from the “BSA Area Project” website.⁴

I’m not persuaded that the sweeping, unprecedented changes proposed by the *CRR* are justified, nor, for that matter, are they even aimed in the right direction. Rather, to the contrary, I that believe the *Crossroads Recommendation* is an extremely risky proposition. **It should not be adopted.**

Overview

We, as the Boy Scouts of America, do have a problem: Declining membership. Central Region Area 2 (“CR2”) is not just serving fewer available youth, but also losing market share within our target demographics.⁵

But I see no correlation, let alone any *compelling* one, to justify the top-to-bottom restructuring of CR2 as proposed by the *CRR*.⁶ Certainly not anything favoring a move to “substantially increase the number of Scouting professionals” as its first priority.⁷ Certainly not the massive transfer of assets, e.g., camps,⁸ and financial control⁹ that, at a minimum, dilutes current stakeholders’ interest and voice in decision-making, to, at best, one-eleventh of what it is today.¹⁰ We’re talking about discounting stakeholders, by the way, who are in the closest position to the youth that the BSA, at root, is chartered to serve. These are our boots-on-the-ground accountable volunteers.

Moreover, local influence on any matter, including local matters portending the greatest impact on their boys’ futures, is reduced even further by the *CRR* in two key ways. First, the “flexible boundaries” concept¹¹ will make it difficult if not impossible to form grassroots relationships, build coalitions in support of bottom-up initiatives. The parochial shortcomings we’ve seen in redistricting *à la* United States Congressional areas, caution by parallel. Second, commissioning an extensive, professional “sales force” in the field¹² incentivizes paid professionals to compete against, if not ignore, Units’ individualized interests and strategies for youth membership growth. So-

called Unit Serving Executives (“USEs”), would have to be compensated based on an unflinching mission: To put more boys into Packs and Troops, and start more Units; failing that means real money out of their pockets.

Curiously, even the *CRR* itself acknowledges a damaging “us versus them” environment in its very claim to be “a volunteer driven effort and not a ‘top-down’ approach.”¹³ Yet its own process contradicts that assertion.¹⁴ And the gymnastics advocated to get the *CRR* adopted — via eleventh-hour changes to Council bylaws governing fair voting procedures (changes to be put temporarily in place specifically and only long enough to get the *CRR* passed¹⁵) — undermine any last hope of pitching this as *approved by meaningful consensus in favor of* “the obvious answer.”

On the contrary: The *CRR* grossly disrespects every volunteer and every Unit in Area 2.

Wouldn’t it be ironic if *that* actually ended up evidencing the real problem? What if “the underlying cause” is a decreasingly *volunteer*-led (and -respected, and -leveraged, and -supported) organization?¹⁶ How would it make sense, then, to bias things even more radically in favor of increasing professional dominance as “the answer”?

Furthermore, for all its discussion of “sales,” the *CRR* ignores one of the fundamental tenants of sales:

✓ *If prospects aren’t buying from you, ask first if you’re offering anything they want.*

In Scouting, that means “Program.”

The January 30, 2006, *Newsweek* cover story, “The Boy Crisis,”¹⁷ perhaps unwittingly suggests that we are (or *were*) the solution to the problem it’s identified. Inside, it all-but screams, “Join Boy Scouts!” in laying out how boys learn, what keeps them engaged, and what they need to become successful adults. Literally nothing need change from the founding philosophy of Lord Robert Baden-Powell: *We offer a game — with a purpose.*

So, where in A2P is there a detailed analysis of BSA Program differences as reason for membership, financial declines since 1990?¹⁸ Where is the identification of CR2 Councils, camps evidencing *best practices*?¹⁹ After all, camping is so important to BSA National that it rates measurement as one of only twelve District “Journey to Excellence” metrics.²⁰ Camping is also a big deal to the Scouts themselves. Here’s something I was given early on by my former GSTC Membership Vice President, from a presentation titled, “Re-TEN-tion: The Ten Defining Moments in a Scout’s Life where Retention is Critical ... and what you can do about it!”²¹ In particular, slide #26:

Camping is vital to Scouting. We know that 51% of Boy Scouts drop out from Troops with five or fewer campouts a year. But, only 15% drop from Troops that camp every month.

Anyone on A2P who’d been connected to the Great Sauk Trail Council Board in 2008 (when I received “Re-TEN-tion”), or after, surely should have seen this. Thus, I expected to see it expansively addressed by A2P efforts.

With all due respect, it’s clear that A2P leadership must have had an idea where it thought *CRR* should end up from the very start. *Change the org-chart, increase control by professionals, consolidate power at the top.* From the get-go, the A2P vision exclusively focused on changing structure,²² effectively ignoring all else.

The *Crossroads Recommendation* has asked and answered the wrong question. No doubt in my mind.

Checks-and-balances are compromised, accountability to volunteers is diminished

Having previously served on an international association Board of Directors²³ and consulted to several others,²⁴ I would caution against putting too much weight into the notion of any organization being “volunteer-led” in practice. Employment law, implied authority via trappings of office, and the leverage available to those drawing a salary to advance their interests: These are just a few of the significant positional levers paid staff have to trump volunteers. So powerful is *position* that few professionals can and do commonly control hundreds of volunteers. The *CRR* itself acknowledges the inherent disadvantages of volunteer efforts to exert meaningful influence.²⁵

Volunteers should consider themselves good stewards if they’re just able to do *a pretty good job* of merely performing an oversight role via hindsight.

A Handbook for District Operations, published by the Boy Scouts of America, highlights key District Executive job functions as “coaching”²⁶ and “administration.” So the A2P bias toward equating the 15% increase in total available youth (“TAY”) “served” *by these individuals*²⁷ as “the problem” behind CR2 loss of market share fails to scrutinize *the job paid staffers are supposed to be doing*. Professionals are being paid to leverage and support the volunteers, first and foremost. And since the ratio of volunteers²⁸ to professionals is hundreds to one, each one percent loss in volunteers is hundreds of times more impactful to BSA than each one percent loss in professionals.

The *CRR* dismisses professionals’ support of volunteers as relief from “distraction.”²⁹ That speaks volumes.

Let’s further scrutinize the supposed 15% increase in TAY per District professional. Are Scouting professionals oblivious to all of the performance efficiencies every other worker has realized in the free market over the last twenty years, thanks to technology, networking, and experience? Why shouldn’t they be required to *do more with less* — like the rest of us? By the way, the two Huron Trails District professionals use smartphones.

The *CRR* creates a traditional hierarchy along the lines of an archaic corporate model (“like General Motors,” one Task Force member actually *bragged* to me). The proposed CR2 will be entirely run by professionals³⁰ uncertain in even the degree to which volunteers on its own Executive Board³¹ will provide oversight in holding the Executive Officer and the entire professional staff that ultimate reports to him or her, accountable. Despite A2P use of familiar BSA-friendly “Key 3” nomenclature, it looks to me like the Executive Officer here will be self-reporting:³² “The Executive Officer will report to the Executive Board...,”³³ of which the Executive Officer is an integral part.”³⁴

That brings us to a final note of concern regarding accountability, and that is *vis-à-vis* “quality standards.”

“Area has no authority to enforce quality standards” presently.³⁵ Why does Area need to have authority to enforce quality standards? Are we talking hazardous camp conditions? incompetent staff? If there is some concerning lack of quality standards and/or enforcement thereof, wouldn’t that be true of *all* Council outdoor programs, across the United States? wouldn’t that portend a *National* problem, as opposed to an *Area 2* problem?

Conversely, the current structure has an inherent, healthy competition to foster creativity through choice. Like Unit versus Unit, each under its own Charter Organization. My son’s Troop chooses from among a number of

alternative CR2 camps in no small part because of locally-designed *distinctions*. How many Troops will choose Ohio or Indiana or Illinois camps for variety if all Michigan camps are homogenized in deference to the *CRR*?

I would think the *CRR* melting-pot idea a serious concern for National as well. The annual Council Re-Charter gives National not just an important view of Council management, resource utilization, and market penetration in-and-of-itself, but also *relative* to its neighboring peers. Under the *CRR*, the management and performance audit option elements disappear. And the opportunity to like-kind compare camps doesn't just drop from eleven Councils to five: It effectively disappears as well, given the flexible boundaries concept.³⁶ Like the game of *Whac-A-Mole*.

“Sales” is a serious, specialized profession

“Growing Membership is the primary focus of the entire effort of the Area Project,” reads the first, most forceful statement in Section Two of the *Crossroads Recommendation*³⁷ — the part that the *Crossroads Recommendation Resolution* specifically asks to have approved.³⁸ “This is accomplished in Unit Focused Scouting by placing more Unit Serving Executives in the field as a ‘sales force’....”³⁹

And yet:

- Not one of the eight A2P Task Forces focused on sales⁴⁰
- Not one of the 110 individuals directly involved with A2P efforts is cited for their sales credentials⁴¹
- Nowhere in the *CRR* is there a dedicated discussion of “Sales 101”⁴² *vis-à-vis* Scouting and CR2

How can anything missing such fundamentals be taken seriously?

A properly structured *Sales Task Force* might well have identified “the problem” as being completely front-end, thus centering on new youth attraction. But then they'd still have to have identified *a wide range of possibilities for “why?”* and *tried-on correlations* before drilling down. What if the underlying cause is in reality what one of my college marketing professors called “Sears Loyalty Syndrome”? That is, youth join Scouting, uncritically, because their dads had been Scouts;⁴³ only now, there's a Michigan recession, causing fathers to have less influence on their sons due to dads being depressed, or dads working longer hours, or dads on the road looking for jobs — or all of the above. Maybe dads are no longer providing necessary word-of-mouth marketing.

Or maybe divorce is the issue with diminished dad-advocacy. Or, *maybe*....

Where's anything like a substantive correlation in the *CRR*?

Again, it is concerning that the *Crossroads Recommendation* does not appear to have seriously looked at the aforementioned “Re-TEN-tion” findings, which had for several years been all but opening *ante* required reading for Great Sauk Trail Council Membership Committee members. Thus, it would have been right there in front of A2P.

In Scouting, retention issues have been inextricably tied to program performance.

- *Tiger Cubs*. Packs lose 50% of Tiger Cubs within the first 3 months after they've joined, with parent and youth debriefings that list as reasons, *because it was* “boring, irrelevant, and disorganized.”⁴⁴



- *Wolf Cubs.* Packs often lose 50% of the boys who've moved from Tiger to Wolf, with those who've left citing lack of adult leadership⁴⁵ and "a boring and irrelevant program" as reasons.⁴⁶
- *Webelos.* More than two-thirds of those boys who are Webelos Scouts in the fourth grade are no longer involved at the beginning of the fifth grade; they are attracted other alternatives.⁴⁷
- *Cross-Over.* More than a third of those boys who cross-over into Boy Scout Troops, having earned their Arrow-of-Light recognitions, will not be in Scouting by year-end, complaining that they spent more time tying knots than camping.⁴⁸

Okay, so, say we *do* end up with 9,000 TAY per Unit Serving Executive⁴⁹ — and then let's assume for the sake of modeling the *best case scenario* that each USE is 100% successful in youth recruitment. That's 9,000 new Tiger Cubs coming in at Fall Round-Up. Down to 4,500 before year-end, down to 2,250 within twelve months. By the time Cross-Over comes, that number is down to 750; and, of those, only 500 will be around at the end of their first year in the Troop that received them.

Best case scenario, the *CRR* delivers 500 boys per USE for possible advancement to Eagle. It also creates 8,500 former Scouts who can more credibly say, "trust me, *I was there*: It's "a boring and irrelevant program."^{50,51}

Admirable as A2P goals may have been in taking "sensitive" issues such as staffing "off the table," the reality in practice is that that is impossible. It's highly unlikely that anyone currently hired, further trained, and promoted for competence in administration and operations is going to survive any honest competitive interview process to become a USE. We are thus faced with pink-slipping the bulk of our professional staff overall at the *CRR* onset,⁵² or rejecting claims that "the *CRR* is a needs-based, blank-sheet-of-paper design" as insincere sales puffery.

This speculative USE concept also dilutes, if not eliminates, professional accountability *vis-à-vis* volunteers in their home communities, reducing it to an effective irrelevance. The USE reporting chain begins with Field Councils that are at least twice as big (thus, meaning half as accountable to any given Unit), with an even more watered-down influence under the turbo-charged Area. Further complicating that, the flexible boundaries scheme means that figuring out *which Council am I dealing with this time?* is a moving target. More *Whac-a-Mole*.

This is important because USEs are by current design effectively competitors with the local Units in their communities. USEs are financed by Area mega-funding, versus the *our boys sold a lotta popcorn* Unit budget.

Under the new scheme, USEs have only one way to prove themselves: By delivering numbers. "Growing Membership is the primary focus of the entire effort of the Area Project."⁵³ Like the telemarketer, or the guy at the dealership who sold me my first Oldsmobile in 1987 — if they don't make a sale, they don't eat.

What happens if "bringing in that last application" contradicts a Cubmaster and his Unit Committee's decision about not exceeding the maximum number of boys they've decided their Pack can effectively serve? Will the USE simply forget about her commission, or bonus, or making her performance goal for the number of new Units she is contracted to start, simply because her most promising option would negatively impact the functioning of an existing Pack that meets right across the street from the impressive Charter Organization she has her eyes on?

This is already happening. Only once in my three-plus years as District Vice Chair for Membership in Great Sauk Trail Council did the corresponding professionals with whom I worked even *share* youth or Unit goals with me before they set them. That didn't change after I was elected Huron Trails District Chair last December.^{54,55}

“Program” is “product”⁵⁶ for the Boy Scouts of America

As a volunteer who'd established myself through service in Membership, I readily admit to starting 2011 with the thought that our problem with declining youth numbers was *Membership*. By that same logic, it made sense for me to consider all of our 2010 fundraising shortfalls in terms of *Finance*.

Then I started giving FOS-Family presentations.⁵⁷ Time after time, I heard the same question: “What does ‘District’ actually *do* for us?” Even when it didn't come across as a clear objection, or, for that matter, even when it wasn't actually said at all, this in my opinion is the basis for why we're not maximizing the funds we're raising by voluntary contribution, why we must put increasingly more effort into our asks each year. And I suspect we'll see this as a challenge to product sales (specifically, meaning *popcorn*, here): Units consistently say they resent the percentage “take” that goes to District (read “Council” synonymously here with equal passion), “for what?”

Forget our sales pitch. Local events and visible camp properties motivate “above and beyond” giving. *Tangibles*. That is why youth join and stay in Scouting. That is why adults volunteer. That's why individuals and organizations give. To support Districts and Councils that support Units that take boys *outside* and *do* stuff.

Earlier in this document, I noted the “Re-TEN-tion” finding that 51% of Boy Scouts drop out of Troops that run five or fewer campouts per year, compared to a dropout rate of only 15% for Troops that camp monthly.⁵⁸ CR2 research corroborates this. I know, because I cited it in a White Paper I prepared on April 18, 2011, for members of the GSTC Board, and senior volunteers and the professionals tied to my own Huron Trails District Committee.⁵⁹

First (except for an anomalous jump recorded for 2007), Cub Scout camp attendance ranged from 29.8% to 49.4% *higher* for Resident Camp than Day Camp.⁶⁰ Yet Resident Camp is more costly, requires a significantly greater time commitment on the part of the parent; in other words, it successfully commands a premium....

Metrics for Boy Scouts attending long-term camp are similarly elucidating. Among those selecting destinations of their own choosing (not necessarily in their own Councils), 67.2% to 80.0% go to at least one long-term camp.⁶¹ For the clear majority of youth, “long-term camp” is an indispensable part of what they are going after with the Scouting experience.

That's just one excerpt from a 28-page, 73-footnote document titled, “Maximizing Local Boy Scout Differential Advantages through Program Strategy: A White Paper.” Here's part of the opening observations that motivated it:

Resources and attention are being diverted from what has been proven to work in BSA programming, in favor of trying to play catch-up with both unproven media and outright failed approaches. These include Internet channels as well as classroom oriented teaching techniques. Little effort seems to be put into understanding the “Boy Scout” brand, let alone respectfully following it; in fact, far too many *internal* voices are indulged in railing (*sans* substance) about what a *burden* it is to carry.

... This White Paper goes on to argue that *getting the question wrong* not only compromises efforts to solve “the Program problem,” but also problems in Finance and Membership erosion. Ultimately, there is very

little that these two areas — and add Communications and Nominating functions to that as well — can do if *Program*, which is the fundamental BSA product, isn't on its best footing.⁶²

There and here, I reference the incredible *Newsweek* cover story titled, “The Boy Crisis: At Every Level of Education, They're Falling Behind. What to do?”⁶³ In speaking to changes in public offerings that are failing our young men, it almost perfectly restates the case for Scouting as originally made by Lord Robert Baden-Powell.⁶⁴ Then and here, I encourage those who boast of having “the ear of National now” to consider the July-August 1998 *Harvard Business Review* article, “Welcome to the Experience Economy”⁶⁵ as a guide to get us from *here* to *there*.

That's where A2P will find the right questions. And thus, more likely, the right answers.

Conclusion

Area 2 Project is helpful in that it's bringing attention to a problem that is really big, and has not been seriously addressed for far too long. We all agree that the Boy Scouts of America isn't serving anything near the youth numbers that it can, or that our youth desperately need us to.

As a secondary point, I think that the A2P process, and *Crossroads Recommendation* as a document, shows, if only by accident, how big a problem we have in our currently confusing lines of accountability and cooperation between volunteers and paid professionals. And, for that matter, basic job descriptions.

But that's where our agreement ends. The *CRR* is simply too much change, with too little real, substantiated benefit detail — and too many unexamined potentials for catastrophe. Once the current structure is demolished in favor of A2P, there's no going back if it's wrong. “Bad as things are here in Michigan, we gotta do *something!*” is a lazy, unacceptable call to action. It would be reckless to accept arguments that advocate A2P by insisting, “Anything is better than what we're doing now!” National economies have collapsed under lesser clichés (after which they then have both the original problem, plus fallout from the misdirection — exacerbated by lost time).

And, with all due respect, this is top-down; A2P is the antithesis of volunteer-driven.⁶⁶ When a chunk of verbiage in a pitch spent talking about how to “modify the bylaws of the Councils”⁶⁷ to ease the means by which that thing, let alone something this massive, is passed, that's a huge red flag. Where is the accountability in *that*?

How is that not top-down?

The bulk of those voting for or against the *CRR* are Charter Organization Representatives (“CORs”); they will be speaking on behalf of their Units — which are, in practice, the (only) aspect of the Boy Scouts of America hierarchy that is authentically volunteer-led. It seems to me that we'd sincerely, passionately want to engage and treat our constituent Units as partners in something that will “make history.”⁶⁸ Why squander their ideas and enthusiasm and people by treating COR votes like we're no more than hungry heirs who must swallow hard to put up with a rich, dotty aunt, brought down from the attic for holiday gatherings, merely to protect our place in the Will?^{69,70}

Why *not* target 100% and go for affirmation of an informed, committed electorate? Don't forget: A 51% “pass” means a 49% “fail,” and that's an almost 1:1 ratio of Units against, for every Unit in favor of passing Area 2 Project.

There's one more thing that needs to be added here. On August 23, I was included among Executive Board Members who received a letter from the Great Sauk Trail Council with an updated *Crossroads Recommendation*.⁷¹ In closing, it read, **"VOTE YES TO MORE YOUTH, MORE VOLUNTEERS, MORE SCOUTING ON SEPTEMBER 15."**⁷²

As a volunteer who is consistently, deeply committed to Scouting, I **resent** the implication that a "NO" vote is somehow by definition not for *more youth, more volunteers, more Scouting*. I've actually read all 110 pages of the *CRR*, as well as the central A2P materials. How many people who are being asked to "vote yes" honestly will be able to say that? I have transparently cited specific points so that anyone can confirm or refute my analysis. I've put my name on the line for accountability and risk of being ostracized. Area 2 Project advocates are no more committed to our youth, volunteers, and the Boy Scouts of America than those for whom I've given voice in this opposition.

Which takes more courage? To do your duty and speak out when seeing that the emperor has no clothes? or to fall unquestioningly in line behind advocates who've come in wearing brand new Oxford-cotton dress shirts with custom "Area 2 Project" embroidery? Ironically, that wardrobe decision supports another of Lord Robert Baden-Powell's methods of Scouting: The power of uniforming. I just never would have imagined that wearing a Class-A uniform to Camp Munhacker on July 25 would make me an outsider.

The *Crossroads Recommendation* should be voted down.

Endnotes: Reference citations and additional comments

-
- ¹ **Briefly, about me.** Prior to being elected to the Great Sauk Trail Council ("GSTC") Executive Board as Huron Trails District Chair last December, I'd served over three years as Membership Vice Chair for that District. On the Unit-level, I was a Cubmaster for 2+ years, and Assistant Cubmaster prior to that (the Pack Committee told me I "automatically" became Cubmaster when my predecessor left for a job change). Currently, I am starting my third year as Chaplain for Troop 446 in Saline, Michigan, where my son (who has been a Scout since Wolf) is anticipated to earn Life rank this October. As a youth, I was a Cub Scout with Pack 141 in Bellbrook, Ohio, in the early 1970s.
 - ² **Disclaimer.** Although elected to serve in the capacity indicated, and preparing this document in fulfilling those duties to the best of my ability, accountable to the youth I'm here to represent, let me be clear that the work, opinions, and recommendations herein are solely my own, and in no way implied to be anything or representative of anyone beyond that.
 - ³ *Crossroads Recommendation*, August 20, 2011, Section One, "History of the Area Project."
 - ⁴ Official "BSA Area Project" website, <<http://www.bsaareaproject.org>>, reviewed August 12-24, 2011.
 - ⁵ *Recommendation*, Section One, "History of the Area Project," page 4, chart.
 - ⁶ *Crossroads Recommendation Resolution*, July 1, 2011; and, *Recommendation*, Section Two, "Structure Description."
 - ⁷ *Recommendation*, "Executive Summary," page 1, paragraph 3, item 1.
 - ⁸ *Ibid.*, Appendix 8, "Compare & Contrast," page 1, Topic 4, "Camps."
 - ⁹ *Ibid.*, page 2, Topic 1, "Finance and Budgets."
 - ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, page 1, Topic 6, "Governance."
 - ¹¹ *Ibid.*, Appendix 5, "Boundaries."
 - ¹² *Ibid.*, Section Two, "Structure Discipline," beginning on page 2, "Chart One: Functional Overview of Unit Focused Scouting."
 - ¹³ *Ibid.*, Section One, "History of the Area Project," page 2, paragraph 1.
 - ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, Section One, "History of the Area Project," page 2, paragraph 1: One-third of the A2P "founding fathers" was paid staff. Page 7, "Stage 2 – Devising a Strategy": From its "starting point," it was necessary for A2P "to seek acquiescence from the BSA National Organization." Page 17, "Phase I – Concluding Comments," paragraph 1: "Of the 110 individuals directly involved with..." A2P, seventeen were professionals.
 - ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, page 18, "Phase II," "Stage 10 – Moving the Decision Forward," paragraph 4.
 - ¹⁶ **Example:** Great Sauk Trail Council provides a cautionary tale here, through the results of its two very different approaches to Friends of Scouting ("FOS") fundraising for 2011. Both launched this past January. FOS-Family was cooperatively run by volunteers and the District Executive, told to meet a \$60,000 goal by August 30, 2011. On August 3, 2011, we hit 100% of goal, and are now \$244 over target. FOS-Community continues to be run by the District Director, as it has from the outset. Yet, despite a far more modest goal of \$40,000, it remained stalled at \$8,262 short of that target, as of August 23, 2011. I spent most of the first quarter of 2011 pleading my case all the way up the Council professional hierarchy, asking that the volunteers who report to me in Huron Trails, as well as myself, personally, be integrated into the FOS-Community effort. We were kept shut-out.



Ironically, I see on the agenda for the September 15, 2011, GSTC Executive Board Meeting, this item under Finance: “We need help to find new money.” I’m truly sad to read that. But it’s far from the only fallout from professionals’ *hubris* in FOS-Community leadership. Great Sauk Trail Council is not just playing catch-up on a Huron Trails FOS-Community target that could have just as easily been hit by August 3 — *just as open to exceeding its goal, as FOS-Family is today* — but doing so at a time when it will continue to distract District Director attention from popcorn sales, officially kicked off on August 16.

17 “The Boy Crisis: At Every Level of Education, They’re Falling Behind. What to Do?” *Newsweek*, January 30, 2006.

18 *Recommendation*, Section One, “History of the Area Project.”

19 Respectfully, yes — I have read the *Crossroads Recommendation*, Appendix 5, “Outdoor Program.” Notwithstanding, my question (and underlying concern), to which this endnote relates, remains the same. See my April 18, 2011, White Paper (complete cite at footnote #43, below) for details.

20 “Scouting’s Journey to Excellence: 2011 District Performance Recognition Program,” criteria #8—

- Bronze Level: Increase Cub Scout and Boy Scout camping, or 17% of Cub Scouts went to day camp and resident camp and 45% of Boy Scouts went to a long-term camp.
- Silver Level: 30% of Cub Scouts went to day camp and resident camp and 60% of Boy Scouts went to a long-term camp.
- 50% of Cub Scouts went to day camp and resident camp and 75% of Boy Scouts went to a long-term camp.

21 Wish I knew the original source, authorship on this; it doesn’t appear anywhere that I can see on the slide or script materials that I have. If memory serves, however, it came to GSTC from a council outside of Area 2. My first copy came from Jan Herliczek, then-GSTC Vice President of Membership; earlier this year, I received another copy of the same content, from Howard Conlon, GSTC Vice President of Operations.

22 *Recommendation*, Section One, “History of the Area Project,” page 8, “The Area Project Vision.”

23 Center for Exhibition Industry Research (“CEIR”), 1996-1998.

24 Examples: *Access Group: México, Asociación Mexicana de Profesionales en Ferias, Exposiciones y Convenciones (“AMPROFEC”)*, Greater Pittsburgh Convention & Visitors Bureau (“GPCVB”), National Soft Drink Association (“NSDA”), and SnowSports Industries Association (“SIA”).

25 *Recommendation*, Section One, “History of the Area Project,” page 1, opening paragraph.

26 Again looking to “Scouting’s Journey to Excellence” for Districts, “personal coaching” is incentivized, under criteria #9.

27 *Recommendation*, Section One, “History of the Area Project,” page 5, Phase I, “Stage 1 – Generating and Digesting the Harsh Realities,” eighth *n*-dash.

28 *Ibid.*, Phase I, “Stage 1 – Generating and Digesting the Harsh Realities,” page 4, first *n*-dash.

29 *Ibid.*, Section Two, “Structure Discipline,” page 2, “Chart One: Functional Overview of Unit Focused Scouting,” second bullet point.

30 *Ibid.*, “Chart Two: Area Professional Structure,” beginning on page 3.

31 *Ibid.*, beginning on page 3, “Chart Three: Area-wide Volunteer Structure.”

32 *Ibid.*

33 *Ibid.*, “Details of Organization Charts,” page 6, “Chart Two: Detailed Discussion of Area Professional Structure,” first bullet point.

34 *Ibid.*, “Details of Organization Charts,” page 5, chart.

35 *Ibid.*, Appendix 8, “Compare & Contrast,” page 1, Topic 5, “Outdoor Program Quality.”

36 *Ibid.*, Appendix 5, “Boundaries.”

37 *Ibid.*, Section Two, “Structure Discipline,” page 2, “Summary of Organization Charts,” “Chart One: Functional Overview of Unit Focused Scouting,” first bullet point.

38 *Resolution*, second page, second paragraph.

39 *Recommendation*, Section Two, “Structure Discipline,” page 2, “Summary of Organization Charts,” “Chart One: Functional Overview of Unit Focused Scouting,” first bullet point.

40 “BSA Area Project” website, reviewed August 12, 2011.

41 *Recommendation*, “History,” “Phase I – Concluding Comments,” first paragraph, page 16.

42 Recommended: *Be Your Own Sales Manager: Strategies and Tactics for Managing Your Accounts, Your Territory, and Yourself*, Tony Alessandra, PhD, Jim Cathcart, and John Monoky, PhD (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1990).

43 Dell Deaton, “Maximizing Local Boy Scout Differential Advantages through Program Strategy: A White Paper,” April 18, 2011, page 4.

44 “Re-TEN-tion,” slides #6 and #7.

45 This specific finding, at this significant stage of youth membership loss, points to volunteer loss as “the problem” on which we should be focusing. If there is anything at all related to the paid professionals, it would be concern over shortcomings in their *coaching* duties.

46 “Re-TEN-tion,” slides #10 and #11.

47 “Re-TEN-tion,” slide #17.

48 “Re-TEN-tion,” slide #26.

49 *Recommendation*, Appendix 8, “Compare & Contrast,” page 1, Topic 1, “Unit Focus.”

50 “Re-TEN-tion,” slides #6, #7, #10, #11, #17, and #26.

51 Yes, I have read *Values of Scouting: A Study of Ethics and Character*, based upon research conducted by Harris Interactive (Boy Scouts of America, May 2005). I don’t recall it including anything that would refute what I noted above *vis-à-vis* “Re-TEN-tion.”

52 *Recommendation*, Appendix 8, “Compare & Contrast,” page 2, Topic 10, “Professional Manpower,” eliminates all current District Director and District Executives jobs in favor of part-time labor and paraprofessionals; thus, District Directors and District Executives will either qualify against competitive interviewing for new USE jobs (except for the few who may be promoted to a very limited number of also new positions?) or they’ll have no jobs at all. Additionally see Topic 11, “Professional Development,” which dispenses with the notion of hiring and/or promotions from within as a priority.

53 *Recommendation*, Section 2, “Structure Description,” page 2.

54 The degree to which professionals are already running Districts has, in practice, all-but reduced District Chairs as mere figureheads.

Example: Perhaps not coincidentally — the day before the *Crossroads Recommendation* was presented to Great Sauk Trail Council last month, I was copied on a strongly-worded “reminder” that “All district web and communications **MUST** have their appropriate staff professional’s approval” [emphasis original to quote]. So, although (*actual* volunteer-led) Units are trusted and encouraged to “get the word out on Scouting,” not even the Huron Trails District Chair (who, in this case, studied marketing and communications at the University



of Michigan, Ann Arbor, and has worked professionally in the field since 1983), can do the same on behalf of the District he was elected to serve, represent, and advocate.

Deferring to the professionals, I ceased writing my periodic column for AnnArbor.com (initially titled, "Scout Chaplain on the Great Sauk Trail," later rebranded, "Scouting for Boy Scouts"). AnnArbor.com is online successor to *The Ann Arbor News*.

- Deaton, "Preparing for the exact instant when our sons will become young men," AnnArbor.com, October 11, 2010 < <http://www.annarbor.com/entertainment/parenting/preparing-for-the-exact-instant-when-our-sons-will-become-young-men/>>, accessed August 24, 2011.
- *Id.*, "Boy Scout resources for your Apple iPhone (Part 1)," AnnArbor.com, August 23, 2010 < <http://www.annarbor.com/entertainment/parenting/boy-scout-resources-for-your-apple-iphone-part-1/>>, accessed August 24, 2011.
- *Id.*, "New Scouting stamp suggests many great ways to support getting in touch," August 16, 2010 < <http://www.annarbor.com/entertainment/parenting/new-scouting-stamp-suggests-many-great-ways-to-support-getting-in-touch/>>, accessed August 24, 2011.
- *Id.*, "Locating a Cub Scout Pack in Washtenaw County just got even easier," AnnArbor.com, August 9, 2010 < <http://www.annarbor.com/entertainment/parenting/locating-a-cub-scout-pack-in-washtenaw-county-just-got-even-easier/>>, accessed August 24, 2011.
- *Id.*, "How do we prepare for all the new Cub Scouts?" AnnArbor.com, August 3, 2010 < <http://www.annarbor.com/entertainment/parenting/how-do-we-prepare-for-all-the-new-incoming-cub-scouts/>>, accessed August 24, 2011.
- *Id.*, "Driver needed. No speeding tickets. Reliable vehicle a must," AnnArbor.com, July 27, 2010, < <http://www.annarbor.com/entertainment/parenting/driver-needed-no-speeding-tickets-reliable-vehicle-a-must/>>, accessed August 24, 2011.
- *Id.*, "Is Scouting really all that much 'fun'?" AnnArbor.com, July 20, 2010, <<http://www.annarbor.com/passions-pursuits/is-scouting-really-all-that-much-fun/>>, accessed August 24, 2011.
- *Id.*, "Leaving your mark on the Boy Scouts of America, nearly 100 years later," November 8, 2009 < <http://www.annarbor.com/entertainment/parenting/leaving-your-mark-on-the-boy-scouts-of-america-99-years-later/>>, accessed August 24, 2011.

• *Id.*, "Introduction to an adult volunteer's view of Boy Scouts, right in our area," October 17, 2009 < <http://www.annarbor.com/entertainment/parenting/introduction-to-an-adult-volunteers-view-of-boy-scouts-right-in-our-area/>>, accessed August 24, 2011.

55 **Example:** When Michigan Governor Rick Snyder signed legislation to authorize a new license plate promoting and raising funds to support the Boy Scouts of America, up to twenty Scouts and Scouters were allowed to be included the official ceremony. Inexplicably, that allotment went unfilled: < <http://2.bp.blogspot.com/-FKb1QLD5MnQ/ThMdlMc0iQI/AAAAAAAAABBQ/V2Fl1xkAOdE/s1600/license%2Bplate.jpg>>, accessed August 26, 2011. (I can be seen fulfilling my ceremonial role, standing behind the only female in the photo.)

56 The word "product" here not to be confused with "product sales," i.e., how BSA helps finance its mission. Rather, product as one of the *four Ps* — the basis upon which constituents rely in joining and otherwise supporting the Boy Scouts of America.

57 I'd approached my District Chair early in the first quarter of 2010 about becoming Huron Trails District Vice Chair for Finance, but that didn't work out because we couldn't seat a replacement for my then-current Membership responsibilities. Still, I ended up giving something like ten FOS-Family presentations last year.

58 "Re-TEN-tion," slide #26.

59 Deaton, White Paper, page 8.

60 Great Sauk Trail Council, "Progress Report Meeting" agenda, chart 43 ("Cub Scout Camp Attendance"), page 52, March 22, 2011.

61 *Ibid.*, page 53, chart 44 ("Cub Scout Camp Attendance").

62 Deaton, White Paper, page 3.

63 *Newsweek*.

64 Also see for example, Deaton, White Paper, page 20.

65 B. Joseph Pine II and James H. Gilmore, "Welcome to the Experience Economy," *Harvard Business Review*, July-August 1998.

66 *Recommendation*, Section One, "History of the Area Project," page 2, paragraph 1.

67 *Ibid.*, "Phase II," page 17, "Stage 10 – Moving the Decision Forward," paragraph 4.

68 Great Sauk Trail Council, "Thousands More Youth Can Know the Joy of Scouting," August 2011. Sent to Board Members via eMail on August 23, 2011.

69 Or maybe the "bylaws change" scheme is evidence of *chickens come home to roost?* For years, I've been among District and Council volunteers arguing against professionals' top-down imposition of new Unit start-up targets. Chartered Organizations and their CORs regarded merely as names to complete (pesky?) forms *so we can get the paperwork in to National!* "Make it as easy as possible for them to sign on the dotted line."

If this was the standard for entrusting CORs with Unit health and youth, shouldn't the leadership of A2P reap what it sowed by putting its own fate before those same CORs — *sans* any special, one-time-only bylaws change to lower the bar on voting to make it easier to get approval?

70 As of today, August 26, 2011, I note that the official "BSA Area Project" has still not been updated to make available the August 20, 2011, *Crossroads Recommendation* revision (it continues to show the July 1, 2011, draft as current). This implies yet another example of where the electorate at large ranks in terms of accountably making information available to them in a timely fashion in support of their making an informed decision.

Remember: The current revision swelled by a full 40 pages over the 70-page July 1 version, meaning a 57% increase in material. Yet A2P leadership would have interested readers continue relying upon outdated material for almost a week, and counting? Speaking from personal experience, comparing the August 20 and July 1 documents for differences delayed my ability to get this material out until today (which is as late as I felt I could wait, given the final-stretch pitch meeting next Thursday): A rush no doubt evidenced at points here and there in what I have written here for consideration.

71 Great Sauk Trail Council, "Thousands More Youth....," closing paragraph.

72 All-caps, bold-face typography original to quote.