

CIRCLE TEN COUNCIL ALIGNMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

June 1, 2011

The Circle Ten Council Board and Chartered Organization Representatives approved a new Strategic Plan at the December 2010 Annual Meeting that is designed to enable Circle Ten Council to become “The ICONIC BSA Council”. As part of that plan, the Council formed an Alignment Committee to study the alignment of districts within the Council to ensure that we are positioned to make the maximum impact for the youth that we serve. Circle Ten Council is currently divided into 19 traditional Scouting districts, of which 6 are served by two professionals each (“two man districts”). The current alignment has districts with a wide disparity of financial, youth and adult leadership resources. It was determined that it has been at least 30 years since the last comprehensive review of district boundaries has occurred.

The Alignment Committee, made up of forty-one experienced and engaged volunteer leaders with representation from each district, met five times over several months. The charge given to the committee was to assume that there were currently no district boundaries and that we were establishing district boundaries for the first time. The committee was asked to make recommendations as to what alignment would best enable us to serve more youth with a quality Scouting program.

Although a Scouting District can be successful with different sizes, the experience of the Boy Scouts of America nationwide has shown that districts that fall close to these criteria are most effective in delivering the program of Scouting. These criteria are commonly called “The Ideal District”:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Total Available Youth: | 11,500 |
| 2. Cub Scout Youth Served: | 21.0% |
| 3. Boy Scout Youth Served: | 17.6% |
| 4. Venturing Youth Served: | 2.1% |
| 5. Total Youth Population Served: | 12.5% or approx. 1,450 youth members |
| 6. Total Units: | 50 – 60 |
| 7. Unit Commissioners: | 17 – 20 (1:3 units) |
| 8. District Committee Members: | 21 |
| 9. Retention: | 71.0% |

Our culture in Texas is to gravitate to size – “bigger is better”. In Scouting this can work against us. We can have a large district with lots of members but not be attaining even the national standard of the percentage of youth available to be members. In addition the logistics of managing a large district can become more than a group of volunteers is willing or able to handle as a part-time endeavor.

“Scouting’s Journey to Excellence” (“JTE”) is the BSA’s council performance recognition program designed to encourage and reward success and measure the performance of our units, districts, and councils. It is replacing the Centennial Quality Awards Program as a means of encouraging excellence in providing a quality program at all levels of the BSA.

The BSA groups councils by size. Circle Ten Council is one of the ten largest councils in the country. The table below shows % Youth Served and Retention for those 10 largest (by 2010 membership) councils in the country. These two key measures are critical in showing how well a council is serving the youth of its communities. The percent served shows how well a council is extending the opportunity to join Scouting.

Retention is the key program quality indicator, showing how well a council keeps those youth in Scouting. As you can see from the data below, Circle Ten Council does not fare well in either of these key indicators:

| | % of Youth Served | Retention % |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| JTE Council Gold Level | 14.0% | 75.0% |
| JTE Council Silver Level | 10.0% | 68.0% |
| JTE Council Bronze Level | 7.0% | 62.0% |
| “Ideal” District Standard | 12.5% | 71.0% |
| 2010 Results: | | |
| Circle Ten | 8.9% - Rank 7 | 68.0% - Rank 8 |
| National Capital Area – DC | 9.7% - Rank 5 | 78.3% - Rank 2 |
| Saint Louis | 14.0% - Rank 3 | 74.5% - Rank 4 |
| Salt Lake | 49.1% - Rank 1 | 83.4% - Rank 1 |
| Houston | 8.4% - Rank 10 | 69.3% - Rank 7 |
| Atlanta | 8.5% - Rank 8-Tie | 67.5% - Rank 9 |
| Saint Paul | 11.7% - Rank 4 | 73.2% - Rank 6 |
| Kansas City | 16.3% - Rank 2 | 73.8% - Rank 5 |
| Phoenix | 8.5% - Rank 8-Tie | 76.9% - Rank 3 |
| Denver | 9.4% - Rank 6 | 49.9% - Rank 10 |

The committee believes that by making the districts smaller, the logistics of managing the district get smaller and simpler allowing district leadership the opportunity to focus on becoming the ICONIC BSA Council, instead of just customer service of existing members. More districts allow for more volunteer leadership opportunities and more youth leadership opportunities through activities, such as the Order of the Arrow. The committee feels strongly that their recommendations will allow volunteers and staff to work together to expand the Scouting program to more young people.

Recommendations:

After careful review the committee is recommending the realignment of almost every current district. Below is a brief summary of the impact of the recommendation:

1. **Texoma Valley** – No change
2. **Lone Star** – No change – TAY is large and is anticipated to continue to grow
3. **Southern Sky 1** – Allen ISD and Lovejoy ISD
4. **Southern Sky 2** – Remainder of Southern Sky – primarily Frisco ISD, Celina ISD, Prosper ISD
5. **Great Plains 1** – Divide Plano ISD in two – Northern half of Plano ISD, north of Parker Road, transfer Wylie ISD, Communities ISD, Nevada to Gray Owl 2
6. **Great Plains 2** – Southern half of Plano ISD, south of Parker Road
7. **Tawakoni** – Hunt and Rains County
8. **Gray Owl 1** – Garland ISD (Garland and Rowlett)
9. **Gray Owl 2** – Wylie ISD, Communities ISD, Nevada, Rockwall County
10. **Cherokee 1** – Kaufman and Van Zandt Counties – Although the TAY for this area is relatively small, it is believed that a district executive and district leadership would improve our percentage of youth served substantially.
11. **Cherokee 2** – Henderson and Navarro Counties – Corsicana and Athens - Although the TAY for this area is relatively small it is believed that a district executive and district leadership would improve our percentage of youth served substantially.
12. **Bluebonnet** – Ellis County

13. **Wisdom Trail** – No Change - Duncanville ISD, DeSoto ISD, Cedar Hill ISD, Lancaster ISD
14. **Mountain Lake** – No change - Grand Prairie ISD
15. **Western Star** – Coppell ISD, Irving ISD
16. **North District** – Carrollton-Farmers Branch ISD, transfer current DISD portions to North Trail 2
17. **North Trail 1** – Richardson ISD
18. **North Trail 2** – Dallas ISD north of Northwest Highway– Preston Hollow, Addison, northwest Dallas
19. **North Trail 3/West View** – Highland Park ISD, old West View District, south of HPIISD and west of Central Expressway, downtown, Fair Park area of Comanche District
20. **White Buffalo/White Rock** – Merge – areas west of Central Expressway and south of I-30 to be combined with North Trail 3/West View
21. **Tomahawk** – Mesquite ISD
22. **Comanche** – Move Fair Park to North Trail 3/West View – South Dallas – Dallas ISD east of I - 45 and south of I - 30
23. **Mustang** – No change – Oak Cliff – Dallas ISD west of I - 45 and south of I - 30

Implementation Strategy

1. Timing - Although the consensus was that the Council will be best served by implementing the realignment as of January 1, 2012 several committee members voiced their opinion that the phase-in process start as soon as possible and extend to the end of the 2011-2012 school year. This would allow units to plan district activities with the least amount of disruption.
2. Implementation Process - The major items of preparation that will need to be accomplished:
 - Create nominating committees knowledgeable of the new districts
 - Recruit new district leadership
 - Divide existing district committees and commissioner staffs according to new district boundaries
 - Recruit full committees in new districts
 - Establish regular district meeting schedule and locations
 - Communicate the change with all constituents
 - Realignment of professional staff
 - Work with the Order of the Arrow to create new chapters and select youth and adult leadership
 - Create new district names
3. Anticipated Results:
 - Better serve our youth and volunteer leaders
 - Increase our percent youth served
 - Increase our retention
 - Provide more leadership opportunities for adults and youth
 - Improve communications at all levels
 - Improve volunteer and professional leadership
 - Improve community involvement across the council
 - Review results and adjust boundaries at least every five years