

SCOUTS-L

QUALITY UNIT

From <@pucc.PRINCETON.EDU:owner-scouts-l@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU> **Fri Nov 22 16:52:51 1996**

Return-Path: <@pucc.PRINCETON.EDU:owner-scouts-l@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>

Received: from dns.capaccess.org (root@dns.CapAccess.org [207.91.115.4]) by cap1.CapAccess.org (8.6.12/8.6.10) with ESMTP id QAA20141; **Fri, 22 Nov 1996 16:52:51 -0500**

Received: from pucc.PRINCETON.EDU (smtpc@pucc.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.99]) by dns.capaccess.org (8.6.12/8.6.12) with SMTP id QAA05458; **Fri, 22 Nov 1996 16:52:47 -0500**

Received: from PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU by pucc.PRINCETON.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)

with BSMTP id 4616; **Fri, 22 Nov 96 16:34:20 EST**

Received: from TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (NJE origin MAILER@TCUBVM) by PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 3226; **Tue, 19 Nov 1996 18:40:49 -0500**

Received: from TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (NJE origin LISTSERV@TCUBVM) by TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 6255; **Tue, 19 Nov 1996 17:34:09 -0600**

Received: from TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU by TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (LISTSERV release 1.8b)

with NJE id 6244 for SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU; **Tue, 19 Nov 1996**

17:33:16 -0600

Received: from TCUBVM (NJE origin SMTP@TCUBVM) by TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (LMail

V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 6243; **Tue, 19 Nov 1996 17:33:15 -0600**

Received: from yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU by tcubvm.is.tcu.edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)

with TCP; **Tue, 19 Nov 96 17:33:13 CST**

Received: from vines.ColoState.EDU by yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU (AIX 4.1/UCB

5.64/4.03) id AA58122; **Tue, 19 Nov 1996 16:32:55 -0700**

Received: by vines.ColoState.EDU with VINES-ISMTTP; **Tue, 19 Nov 96 16:33:12 MST**

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Message-ID: <vines.1pu7+pCYyMA@vines.ColoState.EDU>

Date: Tue, 19 Nov 1996 15:59:26 MST

Reply-To: Carol Breuer <CBreuer@VINES.COLOSTATE.EDU>

Sender: Scouts-L Youth Group List <Scouts-L@tcu.edu>

From: Carol Breuer <CBreuer@VINES.COLOSTATE.EDU>
Subject: QU requirements
To: Multiple recipients of list SCOUTS-L <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>
Status: RO
X-Status:

Okay, I got busy and called our council office on this. They faxed me a copy of the 1997 Quality Unit form for troops. This is what I found out.

"Unit must achieve six of ten to qualify as a National Quality Troop. (Five starred [*] items are required, plus an additional one - six total.)"

The starred items are:

"1. Training. The Scoutmaster will complete Boy Scout Leader Fast Start Training and Scoutmastership Fundamentals."

"2. Two-Deep Leadership. We will have one or more assistant Scoutmasters registered, trained, and active. One registered adult is assigned responsibility for Youth Protection training."

"7. Outdoor Activities. The troop will conduct six highlight activities (such as hikes, campouts, trips, tours, etc.) and attend a Boy Scouts of America long-term camp."

"8. Membership. We will renew our charter with an equal or greater number of youth registered over a year ago.

_____ Number of Boy Scouts registered at the beginning of the current charter year.

_____ Number of Boy Scouts who will register at the beginning of the next charter year."

"10. On-Time Charter Renewal. The troop will complete its charter renewal before its current charter expires."

Please note that #8 is required, but that the requirement is for an ****EQUAL**** or greater number of youth. This is not saying that the troop has to increase in numbers indefinitely, but that membership for a quality unit should not decrease from one year to the next.

Yes, this will knock some troops out of the Quality Award if they show

a decrease in numbers. Sometimes there are valid reasons why that might happen, but maybe we need to look at why this change is being made. If a troop is offering a quality program, should we see a decrease in the number of scouts benefitting from that program? If boys join a troop, and then become inactive, is there adequate follow-up being done to find out why they lose interest?

As volunteers we often accuse our professional staff of being too concerned with numbers for numbers sake. But on the other hand, those numbers indicate youth who are part of the Scouting program, and no matter how good our program is, it can't benefit those who are not a part of it.

I have to admit to being caught with egg on my face on this one. I missed being informed of a change I should have been aware of. And I am disturbed that more notice and attention did not get paid to this kind of a change. But with a little more thought on it, I begin to see why it might be a positive direction for the future. It reminds us to keep our focus on the youth we want to serve, and not let them fall by the wayside without more effort to meet their needs.

YiS,
Carol Breuer, Fort Collins, CO
Asst. District Commissioner
. . . I used to be an eagle, NC-155

From <@pucc.PRINCETON.EDU:owner-scouts-l@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU> Tue Nov 26 18:18:05 1996

Return-Path: <@pucc.PRINCETON.EDU:owner-scouts-l@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>

Received: from pucc.PRINCETON.EDU (smtp@pucc.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.99]) by cap1.CapAccess.org (8.6.12/8.6.10) with SMTP id SAA19769; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 18:18:05 -0500

Received: from PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU by pucc.PRINCETON.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)

with BSMTP id 3549; Tue, 26 Nov 96 18:13:37 EST

Received: from TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (NJE origin MAILER@TCUBVM) by PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 5173; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 18:13:36 -0500

Received: from TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (NJE origin LISTSERV@TCUBVM) by TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 9381; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 17:11:33 -0600

Received: from TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU by TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (LISTSERV release 1.8b)

with NJE id 9285 for SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU; Tue, 26 Nov 1996

17:07:40 -0600

Received: from TCUBVM (NJE origin SMTP@TCUBVM) by TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (LMail

V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 9284; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 16:58:20 -0600

Received: from ALPHA.IS.TCU.EDU by tcubvm.is.tcu.edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R2) with

TCP; Tue, 26 Nov 96 16:57:38 CST

Received: from Kitten.mcs.com (Kitten.mcs.com) by ALPHA.IS.TCU.EDU (PMDF V5.0-5

#15868) id <01ICB4THKRW00003TJ@ALPHA.IS.TCU.EDU> for Scouts-L@ALPHA.IS.TCU.EDU; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 16:57:11 -0500

(CDT)

Received: from rgn.pr.mcs.net (rgn.pr.mcs.net [205.164.61.189]) by Kitten.mcs.com (8.8.2/8.8.2) with SMTP id QAA10143 for

<Scouts-L@tcu.edu>; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 16:56:56 -0600 (CST)

X-Sender: rgn@popmail.mcs.com

MIME-version: 1.0

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.4 (32)

Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT

Message-ID: <1.5.4.32.19961126225802.00682944@popmail.mcs.com>

Date: Tue, 26 Nov 1996 16:58:02 -0600

Reply-To: Bob Nieland <rgn@MCS.NET>

Sender: Scouts-L Youth Group List <Scouts-L@tcu.edu>

From: Bob Nieland <rgn@MCS.NET>

Subject: Honor Unit Recognition

X-To: Scouts-L Youth Group List <Scouts-L@tcu.edu>

To: Multiple recipients of list SCOUTS-L <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>

Status: RO

X-Status:

John Pannell wrote:

>In our district we had - before the split - and will continue to have and

>"Honor Unit Award". This was created after National switched from

"Honor

>Unit" to "Quality Unit". Traditionally the requirements for this have been

>all the QU requirements, more or less.

>

>We will be considering not including the membership increase requirement as

>a requirement for our local Honor Unit award. We have units in our
>districts that **should** NOT increase in size because to do so would strain
>or harm their programs.

Our pack is part of the District John refers to. In the years in which we earn it, we purchase the District's Honor Unit, rather than the National Quality Unit, patches. For those of you who may be interested in pursuing the idea of a District Honor Unit Award in your area, below is a list of what our District's requirements were for 1996:

=====

In order to earn the Honor Unit citation, the unit must achieve all ten items for the National Quality Unit Award, plus seven of the ten items below:

1. **Rechartering.** The unit rechartered on or before the 15th day of the month preceding the date of its charter expiration.

2. **Advanced Training.** A minimum of 51% of the unit's uniformed leadership participated in advanced or supplemental training courses.

3. **Unit Administration.** The unit plans a full year's program in advance, distributes printed copies to all families and holds monthly planning meetings.

4. **Roundtable Participation.** The unit was represented at each monthly Roundtable.

5. **Boys' Life.** One hundred percent of the unit's Scouts subscribe to Boys' Life magazine.

6. Camping. The unit attended Three Fire Council's Cub Scout Day Camp or Resident Camp.

7. Budgeting. The unit uses the budget plan and develops a budget worksheet, periodically reviews actual expenses against budget, and participates in the Friends of Scouting campaign.

8. Youth Protection Training. At least 51% of the adult leaders have attended youth protection training.

9. Kickoff. The unit was represented by two or more leaders at the Council's annual program kickoff.

10. Scout-O-Rama. The unit participated with a booth at Scout-O-Rama.

=====

Bob Nieland
Committee Chairman, Cub Scout Pack 101
Naperville, Illinois
<http://www.pack101.org>
<mailto:rgn@mcs.net>

From <@pucc.PRINCETON.EDU:owner-scouts-l@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU> Wed
Nov 27 18:56:23 1996
Return-Path: <@pucc.PRINCETON.EDU:owner-scouts-l@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>
Received: from pucc.PRINCETON.EDU (smtpc@pucc.Princeton.EDU
[128.112.129.99]) by cap1.CapAccess.org (8.6.12/8.6.10) with SMTP id
SAA28788; Wed, 27 Nov 1996 18:56:23 -0500

Received: from PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU by pucc.PRINCETON.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)

with BSMTP id 4680; Wed, 27 Nov 96 18:51:25 EST

Received: from TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (NJE origin MAILER@TCUBVM) by PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 2340; Wed, 27 Nov 1996 18:51:25 -0500

Received: from TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (NJE origin LISTSERV@TCUBVM) by TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 4794; Wed, 27 Nov 1996 17:48:59 -0600

Received: from TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU by TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (LISTSERV release 1.8b)

with NJE id 4788 for SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU; Wed, 27 Nov 1996

17:47:58 -0600

Received: from TCUBVM (NJE origin SMTP@TCUBVM) by TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (LMail

V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 4787; Wed, 27 Nov 1996 17:47:56 -0600

Received: from emout09.mail.aol.com by tcubvm.is.tcu.edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)

with TCP; Wed, 27 Nov 96 17:47:54 CST

Received: by emout09.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id SAA15310 for SCOUTS-L@tcubvm.is.tcu.edu; Wed, 27 Nov 1996 18:47:32 -0500

Message-ID: <961127184731_706284351@emout09.mail.aol.com>

Date: Wed, 27 Nov 1996 18:47:32 -0500

Reply-To: A91VIGIL@AOL.COM

Sender: Scouts-L Youth Group List <Scouts-L@tcu.edu>

From: Geary Morrill <A91VIGIL@AOL.COM>

Subject: Re: Quality Unit (opinions are nice, seems everybody has one.. here's some facts

To: Multiple recipients of list SCOUTS-L <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>

Status: RO

X-Status:

If everyone who has posted to this thread would simply apply the same creative thought processes shown in arguing their positions to meeting existing QU objectives as written, we'd soon have to find another topic. Considering none of us would have ever been in Scouting if our leadership hadn't been receptive to some growth, we seem to now be strangely myopic about encouraging growth.

I've never seen so many arguments against growth. What's really being discussed is regeneration. It's biological. Your body grows cells every day,

and it doesn't debate the importance. Cells are lost. Without new cells, pretty soon the body dies. Arguing against "planned growth" is arguing for "planned death"

Facts:

Scoutings reach = 18% = <1 in 5 Scouting age youth.

Median BSA troop size = 16 Scouts.

Program quality increases significantly* when troop size reaches 21.

Strongest Troops* serve 33 or more youth -11% of all units

Ratio of adults to Scouts in strongest units nearly 1 to 2**

Strong Troops exist in every size & type of town/city/ region

Common denominator = strong, well trained, motivated adult/youth leadership

*** in advancement, membership growth, trained leadership & member retention.**

**** either as a unit leader or member of committee.**

Among troops 16 youth members

61% of larger troops plan troop program in patrol leaders council.

71% conduct monthly patrol leaders council meetings

66% went camping 25 or more days/year

93% went to a Boy Scout-operated summer camp.

A majority also have outdoor adventures their youth membership plan, a program for older Scouts, and add 10 new members a year (yes they have losses, too!)

Among troops 16 youth members

16% plan troop program in patrol leaders council

26% conduct monthly patrol leaders council meetings

To quote one Scoutmaster: "Small Troops are ran by adults, large Troops are ran by boys".

71% of dropped troops had five (minimum requirement) or fewer adults

78% of dropped units had 16 or fewer boys.

100% of Dropped units deliver poor quality program.

95% of Scoutmasters get 100% of membership from Webelos Scout Dens (that's 19 of 20 units)

2nd year Webelos program serves 20% of the available youth population

(400% growth potential - unless, of course, you enjoy focusing on negatives)

Majority (> 2/3) of Scoutmasters are pleased with the size of their unit than

not

(regardless of it's size). They see little or no need for further growth.

Top reasons given for not wanting/having growth objectives

- Not enough young people in the neighborhood
- Not enough room in the meeting hall

Majority of Scouts (> 2/3) want more Scouts in their units than not (regardless of size)

Top reasons given:

- More fun having more guys involved
- More things to do

So, whose troops are these, anyway? Possible wrong people (former youth) are

making all decisions/rationalizations about lack of unit growth??

- Train 'em
- Trust 'em
- Let 'em lead

It was true over 80 years ago, and when some of us were youth members..Do we suspect it may still be valid today?

Geary

From <@pucc.PRINCETON.EDU:owner-scouts-l@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU> Fri Nov 22 16:52:51 1996

Return-Path: <@pucc.PRINCETON.EDU:owner-scouts-l@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>

Received: from dns.capaccess.org (root@dns.CapAccess.org [207.91.115.4])

by cap1.CapAccess.org (8.6.12/8.6.10) with ESMTP id QAA20141; Fri, 22 Nov 1996 16:52:51 -0500

Received: from pucc.PRINCETON.EDU (smtpc@pucc.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.99]) by dns.capaccess.org (8.6.12/8.6.12) with SMTP id QAA05458; Fri, 22 Nov 1996 16:52:47 -0500

Received: from PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU by pucc.PRINCETON.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)

with BSMTP id 4616; Fri, 22 Nov 96 16:34:20 EST

Received: from TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (NJE origin MAILER@TCUBVM) by PUCCL.PRINCETON.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 3226; Tue, 19 Nov 1996 18:40:49 -0500

Received: from TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (NJE origin LISTSERV@TCUBVM) by TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 6255; Tue, 19 Nov 1996 17:34:09 -0600

Received: from TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU by TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (LISTSERV release 1.8b)

with NJE id 6244 for SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU; Tue, 19 Nov 1996

17:33:16 -0600

Received: from TCUBVM (NJE origin SMTP@TCUBVM) by TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (LMail

V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 6243; Tue, 19 Nov 1996 17:33:15 -0600

Received: from yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU by tcubvm.is.tcu.edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)

with TCP; Tue, 19 Nov 96 17:33:13 CST

Received: from vines.ColoState.EDU by yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU (AIX 4.1/UCB

5.64/4.03) id AA58122; Tue, 19 Nov 1996 16:32:55 -0700

Received: by vines.ColoState.EDU with VINES-ISMTP; Tue, 19 Nov 96 16:33:12 MST

X-Priority: 3 (Normal)

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Message-ID: <vines.1pu7+pCYyMA@vines.ColoState.EDU>

Date: Tue, 19 Nov 1996 15:59:26 MST

Reply-To: Carol Breuer <CBreuer@VINES.COLOSTATE.EDU>

Sender: Scouts-L Youth Group List <Scouts-L@tcu.edu>

From: Carol Breuer <CBreuer@VINES.COLOSTATE.EDU>

Subject: QU requirements

To: Multiple recipients of list SCOUTS-L <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>

Status: RO

X-Status:

Okay, I got busy and called our council office on this. They faxed me a copy of the 1997 Quality Unit form for troops. This is what I found out.

"Unit must achieve six of ten to qualify as a National Quality Troop. (Five starred [*] items are required, plus an additional one - six total.)"

The starred items are:

"1. Training. The Scoutmaster will complete Boy Scout Leader Fast Start Training and Scoutmastership Fundamentals."

"2. Two-Deep Leadership. We will have one or more assistant Scoutmasters registered, trained, and active. One registered adult is assigned responsibility for Youth Protection training."

"7. Outdoor Activities. The troop will conduct six highlight activities (such as hikes, campouts, trips, tours, etc.) and attend a Boy Scouts of America long-term camp."

"8. Membership. We will renew our charter with an equal or greater number of youth registered over a year ago.

_____ Number of Boy Scouts registered at the beginning of the current charter year.

_____ Number of Boy Scouts who will register at the beginning of the next charter year."

"10. On-Time Charter Renewal. The troop will complete its charter renewal before its current charter expires."

Please note that #8 is required, but that the requirement is for an **EQUAL**** or greater number of youth. This is not saying that the troop has to increase in numbers indefinitely, but that membership for a quality unit should not decrease from one year to the next.**

Yes, this will knock some troops out of the Quality Award if they show a decrease in numbers. Sometimes there are valid reasons why that might happen, but maybe we need to look at why this change is being made. If a troop is offering a quality program, should we see a decrease in the number of scouts benefitting from that program? If boys join a troop, and then become inactive, is there adequate follow-up being done to find out why they lose interest?

As volunteers we often accuse our professional staff of being too concerned with numbers for numbers sake. But on the other hand, those numbers indicate youth who are part of the Scouting program, and no matter how good our program is, it can't benefit those who are not a part of it.

I have to admit to being caught with egg on my face on this one. I

missed being informed of a change I should have been aware of. And I am disturbed that more notice and attention did not get paid to this kind of a change. But with a little more thought on it, I begin to see why it might be a positive direction for the future. It reminds us to keep our focus on the youth we want to serve, and not let them fall by the wayside without more effort to meet their needs.

YiS,

Carol Breuer, Fort Collins, CO
Asst. District Commissioner

. . . I used to be an eagle, NC-155

From <@pucc.PRINCETON.EDU:owner-scouts-l@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU> Tue
Nov 26 18:18:05 1996

Return-Path: <@pucc.PRINCETON.EDU:owner-scouts-l@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>

Received: from pucc.PRINCETON.EDU (smtpe@pucc.Princeton.EDU
[128.112.129.99]) by cap1.CapAccess.org (8.6.12/8.6.10) with SMTP id
SAA19769; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 18:18:05 -0500

Received: from PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU by pucc.PRINCETON.EDU (IBM VM
SMTP V2R2)

with BSMTP id 3549; Tue, 26 Nov 96 18:13:37 EST

Received: from TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (NJE origin MAILER@TCUBVM) by
PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 5173; Tue, 26 Nov
1996 18:13:36 -0500

Received: from TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (NJE origin LISTSERV@TCUBVM) by
TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 9381; Tue,
26 Nov 1996 17:11:33 -0600

Received: from TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU by TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (LISTSERV
release 1.8b)

with NJE id 9285 for SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU; Tue, 26 Nov
1996

17:07:40 -0600

Received: from TCUBVM (NJE origin SMTP@TCUBVM) by
TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (LMail

V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 9284; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 16:58:20 -0600

Received: from ALPHA.IS.TCU.EDU by tcubvm.is.tcu.edu (IBM VM SMTP
V2R2) with

TCP; Tue, 26 Nov 96 16:57:38 CST

Received: from Kitten.mcs.com (Kitten.mcs.com) by ALPHA.IS.TCU.EDU
(PMDF V5.0-5

#15868) id <01ICB4THKRW00003TJ@ALPHA.IS.TCU.EDU> for
Scouts-L@ALPHA.IS.TCU.EDU; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 16:57:11 -0500

(CDT)

Received: from rgn.pr.mcs.net (rgn.pr.mcs.net [205.164.61.189]) by Kitten.mcs.com (8.8.2/8.8.2) with SMTP id QAA10143 for <Scouts-L@tcu.edu>; Tue, 26 Nov 1996 16:56:56 -0600 (CST)
X-Sender: rgn@popmail.mcs.com
MIME-version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.4 (32)
Content-type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Message-ID: <1.5.4.32.19961126225802.00682944@popmail.mcs.com>
Date: Tue, 26 Nov 1996 16:58:02 -0600
Reply-To: Bob Nieland <rgn@MCS.NET>
Sender: Scouts-L Youth Group List <Scouts-L@tcu.edu>
From: Bob Nieland <rgn@MCS.NET>
Subject: Honor Unit Recognition
X-To: Scouts-L Youth Group List <Scouts-L@tcu.edu>
To: Multiple recipients of list SCOUTS-L <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>
Status: RO
X-Status:

John Pannell wrote:

>In our district we had - before the split - and will continue to have and
>"Honor Unit Award". This was created after National switched from
>"Honor
>Unit" to "Quality Unit". Traditionally the requirements for this have been
>all the QU requirements, more or less.
>
>We will be considering not including the membership increase
requirement as
>a requirement for our local Honor Unit award. We have units in our
>districts that *should* NOT increase in size because to do so would strain
>or harm their programs.

Our pack is part of the District John refers to. In the years in which we earn it, we purchase the District's Honor Unit, rather than the National Quality Unit, patches. For those of you who may be interested in pursuing the idea of a District Honor Unit Award in your area, below is a list of what our District's requirements were for 1996:

=====

In order to earn the Honor Unit citation, the unit must achieve all ten

items for the National Quality Unit Award, plus seven of the ten items below:

1. Rechartering. The unit rechartered on or before the 15th day of the month preceding the date of its charter expiration.

2. Advanced Training. A minimum of 51% of the unit's uniformed leadership participated in advanced or supplemental training courses.

3. Unit Administration. The unit plans a full year's program in advance, distributes printed copies to all families and holds monthly planning meetings.

4. Roundtable Participation. The unit was represented at each monthly Roundtable.

5. Boys' Life. One hundred percent of the unit's Scouts subscribe to Boys' Life magazine.

6. Camping. The unit attended Three Fire Council's Cub Scout Day Camp or Resident Camp.

7. Budgeting. The unit uses the budget plan and develops a budget worksheet, periodically reviews actual expenses against budget, and participates in the Friends of Scouting campaign.

8. Youth Protection Training. At least 51% of the adult leaders have attended youth protection training.

9. Kickoff. The unit was represented by two or more leaders at the Council's annual program kickoff.

10. Scout-O-Rama. The unit participated with a booth at Scout-O-Rama.

=====
Bob Nieland
Committee Chairman, Cub Scout Pack 101
Naperville, Illinois
<http://www.pack101.org>
<mailto:rgn@mcs.net>

From <@pucc.PRINCETON.EDU:owner-scouts-l@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU> Wed Nov 27 18:56:23 1996
Return-Path: <@pucc.PRINCETON.EDU:owner-scouts-l@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>
Received: from pucc.PRINCETON.EDU (smtpc@pucc.Princeton.EDU [128.112.129.99]) by cap1.CapAccess.org (8.6.12/8.6.10) with SMTP id SAA28788; Wed, 27 Nov 1996 18:56:23 -0500
Received: from PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU by pucc.PRINCETON.EDU (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)
with BSMTP id 4680; Wed, 27 Nov 96 18:51:25 EST
Received: from TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (NJE origin MAILER@TCUBVM) by PUCC.PRINCETON.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 2340; Wed, 27 Nov 1996 18:51:25 -0500
Received: from TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (NJE origin LISTSERV@TCUBVM) by TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (LMail V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 4794; Wed, 27 Nov 1996 17:48:59 -0600
Received: from TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU by TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (LISTSERV release 1.8b)
with NJE id 4788 for SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU; Wed, 27 Nov 1996

17:47:58 -0600

Received: from TCUBVM (NJE origin SMTP@TCUBVM) by TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU (LMail

V1.2a/1.8a) with BSMTP id 4787; Wed, 27 Nov 1996 17:47:56 -0600

Received: from emout09.mail.aol.com by tcubvm.is.tcu.edu (IBM VM SMTP V2R2)

with TCP; Wed, 27 Nov 96 17:47:54 CST

Received: by emout09.mail.aol.com (8.6.12/8.6.12) id SAA15310 for SCOUTS-L@tcubvm.is.tcu.edu; Wed, 27 Nov 1996 18:47:32 -0500

Message-ID: <961127184731_706284351@emout09.mail.aol.com>

Date: Wed, 27 Nov 1996 18:47:32 -0500

Reply-To: A91VIGIL@AOL.COM

Sender: Scouts-L Youth Group List <Scouts-L@tcu.edu>

From: Geary Morrill <A91VIGIL@AOL.COM>

Subject: Re: Quality Unit (opinions are nice, seems everybody has one.. here's some facts

To: Multiple recipients of list SCOUTS-L <SCOUTS-L@TCUBVM.IS.TCU.EDU>

Status: RO

X-Status:

If everyone who has posted to this thread would simply apply the same creative thought processes shown in arguing their positions to meeting existing QU objectives as written, we'd soon have to find another topic. Considering none of us would have ever been in Scouting if our leadership hadn't been receptive to some growth, we seem to now be strangely myopic about encouraging growth.

I've never seen so many arguments against growth. What's really being discussed is regeneration. It's biological. Your body grows cells every day, and it doesn't debate the importance. Cells are lost. Without new cells, pretty soon the body dies. Arguing against "planned growth" is arguing for "planned death"

Facts:

Scoutings reach = 18% = <1 in 5 Scouting age youth.

Median BSA troop size = 16 Scouts.

Program quality increases significantly* when troop size reaches 21.

Strongest Troops* serve 33 or more youth -11% of all units

Ratio of adults to Scouts in strongest units nearly 1 to 2**

Strong Troops exist in every size & type of town/city/ region

Common denominator = strong, well trained, motivated adult/youth leadership

*** in advancement, membership growth, trained leadership & member retention.**

**** either as a unit leader or member of committee.**

Among troops 16 youth members

61% of larger troops plan troop program in patrol leaders council.

71% conduct monthly patrol leaders council meetings

66% went camping 25 or more days/year

93% went to a Boy Scout-operated summer camp.

A majority also have outdoor adventures their youth membership plan, a program for older Scouts, and add 10 new members a year (yes they have losses, too!)

Among troops 16 youth members

16% plan troop program in patrol leaders council

26% conduct monthly patrol leaders council meetings

To quote one Scoutmaster: "Small Troops are ran by adults, large Troops are ran by boys".

71% of dropped troops had five (minimum requirement) or fewer adults

78% of dropped units had 16 or fewer boys.

100% of Dropped units deliver poor quality program.

95% of Scoutmasters get 100% of membership from Webelos Scout Dens (that's 19 of 20 units)

2nd year Webelos program serves 20% of the available youth population (400% growth potential - unless, of course, you enjoy focusing on negatives)

Majority (> 2/3) of Scoutmasters are pleased with the size of their unit than

not

(regardless of it's size). They see little or no need for further growth.

Top reasons given for not wanting/having growth objectives

- Not enough young people in the neighborhood

- Not enough room in the meeting hall

Majority of Scouts (> 2/3) want more Scouts in their units than not (regardless of size)

Top reasons given:

- **More fun having more guys involved**
- **More things to do**

So, whose troops are these, anyway? Possible wrong people (former youth) are making all decisions/rationalizations about lack of unit growth??

- **Train 'em**
- **Trust 'em**
- **Let 'em lead**

It was true over 80 years ago, and when some of us were youth members..Do we suspect it may still be valid today?

Geary