

american **CAMP** association®

20/20 Initiatives

Name of Initiative: Local/Section Operations

Overview

- **Key Personnel:**
 1. Volunteers: Rich Garbinsky, Peter Surgenor, Ann Sheets, Posie Taylor, Scott Brody, Diane Tyrrell
 2. Staff: Peg Smith, Susan Yoder

- **Objective** (Charge): Develop a process to facilitate dialogue with the Sections and the National Board regarding the long-term viability and structure of the local grass-roots arm of the association.

- **Desired Outcomes** (including return on investment [ROI] and specific benchmarks):
 1. Present recommendations to the National Board regarding the future structure and operations of the local grass-roots arm of the association that will set the association up to achieve viability and the 20/20 vision.
 2. Full participation of the Sections through their Presidents, Section Boards, Delegates and Staff.
 3. ROI: More stability and viability in the local grass-roots arm of the association leading to decreased redundancy and better use of resources.

- **Timeline(s)** (including benchmark timelines):
 1. Preliminary discussion materials to the Sections by 9/1/08.
 2. Preliminary discussion materials to the Presidents and Executives in preparation for the November meeting – by 10/15/08.
 3. In person discussion with Presidents and Executives 11/17-18/08.
 4. Follow up materials to the Sections by 1/2/09.
 5. In person discussion with the COD 2/2009.
 6. Follow up materials to the Sections by 3/1/09.
 7. Continuing discussions in the field following 3/1/09.
 8. Leadership summit – fall of 2009.

- **Other Impacted Groups:**
 1. Name(s): All Sections, National Board
 2. Communication Strategies: See timeline above.
 3. Avenues for Dialogue and Feedback: See timeline above

- **Budget:** Work of this group is within the budget of the 2020 Task Force.

Current Status

- Date of Update: 10/2/2009
- Name of Individual Providing Update: Ann Sheets
- Action Steps:
 - Action Steps in Process:
 1. See attached
 - Action Steps in Future (Planned):
 1. Refinement of proposal with appropriate feedback.
 2. Leadership Summit.
 3. Proposal to National Board.
- Narrative on Current Status (including comparison to benchmarks and alternatives/modifications needed related to the result of the benchmark review):

See attached

Other Documents/Key Materials (if there are other working documents related to this initiative, attach to this document):

- Attachment A – Update as of 10/2/2009
- Link #1: Section Commitments to the 20/20 Vision Provided at the 2008 Council of Delegates Meeting: <http://www.acacamps.org/volunteers/delegates/>
- Link #2: Maps of the locations of current ACA members and camps: <http://www.acacamps.org/volunteers/sectionmanual/> (Look under “Maps of ACA Camps and Members”).
- Link #3: Overview of all National Services offered to the Sections: <http://www.acacamps.org/volunteers/sectionmanual/> (Look under “National Services”)
- Current ACA Charter Agreement: <http://www.acacamps.org/volunteers/sectionmanual/> (Look under “Charter”).
- Link #4: 20/20 Vision Powerpoint: <http://www.acacamps.org/volunteers/delegates/index.php>
- See 20/20 Vision Resources:
 - 20/20 Puzzle Graphic
 - Data maps Updated 1/23/009
 - 20/20 Newsletters, especially February 27, 2009 edition

american **CAMP** association®

20/20 Vision Progress Report Local/Section Operations



Team:

20/20 Task Force: Scott Brody, Rich Garbinsky, Ann Sheets, Peg Smith, Peter Surgenor, Posie Taylor, Diane Tyrrell, Susan Yoder

Overview Statement:

The ability to influence the public about the value and importance of the camp experience, especially to the new demographic is seriously and significantly impaired by our current structure in which we, more often than not, operate like 25 separate businesses.

In May, when we shared with you an outline for a preferred structure of the organization, we were asked to develop two different models based on your input. This report includes all of the work we did in developing those two models. We feel it is important to share with you that while you will see all of the information about both models, we believe that Model A is the better model for ACA. It provides a framework in which an organization of multiple stakeholders with diverse beliefs and styles of operation can work together, while still achieving the principles of the model we shared with you in May. It also addresses the challenge of distributed power with clearly defined roles and responsibilities to the whole, yet interdependent and shared.

Relevancy to ACA's Preferred Future:

From the list of the 10 items for ACA's Preferred Future, the following are relevant to this project:

- *Item 1 —ACA would be an organization that shares and embraces a common vision and mission.*
- *Item 2 —ACA would recognize the significant challenge of influencing our complex culture and would mobilize its collective resources across the country to advance the success of the whole.*
- *Item 3 —ACA would have strong delivery systems capable of providing relevant service to a broad range of users, including camp professionals, parents, and others interested in the camp experience.*
- *Item 4— ACA would have contemporary and dynamic strategies designed to maximize and mobilize all appropriate resources (fiscal, human, and knowledge).*
- *Item 6 —ACA would have both a national and a local presence.*
- *Item 8 —ACA would have unified operational processes and procedures to maximize efficacy and desired outcomes and minimize confusion and competition.*

Assumptions:

- ACA will not continue to operate as 25 separate businesses. Any new future will have one business model that preserves our strengths and addresses our challenges.
- Current Section reserves will be restricted for future use as specifically outlined by the current Section.
- Regional conferences will be maintained.
- The state of Illinois Title XX government program that provides children with camp experiences will be preserved.
- Regardless of future model and if desired by ACA, New England, ownership of their building can be maintained by the New England Camp Director's Association (their current incorporated name —without the “dba”).
- Any new organizational model must preserve the ability for local entities/regions to be entrepreneurial, to respond to the unique and emerging challenges in their environment, and to retain the profit from such events in order to support other services.

Facts, Research, Environmental Scan:

- We examined many different models of association structure, including:
 - Models where a national organization has regionally—based affiliates that are separately incorporated from the national organization and are tied together by a written agreement (e.g., Habitat for Humanity, Spina Bifida Association).
 - Models where a national organization has local offices with groups of local volunteers serving on a local board (e.g., National Association for the Education of Young Children, American Heart Association, The League).
 - Models where a national organization has local franchises (e.g., corporate models such as Subway®, and similar to the Boys and Girls Clubs of America).

Findings:

- The ability to influence the public about the value and importance of the camp experience, especially to the new demographic, is seriously and significantly impaired by our current systems.
 - Of the estimated 12,000 traditional camps in the US, only 2,600 are accredited by ACA.
 - The number attending all camps is less than 20% of the total population of children.
 - The number attending ACA camps is less than 2% of the total population of children.
- Internal competition (between national and sections, and between different sections) and differences in human and fiscal resources detracts from our ability to apply rigor and resource to programs and services that support our core values.
 - 9 of 24 sections have fewer than 200 members
 - 15 sections have fewer than 100 camps
 - 4 sections have fewer than 50 camps
 - 15 sections do not have a full—time staff person
 - only 4 sections have more than one staff person
 - 7 sections have less than \$50K in net assets
 - 6 sections have less than \$50K in annual income
 - 16 of our 24 sections rely on dues and fees for over 60% of their annual operating budgets
 - For more of these findings, refer to the “Brutal Truths” information previously shared on the ACA Web site: www.ACAcamps.org/2020/
- Current cost of doing business is not understood by most sections. ACA national is absorbing many “costs of doing business” for the sections with limited return on investment per growth or relevancy as a national association.

Recommendations:

Two potential models for the future structure of the organization:

Topic:	Model A	Model B
General Description	One national corporation with multiple regions, networking groups, and affinity groups; with authority vested in the Board and delegated to the CEO.	One national entity that contracts (through an affiliation agreement) with multiple, separately incorporated organizations for service delivery; with the authority to set the terms of the affiliation agreements vested with the Board and delegated to the CEO.
Volunteer Roles	Regardless of model, the roles of volunteers will continue to be: serving on National and Regional boards, committees and task forces, serving on special project work groups, etc.	
National Board Role	Sets overall policies, determines strategic direction for the entire association. Receives input from Council of Delegates — which is comprised of people from each region.	Develops the affiliation agreement specifying effective processes, reviews, controls, and sanctions related to: Intellectual Property Accounting Human Resources/Payroll National Programs & Services Delivery, including: Standards Education Legal/Contract management Fund Raising Public Policy Public Awareness
National CEO	Responsible for hiring and supervision of staff, but for regional staff —develops criteria for use at the local level so regional boards may hire their own staff. Performance review of regional staff is conducted in partnership with the National CEO and the regional boards.	Responsible for hiring and supervision of national staff only. The separately incorporated entities that choose to contract with ACA through an affiliation agreement are completely responsible for their own staff.
All Other Staff	Report to the National CEO. Regional staff report to both the National CEO and their Regional Boards as indicated by policy and procedures.	Report to the National CEO. The separately incorporated entities that choose to contract with ACA through an affiliation agreement are completely responsible for their own staff.
National Office Responsibilities	Accounting Human Resources/Payroll Legal/Contract management <u>National</u> Programs & Service Delivery, including: Standards, Education Fund Raising, Public Policy, Public Awareness Determines fees considering geographic	Determines member and camp fees considering geographic cost of living and level of service provided. Collects and distributes member dues and camp fees. Other roles and responsibilities to be determined as negotiated during the

	<p>Cost of Living and level of service provided. Collects dues and fees.</p> <p>Other roles and responsibilities to be determined as negotiated during the organizational design process.</p>	<p>organizational design process.</p>
<p>Regional Responsibilities</p>	<p><u>Local</u> service delivery, including regional conferences, educational programs, events, membership recruitment, networking opportunities, local and state public policy engagement, public awareness, etc.</p> <p>Entrepreneurial innovation to respond to their local markets, emerging issues and opportunities. (Profits from events held at the regional level are retained locally in order to support innovation and customized programs.)</p>	<p>Complies with Affiliation Agreement as related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accounting Human Resources/Payroll National Programs & Service Delivery, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standards Education Legal/Contract management Fund Raising Public Policy Public Awareness
<p>Regional Boards</p>	<p>Will perform the functions above as well as facilitate all networking and program delivery sub-groups of the Region. These might include state groups, affinity groups based on other geography, and other affinity groups based on interest; will have representatives on the Council of Delegates.</p>	<p>Maintains separate incorporation with own Bylaws. Determines its own committees, task forces, networking groups, and affinity groups.</p>
<p>Council of Delegates</p>	<p>Provides input to the national board. Consists of representatives from each regional board.</p>	<p>Ensures compliance with affiliation agreements. Provides input back to advisory committees and the national board. Consists of people from each affiliate.</p>

Analysis of the two models

In May, when we shared with you an outline for a preferred structure of the organization, we were asked to develop two different models based on your input. This report includes all of the work we did in developing those two models. We feel it is important to share with you that while you will see all of the information about both models, we believe that Model A is the better model for ACA. It provides a framework in which an organization of multiple stakeholders with diverse beliefs and styles of operation can work together, while still achieving the principles of the model we shared with you in May. It also addresses the challenge of distributed power with clearly defined roles and responsibilities to the whole, yet interdependent and shared.

	Model A	Model B
Pro for the Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No confusion about ACA as it is all one entity. Potential for current public services to be expanded because of efficiencies and potential ease to replicate programs and services across the country — “better services for all.” Potentially will free up the organization’s ability to serve more of its “c3” mission as there will be a clear mission/vision across one organization. More consistent communication with public (e.g., currently some sections don’t answer the phone regularly as their staff is very, very part-time.) If ACA is better at coordinated fund raising, then there is the potential for more money to be spent on new public services. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pooling of resources in any newly formed affiliate (the “regions”) may result in better services in that geography if it is combining a number of the current sections. Local entity can really focus on just their geographic area.
Con for the Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for “slow ability to react” if model A becomes a bureaucracy that does not move quickly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confusion about the organization since it will be made up of separately incorporated entities. Local entities only focus on just their geographic area, so public might not be served with what breadth they want/need. Feel of separate businesses might look to the public that we are more about serving members.
Pro for ACA, Inc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to speak as and for one nationwide association. One staff leads to one accountability structure. No competition between components. Increased efficiency. Reduce redundancy. No confusion about who is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No longer would have to provide services to local affiliates unless specified in the affiliation agreement. Ability to provide more directive templates for programs through the affiliation agreement. More efficient than current model because the national organization would not be responsible for the affiliates.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • serving whom. • Sets up a system of consistency of services with ability to customize locally. • Is a partnership environment. • Boundary—less service provision • More possibility to sit with other partners when we can speak as one. • Fits the “better camping for all” tradition of ACA. • Allows for the flexible deployment of resources across the nation. • Friendly, non competitive model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy to understand. • Similar to current structure, so people who are change—adverse will like it. • ACA national could concentrate on national programs only. • Less legal risk as the other entities are separate legal entities, not a part of the whole ACA.
<p>Con for ACA, Inc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complex fiscal model during the transition. • Complex staff transition. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No ability to maximize resources. • Does not create new ability to obtain more financial resources. • Does not help to ensure that across the nation we are speaking with one voice and one mission to give more children camp experiences. • Diluted voice — 8 entities doing their own thing can water down the message and focus. • Potential for vision/mission creep with separate entities. • Potential for disparity of services. • Nationwide publicity/marketing/fundraising efforts will be a constant negotiation with separate entities. • Development of an affiliation agreement will be incredibly challenging and how will it be ensured.
<p>Pro for Local Entity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction of redundancy. • Local boards no longer focus on governance and back-office operations, but instead on the things they are passionate about — programs and services. • Ability to be entrepreneurial and address emerging local and regional issues through programs and services. • Increased efficiency. • Regional Board participates in the hiring and review of regional staff. • Maintains local networking. • Assure community funding relationships are intact and that 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retention of complete control over their staff and programs as long as adhering to the affiliation agreement. • As a separately incorporated entity, may do anything they wish as long as in compliance with the affiliation agreement. • Similar to current structure, so people who are change—adverse will like it. • Could create more grassroots opportunities. • Perception that there is a more entrepreneurial spirit available than other model.

	<p>funds generated by local initiatives can be utilized to increase services in that area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased legal compliance —IRS, for example. • No confusion about who is serving whom. • Is a partnership environment. • Boundary—less service provision. • Fits the “better camping for all” tradition of ACA. • Allows for the flexible deployment of resources across the nation. • Friendly, non competitive model. 	
<p>Con for Local Entity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceived loss of control and authority. • Potential for bureaucratic slowness in decision making around national issues. • Perception that there is too much power in one place. • Some feel that a national staff will fail to deliver in this model. • Unsure of where the buck stops with regional staff hiring and performance review. • Potential for loss of local involvement if not structured to address. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No formalized way to partner with other local affiliates. • ACA would no longer provide any services or support to affiliates (e.g., Web hosting, payroll, marketing materials, field support, etc). • ACA, Inc would longer mediate issues between the local affiliates. • No ability to serve outside of their geographic boundaries (limits them). • No feel for “we are all in this together” • This is not set up as a partnership.
<p>Mutual Pro</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased efficiency. • Reduced redundancy. • Ability to speak as one nationwide organization. • Sets up a partnership not a competition. • No confusion about who is serving whom. • Sets up a system of consistency of services with ability to customize locally. • Boundary-less service provision • More possibility to sit with other partners when we can speak as one. • Fits the “better camping for all” tradition of ACA. • Provides opportunities for regions to be entrepreneurial, retain the benefit of those efforts, and share their successes with others so that 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy to describe, simple to understand that there are separate entities.

	<p>the best ideas flourish across the country.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allows for the flexible deployment of resources across the nation.• Friendly, non competitive model.	
Mutual Con	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Challenge of creating the financial model.• Challenge of creating a transition plan to move from current to model A.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No real/substantial change.• No ability to coordinate efforts.• No ability to maximize resources.• This is not set up as a partnership.• Sets up a competitive atmosphere.