

METHODOLOGY

Methodology

The methodology employed to conduct this study started with the selection of criteria that define and differentiate the intrinsic properties of a given camp. A list of 19 criteria was developed and closely defined. Area 3 Leadership reviewed, commented on and force ranked the criteria from most to least important in defining a desirable property.

A scoresheet was developed, enabling the evaluators to rank a property by how well it met each of the 19 criteria. Those scores ranged from "fully meets the definition" with a weight of 5, to "does not meet the definition" with a weight of 1.

The criteria weight (1-19) was multiplied by the score (1-5) and a numerical value was derived for each criteria. Thus if **Land features**, with a criteria weight of 19 was determined as "Mostly Meets", with a score of 4, the resulting value was $19 \times 4 = 76$. All of the values were summed and totaled to derive a total property score.

The Study Team was comprised of volunteers and professionals. A professional, who has had experience with the process was chosen to lead each team. After each camp evaluation,

the team deliberated in order to reach a consensus on the scoring submitted. Care was taken so that no volunteer was assigned to a camp belonging to their home council. The team was broken into 4 groups and each group had responsibility to evaluate the camps with in a given geographic area. All four groups evaluated their areas during the week of July 24. Information packets for each property containing financial data, historical data taken from the council/ camp's web sites, radius mapping, NCAP data, Troop Leader's Guide and site plans were assembled by the National Office and delivered to each team for the properties they were to evaluate.

Notes were taken by the team and both the notes and the scores were transmitted back to the National Office for transcription. Those sheets were appended to this report.

A final calibration across teams was conducted to assure that the team's evaluations were consistent. Thus, the process contained both horizontal and vertical calibration for consistency.

Camp Name	Criteria																			
	Rank	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
	Weight	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Fully Meets Criteria	5																			
Mostly Meets Criteria	4																			
Meets 50% of Criteria	3																			
Meets Few Criteria	2																			
Barely to Does Not Meet Criteria	1																			
Total Criteria Calculation		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Club President Camp																				
Miscellaneous Notes -																				