

Trust-Based Relationships in Commissioner Service

William L. Trinemeyer

Assistant District Commissioner

Chicora District – Indian Waters Council

Scouting America



**A Thesis Presented in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Doctorate of Commissioner Science**

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project only came together because the unit leaders allowed me to walk into their meetings without trying to clean anything up. I stepped into whatever they were dealing with that week, the parts that ran smoothly, and the parts being held together with whatever energy people had left. You do not get that kind of access unless people decide you are alright to have in the room, and that kind of trust takes time.

This thesis also carries the steady influence of my advisor, Lee Doty, who kept advising me to slow down and actually look at what was happening instead of rushing through it. He was the person who explained what a “qualitative” study is, assured me my subject was an excellent idea, and continued to encourage me throughout the process.

I also need to thank my wife, who carried more of the weight than anyone will ever see and who stayed patient through the late nights and the rewrites that kept stacking up. My son and grandson deserve a mention as well. Because of their involvement in Scouting and the way my grandson talks about campouts, badges, and what he’s learning, it kept reminding me why all of this matters.

ABSTRACT

This study looks at how trust-based relationships take shape in Commissioner Service and why early conversations stay polite and surface-level until trust has had time to settle. The work started with a pattern I kept seeing on ordinary visits, when leaders greeted me warmly but their answers felt guarded. After a few visits, the tone shifted in small ways. Someone lingered after a meeting. A concern surfaced in the parking lot. Those moments showed when trust began to reshape what people were willing to say. The space between that careful first impression and the fuller picture that emerges once leaders feel more at ease is what this study calls the Inspector Gap. The gap comes from the tension built into the commissioner role itself. Commissioners are expected to support and encourage leaders while also monitoring unit health, policy compliance, and program quality. Because of that dual role, leaders may hold back at first while they decide whether the commissioner is there to help or to evaluate them.

This qualitative study followed multiple units over more than six months to see how trust developed when the same commissioner kept showing up. A qualitative approach fit because trust and the small moments that shift a room do not appear in surveys. Using Practitioner Inquiry (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009), I examined my own practice and watched how conversations changed from visit to visit. Trust grew not from technique but from steady habits that made the visit feel less like an inspection. Remembering a follow-up helped. Staying calm when a concern came out sharper than expected helped. Keeping the Commissioner Visit Checklist in my pocket helped. These small habits made it easier for leaders to talk openly. The checklist appears in Appendix A.

The findings suggest that commissioners close the Inspector Gap by creating visits where leaders stop bracing for impact. When the room feels steady enough for honest talk, commissioners can finally see the real conditions of a unit and offer support that matches the actual need.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments.....	i
Abstract.....	ii
Table of Contents	iv
Table of Figures	iv
1. Introduction	1
2. The Inspector Gap and How It Closes.....	4
3. Methodology	7
4. Trust and Practical Applications.....	11
5. Findings.....	14
5.1. Early Caution and the Inspector Gap.....	14
5.2. How Repeated Visits Changed the Conversation	14
5.3. A Night When Steadiness Made the Difference	15
5.4. Where Trust Did Not Fully Develop	15
5.5. What the Four Patterns Showed	16
6. Conclusions and Recommendations.....	17
Glossary of Terms	21
Bibliography	22
Appendix A Commissioner Visit Checklist.....	23

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 1, Trust Centered Leadership.....	3
Figure 2, The Inspector Gap	5
Figure 3, Trust Grows When You Deliver.....	16
Figure 4, Establishing Trust	20

1. INTRODUCTION

Commissioner Service is meant to help units stay steady and keep the Scouting program healthy. On paper, the job looks straightforward. In the room, it takes on a different weight. Some nights the welcome comes easily. Other nights there is a pause in the greeting, a small sign that the leader is still deciding how open the conversation can be.

Across repeated visits, I kept noticing the same pattern. Leaders greeted me warmly, but their answers stayed tight and careful, trimmed down to what felt safest to say out loud. Even when I tried to keep the tone light, the visit could still feel like an evaluation they had not asked for. Milliken, Morrison, and Hewlin (2003) describe this instinct to hold back when judgment feels possible, and their work matched what I had been watching in real rooms long before I had a name for it.

Over time, something began to shift. It did not arrive in a dramatic moment. It showed itself in small signs that were easy to miss at first. A leader lingered after the meeting longer than usual. A quick glance toward a tired assistant leader revealed more than words could. Sometimes, a pause stretched longer than it should have and told its own story.

The difference between the early careful version of the unit and the later more complete one is what this study calls the Inspector Gap. It is not dishonesty. It is caution, and it grows out of a role where support and oversight sit close together in ways that are not always comfortable. Psychological safety helps explain why that shift matters. Edmondson (1999) describes how people speak more openly only when the room feels steady enough to hold the truth, and I could

hear that truth in the way leaders talked once the early tension eased and the visit no longer felt like a quiet review.

This pattern sits inside a larger organizational moment. Scouting America has been trying to move away from older administrative habits and toward relationship-based service. The 2025 and 2026 guidance points in that direction, but the habits in some rooms have not caught up (Scouting America, 2025; Scouting America, 2026). Leaders who remember when commissioner visits felt like checkups still brace themselves out of instinct, and that history sits in the room whether anyone names it or not.

Seeing this tension raised a practical question about what was actually happening in those early minutes of a visit. How does trust shape the way leaders talk during visits, and what can commissioners do to shrink that early gap? I learned quickly that sharper questions were not the answer because pointed questions only made leaders tighten up. People often become more cautious when they are unsure how their answers will be interpreted or evaluated (Edmondson, 1999; Milliken et al., 2003). What helped instead were the small consistent habits that changed the feel of the room in ways I did not always notice until later. Showing up when I said I would signaled something different. Following through on the little things showed that the visit was not just another task. Listening without rushing to fix kept the conversation steady enough for leaders to stay open. Treating concerns as normal parts of volunteer leadership instead of signs of failure made the room feel safer. Covey (2006) argues that trust grows through consistent and reliable actions rather than big gestures, and that lined up with what I was seeing night after night.

This study grew from those ordinary nights when the polite openings slowly gave way to something more real. The early small talk settled into moments when the conversation finally had enough room to be honest. If Scouting America wants relationship-based service to mean something beyond new language in a handbook, we have to understand what gets in the way of plain talk and what helps clear space for it. This study seeks to understand and close the Inspector Gap, making trust-based service real in practice and not just in theory, even as the current commissioner service emphasis continues to evolve.



Figure 1, Trust Centered Leadership

2. THE INSPECTOR GAP AND HOW IT CLOSES

In this chapter, I explain what the Inspector Gap is, why it matters in commissioner service, and how it can be closed through trust-building actions. The Inspector Gap showed up in small moments, when a leader said things were fine and the night drifted another way. It also surfaced when someone who sounded confident earlier, then looked worn down once the room settled into its usual rhythm. None of it felt deceptive. It felt cautious, the kind of caution people use when they are not sure how much of what is going on they want to share.

Early visits often followed the same pattern. Leaders were polite, sharing what felt safe while the rougher edges stayed tucked away where I could sense them but couldn't quite reach. Milliken, Morrison, and Hewlin's (2003) writing on guarded communication helped me understand what I had been seeing for years. People often hold back when they sense even a small chance of being judged, and that matched the tone in the rooms long before I had a name for it.

As the visits continued, the tone shifted. Leaders began sharing things they hadn't raised before, like plans that sounded organized at first but revealed gaps and strain once they talked through the realities of the week. Those details surfaced slowly, usually in passing, once the room felt relaxed enough for plain talk. That slow move from the early, careful version of the unit to the later, more complete one is what this study calls the Inspector Gap.

The gap matters because it shapes what a commissioner can actually see and do. If all you hear is the early, careful version, then how much of the real story is missing? A unit that sounds steady can be one busy month away from losing its footing. And a leader who says things

are fine may be carrying more on their shoulders than they want to show. When you cannot see the full picture, the help you offer may land wide of the mark.



Figure 2, The Inspector Gap

Courtesy alone does not explain the gap. Politeness plays a part, but the guarded tone lasts longer than first impressions. Much of it comes from the structure around the visit and from older habits in the organization that still echo in the room. Most of it comes from the simple fact that the commissioner role sits close to both support and oversight. Even with the best intentions, leaders sometimes braced themselves, a small shift in posture or tone that told me the room was waiting to see which part of the role I was bringing.

Understanding the gap changed how I approached visits. The work was not just listening for information. It was creating a setting where leaders felt comfortable enough to say what was actually happening. Shrinking the gap became part of the service. When leaders felt safe enough

to speak openly, the conversation stopped circling the surface and finally reached the parts of the visit that truly mattered.

Psychological safety shaped the room more than anything written in a guide. Leaders spoke more openly when they sensed their words would not be used against them. I learned to hold my reactions carefully. Sometimes that meant letting a silence stretch or naming a concern without rushing in to fix it.

I saw the same direction reflected in Scouting America's guidance on relationship-based service. The documents encouraged commissioners to move away from inspection-driven habits and toward partnership. When I read them, it felt like someone had written down what the rooms had already been teaching me. Leaders opened up when the visit felt like a shared effort instead of a quiet review.

Greenleaf's (2002) writing on servant leadership helped me understand why presence and care mattered more than authority. Influence in volunteer settings grows from how you show up, not from the title you carry. I noticed this most clearly on nights when leaders relaxed into the conversation because nothing felt rushed or formal. Lencioni's (2002) work on trust in teams echoed the same truth, but the understanding came from the rooms first.

Closing the Inspector Gap does not guarantee that every leader will open up. Some units stayed cautious no matter how often I visited. One leader remained friendly but kept the talk on the surface for months. Those nights reminded me that trust shifts for all sorts of reasons, many of them outside the commissioner's reach.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study grew out of typical commissioner work. I wanted to understand how trust changed the way leaders talked during repeated visits. I paid close attention to what happened during visits over several months. Nothing about the setting was controlled. These were regular weeknight meetings with all the noise and distractions.

The approach fits what qualitative work is meant to do. It stays close to lived experience and lets meaning grow from what actually happens instead of from a preset structure. This kind of work is sometimes called practitioner inquiry, and that term fits. I was studying my own practice from the inside and not observing someone else's. Cochran-Smith and Lytle (2009) describe practitioner inquiry as a sustained stance toward one's own work, a habit of questioning assumptions and learning from within the practice itself, and that framing captures what this study tried to do across several months of ordinary visits.

Commissioner visits often began in familiar ways. Leaders gave quick updates that stayed close to the surface, and when I tried asking more direct questions, their responses tightened instead. As noted earlier in this study, Milliken, Morrison, and Hewlin (2003) describe how people hold back when they sense even a small chance of being judged, which helped interpret what I had been observing during visits.

Repeated visits slowly changed the dynamic. Trust did not arrive in a single moment. It built in small ways that were easy to overlook. One night I forgot to follow up on a training question I had promised to check on. The leader never mentioned it, but I felt the small drop in the room when I walked in without an answer. It was not anger. Quiet disappointment reminded me that steadiness isn't something you claim. It is something you prove. From then on, I kept a

small note in my pocket so I would not lose track of the things leaders were counting on me to remember. Over time, those small acts helped the conversations move past the polite version and into the parts that carried more weight. Edmondson's (1999) writing on psychological safety helped me understand why those shifts mattered. People speak more freely when the room feels steady enough to hold the truth.

I relied on participant observation because it matched the work I was already doing. As an Assistant District Commissioner, I visited multiple units over more than six months. In addition to my own observations, I gathered insights through informal conversations and other Scouting meetings. This input helped me identify recurring themes and validated the experiences I observed in the field. All contributions have been anonymized to protect privacy. The commissioner service in this district worked as a collaborative and steady group, which I refer to as the Commissioner Service Team (CST; see Glossary for definition and context). District, Assistant District, and Unit Commissioners sat in the same circle, sharing what they saw and making sure every unit had someone they could count on. It never felt like a management tier. It worked like a safety net of people who talked often enough to spot patterns and pass along what might help the next visit land better. That steady rhythm is what kept the Inspector Gap from widening. The structure that lets relationship-based service shift from a line in a manual to something a leader can actually feel in the room.

Using the Commissioner Visit Checklist after each visit helped me notice the small indicators of trust. Filling it out during meetings changed the atmosphere, and once a leader stopped mid-sentence to ask if he had forgotten something, I put the checklist away and never used it during meetings again.

Used after the visit, the checklist helped me move beyond first impressions. It pushed me to notice the energy in the room, the tone of the conversation, and the small cues that signaled openness or caution. The open notes section became the most valuable part. One entry described a leader glancing toward the hallway, which I first read as distraction but later realized was him keeping an eye on a new assistant leader. Greenleaf's (2002) writing on servant leadership emphasizes attentive presence, and the open notes section supported that kind of reflective practice.

Over time, reviewing the checklists showed the arc of each relationship. I could see when trust deepened, when it stalled, and when it reset due to leadership changes or outside pressures. Those patterns reminded me that trust develops slowly and unevenly and that commissioners have to stay steady even when progress is not obvious. The checklist helped me see that steadiness in my own practice, not as an idea but as something I could trace across weeks.

I kept a personal reflexive journal throughout the study, tracking my own reactions and the shifts in how I interpreted things from one visit to the next. Even so, the work I did in that journal shaped how I understood the visits and helped me stay honest about the part I played in the setting I was studying.

As I went back through the field notes and the journal, I watched for the things that kept showing up: the cautious moments, the shifts in tone, the times when a leader opened up a little more than before. I pulled the similar pieces together and sat with them long enough to see what might be doing the work underneath. It wasn't formal coding, just steady rereading and clustering until the themes made themselves known over time.

When it came time to analyze the notes, patterns didn't show up right away and appeared slowly, much like trust had. One field note surprised me weeks later; a leader's glances toward the hallway took on new meaning in hindsight. I marked moments like that and grouped them into broader themes while paying close attention to the emergence of the Inspector Gap. Thick description helped me hold onto the tone of each night instead of reducing it to short summaries.

Ethical considerations were straightforward but not distant. One night a leader asked me directly what I was doing with my notes. He said it quietly, almost in passing, but the question carried weight. I told him plainly that I was studying how commissioner visits worked and that nothing he said would be tied back to him or his unit. He nodded and moved on, but the moment stayed with me. It reminded me that people deserve to know how their words are being used. To protect that trust, I have generalized all specific leader positions to "leader" in the findings, so no one can be identified by role or context, even unit type within the district. Leaders were informed about the study, participation was voluntary, and no identifying details appear here.

The study has limits. It took place in one district with a modest number of units. My presence shaped the interactions in ways I cannot fully separate from the findings. One night I walked into a troop meeting and felt the room tighten the moment I stepped through the door. I had not said a word yet. The leader later admitted he thought I was there because someone had complained. That moment made it clear that my role carried weight I could not always soften. The results reflect this commissioner's experience over months and not a universal rule. Even so, the approach allowed me to see the subtle and relational parts of trust that would have been hard to capture through more structured methods.

4. TRUST AND PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

Leaders talked differently depending on how steady the visit felt. On calm nights the conversation stretched out and felt easier, and on heavier nights answers tightened and stayed close to the surface. Edmondson's (1999) writing on psychological safety helped me understand what I had been watching. People speak more openly only when the room feels safe enough for small risks, and early visits rarely start with that kind of steadiness.

Trust showed up in small, ordinary moments. Someone would mention a volunteer burning out or admit that planning an event had been harder than expected. A leader might acknowledge that attendance had been unpredictable. These details surfaced only when the room felt settled, and they revealed what support was actually needed. Some of the hesitation came from the structure of the visit, not from anything personal. Even when I tried to be supportive, the role carried weight, and leaders were still deciding whether I was there to help or to quietly evaluate their abilities. Scouting America's relationship-based service guidance matched what I was aiming for, but that shift had not reached everyone yet. Some leaders still braced out of old habits and misconceived ideas of what a commissioner's role really means.

Greenleaf's (2002) writing on servant leadership helped me make sense of what I was seeing. Influence in volunteer settings grows from presence and care, not from authority. I noticed that truth most clearly in the small moments, an ordinary conversation or remembering something from a previous visit often carrying more weight than anything formal. Liden, Wayne, Meuser, Hu, Wu, and Liao (2015) offered empirical support for this. Their work identified empowerment, humility, and consistent support as the servant leadership behaviors most strongly

linked to trust in settings where authority is limited and participation is voluntary. That is exactly the landscape of commissioner work.

Over time, trust stopped being an abstract idea and became something I could hear in the way leaders talked. It decided whether I received a polished summary or the real story. Without trust, the visit stayed narrow and polite. With trust, the conversation finally reached the parts of the night that mattered. Trust did not fix every problem. Some units continued to struggle, and some leaders stayed cautious no matter how often I returned. But trust lowered the cost of honesty and made room for conversations grounded in what was actually happening instead of what felt safe to say.

The question that emerged from over six months of visits was straightforward. What specific actions can commissioners take during routine meetings to help trust grow and close the Inspector Gap? The findings point to subtle, steady behaviors that changed the tone of the room over time, and the effect of those habits often became clear only when looking back across the visits.

One night I pulled the checklist out too early, and the leaders' look tightened almost immediately. It taught me how quickly a visit could shift from supportive to evaluative without a word. After that, I kept the checklist in my folder until I was back in the car.

Curiosity helped, but not every time. Sometimes a leader simply wasn't ready to talk, reminding me that curiosity is an invitation and not a guarantee. Other nights, curiosity opened the room unexpectedly. A leader paused for a long moment and finally admitted he was thinking about stepping down, leading to a quiet, steady conversation that grew from simply listening.

Greenleaf (2002) helped me understand that later, but in the moment, it just felt like being present with someone who needed space to say something hard.

Reliability mattered too. Once, bringing a resource a leader had asked for weeks earlier shifted the tone of the visit, but another time the same action barely registered. It reminded me that reliability is a pattern noticed over time and not a single moment.

Staying calm when concerns surfaced made a difference on most nights. Leaders were more willing to speak openly when they sensed their worries would be received as normal parts of volunteer leadership instead of signs of failure. Edmondson's (1999) work helped me understand why those moments mattered, but the understanding came later. In the room, it just felt like keeping the conversation steady enough that the leader did not have to brace.

One night a leader hesitated before sitting down to talk about losing two key volunteers and feeling unsure how to keep things moving. The shift came from the slow accumulation of steady visits and remembered details.

These moments taught me that practical commissioner work is less about gathering information and more about creating a setting where leaders feel steady enough to speak honestly. The habits that mattered were small and human, and while they never guaranteed trust, they made room for it to grow. Benevene, Dal Corso, De Carlo, Falco, Carluccio, and Vecina (2020) found that consistent follow-through, attentive presence, and expressed appreciation were the strongest predictors of satisfaction and long-term commitment in volunteer settings, a finding that matched what these visits kept showing me. I saw that truth unfold in visit after visit.

5. FINDINGS

The findings in this chapter come from over six months of unit visits. The patterns didn't come from a single meeting. They became clear only after watching the same kinds of interactions repeat across different units. Certain themes kept showing up in the field notes, especially the ways leaders signaled trust or caution when deciding what to share. Four ideas rose to the surface, and the sections that follow take them up one at a time.

5.1. EARLY CAUTION AND THE INSPECTOR GAP

In the first visits, leaders stayed polite and careful, offering only the safe parts and often pausing before answering or quickly shifting to upcoming events. Milliken, Morrison, and Hewlin (2003) describe this kind of guarded communication as a natural response when people sense possible judgment, and that matched what I had been watching during visits.

As visits continued, leaders began naming the parts of the week they had left out earlier, like fatigue and planning trouble. One leader, after only giving brief updates before, finally admitted he had not held a committee meeting in two months, capturing the Inspector Gap better than any definition. Edmondson's (1999) writing on psychological safety helped me understand why those shifts mattered, because people speak more openly when the room feels steady enough to hold the truth.

5.2. HOW REPEATED VISITS CHANGED THE CONVERSATION

One night stands out more than the others. I had been visiting a unit for several weeks, and the leader usually kept the talk light. That night, after the youth left the room, he stayed behind and sat down again. He told me he was not sure he was the right person for the role. He had never said anything close to that before. Nothing in my questions brought it out. It came

from the slow settling that happens when someone realizes the visit is not an evaluation. It reminded me that trust does not arrive because of a technique. It arrives because of time.

Deeper talk usually appeared around the third or fourth visit, often in small ways like a leader lingering after the meeting or mentioning a personal problem. Those moments reminded me that trust is relational and cannot be rushed.

5.3. A NIGHT WHEN STEADINESS MADE THE DIFFERENCE

The behaviors that helped close the Inspector Gap were never a checklist. They showed up on nights like the one pictured here, more than a year before this formal fieldwork began. I had promised a leader I would bring a simple recruiting flyer he could use at a school event, and when I handed it to him the next week, he let out a breath I hadn't realized he was holding. He talked more freely that night than he had in the previous three weeks, a reminder that trust grows in the small moments, like a flyer delivered on time. Even before this study began, moments like that one made it clear that steadiness is not an idea. It is something people feel in the room.

Greenleaf's (2002) writing on servant leadership helped me understand why these small acts mattered. Influence in volunteer settings grows from presence and care and not from authority. I saw that truth most clearly on nights when leaders relaxed into the conversation because nothing felt rushed or evaluative.

5.4. WHERE TRUST DID NOT FULLY DEVELOP

A few units did not follow the expected pattern. One unit changed leaders during the study, which reset the relationship, and another had a leader who stayed friendly but kept the talk on the surface no matter how often I visited. These cases mattered because they showed that steady behavior creates the conditions for trust, but it cannot guarantee it.



Figure 3, Trust Grows When You Deliver

I remember one night when I walked into a meeting and felt the room tighten immediately. The leader later told me he thought I was there because someone had complained. Nothing in the visit itself caused that reaction. It came from older habits and memories that still shaped how some leaders saw the commissioner role. That moment reminded me that trust is influenced by timing, personality, and history, and not just by what happens in the room.

5.5. WHAT THE FOUR PATTERNS SHOWED

The turning points were quiet, with trust showing up in small moments like a leader staying in the room a little longer or mentioning a concern in passing. Those moments changed the direction of visits more than anything I planned. They showed me that the Inspector Gap is closed by presence and steadiness, not technique.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study set out to understand how trust shapes the way unit leaders communicate during commissioner visits and what commissioners can do to close the Inspector Gap. Over six months of observations pointed in the same direction.

The Inspector Gap showed up the same way across the observations. During early visits, leaders usually shared only a narrow view of their unit, not because they were being evasive, but because the commissioner's role carried both support and oversight, and that shaped what they felt comfortable saying. That early caution limited how clearly the work of the unit could be seen and made it harder to identify where support was needed. My field notes and interviews showed this pattern throughout the study.

As visits became familiar, leaders began sharing the real challenges, like volunteer fatigue and planning struggles. The shift was not dramatic, arriving in small moments that changed the work more than any formal technique. Small and consistent behaviors closed the gap more effectively than structured approaches, the habits that mattered most coming from presence and steadiness over time.

The Inspector Gap cannot always be closed. Some leaders continued to stay guarded no matter how often I visited. Leadership changes, outside pressures, and the history a leader carries into the room all play a role. Commissioners can create the conditions for trust, but they cannot guarantee it.

Even so, trust-based relationships can strengthen a unit's ability to deliver a steadier and more sustainable program. In several units where leaders began speaking more openly about concerns such as volunteer shortages or planning fatigue, meeting attendance settled, and

conversations about upcoming challenges became more direct. In one case, a leader who had previously offered only brief updates began naming specific needs for committee support, which led to new volunteers stepping in and planned activities continuing without interruption. These changes did not happen quickly. As trust developed, planning discussions grew more detailed and honest, and units were better able to adjust when problems surfaced. The connection between trust and program sustainability became clear through these patterns, as each deeper conversation revealed the actual conditions and needs of the unit.

The work also showed that commissioners who lead through partnership rather than oversight are better positioned to address challenges before they turn into crises. In one unit, early conversations about declining parent involvement gave the leadership team enough time to recruit two new committee members before a major event, which kept the program on track. When a leader finally admitted he had not held a committee meeting in two months, that admission came because the visit felt safe, not because I asked a precise question. That early and honest disclosure made it possible to offer timely and relevant help, support that would not have been possible if the relationship had stayed formal or the Inspector Gap had remained wide. Proactive help becomes possible only when trust has narrowed the gap enough for leaders to say what is actually happening.

These findings point to several recommendations for commissioners, district leadership, and those responsible for commissioner training. Early visits should be treated as relationship building, not information gathering. The first few visits will yield a polished picture, and commissioners should expect this and resist the urge to push for more detail before trust has developed.

Keeping the Commissioner Visit Checklist out of sight preserves the conversational tone of the visit and prevents leaders from feeling evaluated. The checklist is most useful as a reflective tool completed afterward. Following through on small commitments consistently builds trust faster than any single gesture.

Incorporating the Inspector Gap into commissioner training helps new commissioners understand why early visits stay surface level and what they can do to help conversations deepen over time. The checklist is also most effective when used as a longitudinal tool. When you look at it across multiple visits, it shows the arc of a relationship and lets commissioners see when trust is building, stalling, or starting over again.

Trust does not grow only in meeting rooms or during official visits. It takes shape in the small, honest moments wherever they happen, the kind that show a leader the commissioner is paying attention and not just passing through. The picture of leaders gathered around the campfire says the same thing in its own way. When you have established trust, any time or place is perfect.

Finally, relationship-based service requires time. Scouting America's recent guidance emphasizes partnership over inspection, but that shift only becomes real when commissioners are given the space to build trust across repeated visits. Metrics that measure only visit frequency miss the quality of what happens inside the room.



Figure 4, Establishing Trust

There was one night near the end of the study that stays with me. The meeting had finished, and most of the room had emptied out while the leader lingered by the tables, stacking chairs slowly. When I asked how things were going, he paused and said he finally felt like he could tell me what had actually been keeping him up at night, and it was not dramatic or a crisis but the simple weight of trying to hold a unit together with too few hands. We talked for a few minutes while the last of the chairs clicked into place, and nothing about the conversation was polished, but it was honest in a way the first visits had never been. That moment showed me what closing the Inspector Gap looks like when it finally works, quiet and human work that unfolds one room at a time.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Commissioner Service Team (CST): The mix of Unit Commissioners and the district's Administrative Commissioners who work together to keep units supported. Note: CST isn't an official BSA term. It's just this district's way of naming its collaborative approach.

Commissioner Visit Checklist (CVC): A simple tool used after commissioner visits that helps the commissioner notice what actually happened in the room. It supports reflection without turning the visit into an inspection, and it works best when it stays quietly in the background.

Inspector Gap: A difference between the polite and surface-level version of the unit that leaders often share during early visits and the fuller and more honest picture that appears once trust has had time to settle. It reflects natural caution rather than any intent to mislead.

Psychological Safety: A shared sense that the setting is steady enough for people to take small risks with their words, whether that means asking a question, admitting uncertainty, or naming a concern. It draws from Edmondson's (1999) work on how teams learn and communicate.

Practitioner Inquiry: A way of studying one's own professional practice from the inside that relies on reflection, context, and lived experience rather than outside observation. It treats the practitioner's day-to-day work as the primary source of understanding.

Qualitative Approach: A method that focuses on how people make sense of their experiences and uses non-numerical information to understand meaning, context, and behavior. It answers questions about how and why things unfold the way they do.

Reflexive Journal: A running record where the researcher writes down reactions, assumptions, and shifting interpretations. It helps the researcher stay aware of how their own presence shapes the work and keeps the analysis honest.

Servant Leadership: A way of leading that begins with serving the people in front of you and puts the needs of unit leaders first. It grows influence through steady presence and simple acts of care rather than authority and draws from Greenleaf (2002).

Thick Description: A detailed and textured account of what happened in a setting that includes tone, atmosphere, and context. It helps readers understand the meaning behind what was observed instead of reducing everything to surface details.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Benevene, P., Dal Corso, L., De Carlo, A., Falco, A., Carluccio, F., & Vecina, M. L. (2020). Ethical leadership as an antecedent of job satisfaction, affective organizational commitment, and intention to stay among volunteers of non-profit organizations. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 31(1), 1–13. doi:10.1007/s11266-018-0020-9
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (2009). *Inquiry as stance: Practitioner research for the next generation*. Teachers College Press.
- Covey, S. M. R. (2006). *The speed of trust: The one thing that changes everything*. Free Press.
- Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350–383. doi:10.2307/2666999
- Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press.
- Lencioni, P. (2002). *The five dysfunctions of a team: A leadership fable*. Jossey-Bass.
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Meuser, J. D., Hu, J., Wu, J., & Liao, C. (2015). Servant leadership: Validation of a short form of the SL-28. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(2), 254–269. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.07.002
- Milliken, F. J., Morrison, E. W., & Hewlin, P. F. (2003). An exploratory study of employee silence: Issues that employees don't communicate upward and why. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1453–1476. doi:10.1111/1467-6486.00387
- Scouting America. (2022a). *Commissioner field book for unit service* (No. 33088).
- Scouting America. (2022b). *Commissioner service team manual*.
- Scouting America. (2025). *Strategic plan: Change the way we work together*.
- Scouting America. (2026). *Be the heart, build relationships* (No. 20-026).

Appendix A COMMISSIONER VISIT CHECKLIST

COMMISSIONER VISIT CHECKLIST (CVC)

Date of Visit: _____ Leader Position: _____

How did the visit feel overall (energy, openness, comfort level).

What small cues did you notice about how welcome or guarded the conversation felt?

How open and honest did the conversation feel?

What topics were discussed easily? What topics seemed more difficult or stayed on the surface?

Did the conversation feel more like the "safe/polished version" or closer to the real picture of the unit?

What signs suggested the gap was narrowing or still present?

In what ways did you show up as steady, reliable, and supportive?

What commitments or offers of help did you make, and how did the leader respond?

Which specific actions seemed to help or hinder openness?

What surprised you, stood out, or felt important during this visit?

Open Reflection / Notable Moments: _____

What will you do differently or continue next time? _____

Any other thoughts/notes? _____

WLT2025