

THE “4-WEEK EXPERIMENT” AND THE RISING SUN VISION

written by Attila “TT” Sebök, 2000-2009 (RH, CL & ST), 2007-2008 full time Camp Director (“CD”), 2015 Volunteer Counselor

December, 2015

DISCLAIMER

This document is not my official End of Season Report I have submitted to the Louis August Jonas Foundation in August, 2015, though I have kept its underlying structure, some of my recommendations, and links to the fairly superficial research I did when working on my original report. I say the research is superficial because researching all these issues in great depth would take years. As always, the research is not always a 100 per cent relevant to the very unique programme of Camp Rising Sun (“CRS”), and some of the papers are not freely available online. I still find it exciting and would recommend for everyone to look at some of the articles.

Many of these observations are a result of my unique connection with CRS. I have never been a camper, “only” a staff member, but I still think I learned an invaluable set of skills and perspectives at Rising Sun, for which I will be always grateful. I have already been through many changes and turbulent times with CRS, including the 2009 “gap season” (which I incidentally spent at Stendis). I have also spent quite a few years away from CRS, trying to make it “in the real world” – an expression I don’t much care for. The recommendations in this paper are not given because I think that “back in my day, everything worked so much better.” In fact, we were struggling with many of the same issues. I am painfully aware of my own limitations and past mistakes. Stepping out of a circle and experience a small slice of what successful (and perhaps mostly unsuccessful) management and leadership in my own field is like made me think more strategically about leadership education in particular. Although some of my ideas pertain to the last season, most of them are more general and are in the spirit of “I wish I had understood these things back then.”

Whenever we talk about our CRS, we tend to get emotional. Little do we realise how our memory changes the past. We focus on what was great and forget about the small inconveniences that came our way. Many of us have had a transformation experience, and whichever of the four goals this great experience focused around, we tend to favour that particular aspect of camp above all others. Our connections and emotional bonds are strong; this is why we find it so difficult to think about Camp objectively. The very thing that makes us care about Camp after so many years also makes it likely that we get very emotional about how things are run.

My purpose in making this public is to initiate a kind of discourse that would help question some of the deeply embedded assumptions and contribute to thinking about the mission in a more strategic manner. As perhaps one of the few people who actually experienced some of the results of the “4-week experiment” first hand, and who did not necessarily think it was success in every single way, I felt compelled, perhaps against my softer nature, to make my views known.

Whenever Campers asked me about any difficult issue at Camp, in the spirit of transparency, I have always tried to be as honest as possible, and unless there was a chance someone’s privacy or confidences could have been violated, I always made an honest attempt answer any concerns truthfully without unnecessarily keeping things secret. In this paper, I tried following the same approach. Many of these have been formulated as a result of learning from my very own mistakes. Since I have been in a leadership position myself, making the similar or even the same mistakes, it can be considered self-criticism as much as anything else. I have only included the particulars for this season when I felt I absolutely needed to. My most important agenda is to help us think about how to make sure Freddie’s mission continue to influence the leaders of tomorrow.

I) INTRODUCTION – WHAT IS THE REAL ESSENCE OF THE CAMP RISING SUN EXPERIENCE

I think there is very little doubt that the (hopefully) temporary closure of the Red Hook Campus was not a situation that thrilled anyone. But as with all difficulties, it provided an opportunity for us to evaluate everything our programme is all about, namely what is essential in our mission and what is not. Shifting the context of the programme to a 4-week schedule was an exciting venture because we hoped to gain insight from what is essential to the kind of transformative experience we all hope to gain for ourselves and spread to our newest alumni. The essential question was whether we could recreate our 7-8 week experience in half that time. Even if we were not sure whether the season would be successful, at least there was a chance we could see why it was so vitally important for the CRS experience to last two months for it work.

It is true that I have only spent two weeks at each session, but I can certainly concede that we **provide a great summer camp experience**. But is that all that we wish to give to our new alumni? Even if this is a great summer camp, **it is still just summer camp**. I admit, we try our best to explain how what we do promotes our mission and four goals, but if we want to be honest, what other ordinary camp (or even school) does NOT expose campers to new things, does not allow them to do art, discussions, newspapers, hikes, team building exercises? What youth programme does not pay lip service to diversity, leadership and volunteering these days? **Should the Foundation be really paying a full scholarship to students** (rich and poor) **to do what everybody else is doing?** I would claim this money is only worth spending if we provide what no ordinary school or summer camp can provide.

“Others see a child¹ of today, I see the leader of tomorrow” – claimed Freddie. From what I have heard of him, I can assume that he meant leaders of the world: leaders at the top of their own field – whether it be politics, the economy, science, or arts. **This can only happen if Rising Sun is not just an ordinary summer camp** (even if a very good one), **but a truly exceptional leadership programme**. I am afraid we still have to work hard to live up to this expectation. It is not just the matter of how long camp is, but also how we go about making use of the precious time we have got.

II) TO SEE THE FOREST FOR THE TREES

In this particular analysis, I will not try to focus on the everyday routines of CRS life. A lot of people make a point of focusing on the small things (projects, instructions, evening programs) when they form a judgement on whether a particular season was successful. Instead, I will contemplate about what I think matters most: **the Rising Sun Vision**.

¹ In the original, I believe he used the word “boy” instead of the gender-neutral “child”.

One could conclude that season went smoothly. The few major problems we encountered have been taken care of. The kind of observations I will be focusing on here have been largely beyond the seasonal staff's sphere of influence. Many of the problems I believe can be traced back to the direction we have been taking – not only very recently, but even when I was a Camp Director: our vision and our interpretation of the goals. When discussing these issues, I will try to be more practical and less philosophical. Wherever possible, I will try to **make use of relevant research**. I find this particularly important because I find that in our discourse, there is rarely enough evidence to support our emotionally based statements. If you find some of these ideas not to your liking, please check out the links I have posted at the very end of this paper regarding the particular issue you have got a problem with. There is always debate in academia, but at least you may not think that some of these ideas are completely without foundation or support.

1) NUMBER OF STAFF

Given that there was one staff for both “sessions”, I can fully understand that it was easier and more economical to hire more staff than usual this year. As convenient as this may have been for (partly legally) required supervision “ratios”, it also has provided several disadvantages:

- Staff formed a less cohesive team.
- There were difficulties with planning and communication.
- There was a lack of ownership of responsibilities – since there were so many of us, responsibilities seemed to disperse too much.
- Staff got into each other's way.
- Staff took charge of responsibilities that could have been given to campers.

The research regarding the optimal size of staff is given at the end. It is rather unfortunate that many of the laws and the whole culture of litigation in the United States force us to treat minors as completely helpless individuals, who cannot be trusted to make their own decisions, cannot be held accountable, and who require constant supervision. This unfortunate status quo and general approach threatens to completely undermine any attempt at teaching self-reliance, not to mention the kind of leadership that Freddie advocated.

Recommendations:

- **A tight-knit, well trained, experienced** (with as many return staff as possible) professional team (in its most noble use of the term) **of 15-18**, which also includes kitchen, should be more than adequate. At Stendis, CRS/Europe, there used to be even fewer counselors and at no point did we feel there were not enough staff members to do the job.
- Especially crucial are the medical and kitchen positions. Having been Head Chef twice, I am perhaps not too conceited to state that I have a very good idea as to how the kitchen should be managed. I think familiarity with the programme is important but not sufficient. During my 10 years at CRS, I have seen only a

couple of chefs who could organise work in a both friendly and efficient manner. With good planning, the required competence, two people should be perfectly capable of running the kitchen. The supervision of kitchen and the head chef should preferably come under someone who knows the limits and possibilities of work schedule, planning, and budgets. It is very easy for kitchen staff to claim that they have too much to do, or that they need special resources. Often, it is not more resources but more resourcefulness they need.

- On-site bureaucracy should be minimal or much of it delegated to campers, so that the assistant camp director(s) can be a part of the programme as much as possible. They should be chosen so as to be able **to coach staff and give useful and credible performance feedback**.
- **Use well established management principles to manage staff and campers:** Set clear (and high) expectations, measure performance, discuss and reallocate resources as needed, ensure transparency and accountability.

2) COUNSELORS AS ROLE MODELS

“If you want to change something, don’t ask the younger staff because they feel they must exert their power to differentiate themselves from campers, and are less likely to question what they consider rules,” said one of my fellow core staff members this year. Indeed, there usually seems to be an abundance of **young alumni** for positions, who are only **barely older than the campers themselves**. This has been a trend for as long as I have been involved with the programme. Having many dedicated enthusiastic young alumni as staff sets a very positive, youthful and energetic atmosphere. However, it could be problematic on many levels:

1. The first level is only too easy to observe: there are usually barely any counselors whom the insurance agency can approve to **drive** camp vehicles. This may prove extremely difficult to work around.
2. Some of the younger staff are often simply **unable to behave like responsible adults**, mostly because they wanted to be the campers’ friends and not role models. Some make bad judgement calls on a regular basis.
3. There is an inherent tendency for especially young staff to think that they are very competent and experienced. It took me at least 3-4 years (especially without adequate coaching) to become a half-way decent counselor, and I know I still have to work at it at every turn. I know some start out as better educators than others, but being a counselor is something that one has to learn and keep practicing. **The lack of continuity** makes the training of excellent counselors very problematic.
4. A perhaps deeper and more important issue is the kind of role models we provide for the young: most counselors are of college age. While they may be outstanding college students, if we wish to educate great leaders, intellectuals, and artists, we need to engage more counselors who have already **demonstrated success in their professional careers**. These role models **must know what actual “real world” leadership looks like**, not just the kind of leadership we do at Camp. I have known

alumni who were “successful” at Camp, but could not demonstrate any leadership outside this all-too-familiar context.

5. Having the same staff facilitate both the girls and the boys raises further problems: Though it is true that a more general kind of respect is due to every single person, especially in our community, other types of respect have to be earned. One can only **earn such respect by being competent, strong, consistent, and knowledgeable.** This kind of respect is more or less independent of gender. Men have to earn the boys’ and each other’s respect as well, and it is often a task that requires much effort. It cannot be demanded, and no amount of insistence will gain any such respect. I have known both male and female counselors who managed to do this difficult task, but every year, there are counselors of both sexes who fail miserably at it. Such as there seems to be little disagreement whether all male counselors are fit to work at the girls’ camp, it should also stand to reason that not all female counselors are able to earn the boys’ respect.
6. The most crucial leadership issue I have observed is the following: **barely anyone among the counselors has an idea how a group and a job/project is managed or even organised.** This is especially important because they are the ones supposed to be helping the Sachems organise a project, yet there is often very little evidence of the existence of even rudimentary organisation (let alone project management) skills. This requires not only the counselors’ skills, but also some persistence. Campers tend to revert back to the disorganised state if left alone. Effective coaches have to be skilled at what they are trying to coach.

Recommendations:

The **new recruitment approach** I am recommending might take years to implement and may prove very difficult to do, as most professionals find it nearly impossible to take a whole summer off. It is also unavoidable if we really wish to rebuild a successful world-class leadership programme, and I think the Foundation should make it a priority to come up with a strategy to hire a balanced mixed of different staff.

- College-age students and alumni in their early twenties are an extremely valuable resource and should be encouraged to apply, but they should not make up the overwhelming majority of staff. Some of them are already mature enough and have great potential; others could use more coaching and mentoring. When hired, **management should ensure they get coaching from the CD and/or Assistant Camp Directors (“ACDs”)**, or even other more experienced staff members could do mentoring, even if these staff members do not join the community for the season.
- Hire **sufficiently mature staff** who are excellent role models, and who have become **successful** and have **demonstrated leadership**, as well as **effective management**, and **coaching in their own professional lives.**
- Have the top performers return summer after summer. **Continuity** is paramount!

3) HR ISSUES: RECRUITMENT, HIRING, FIRING

Because we deal with an educational programme where campers' well being is also at stake, serious staff HR issues are always very difficult. Camp Directors, especially if they are seasonal, and/or if they are from abroad have an extraordinary difficulty dealing with such issues. When I was a Camp Director, I myself received little training on how to deal with some of the staffing emergencies that come up almost on a yearly basis. These may include:

- Staff leaving;
- Staff having to be fired – the CDs sometimes meeting physical resistance and even violence from the person who is fired;
- Staff and/or campers suffering from PTSD after interactions that were not appropriate;
- Staff hired by the Foundation not taking direction from the CD (I also had serious problems in 2008 and found it difficult to deal with this unfortunate state of affairs).

Unfortunately, we went through some of these problems this year as well. The Camp Directors usually try to deal with these issues mostly alone; keeping up the appearance that everything is as it should be. In my experience, this takes the CD's precious time and energy away from the programme.

Recommendations:

- The Foundation should **hire a full time Camp Directors** to execute vision, prepare staff pre-season, and directly supervise and coach counselors. It is very difficult for a seasonal CD to dedicate sufficient time to get fully prepared while they are also working somewhere else full time. If having continuity in staff is important, having **continuity** for Camp leadership is infinitely more important.
- The Foundation should give more **support to CD during the season** regarding all issues, but HR issues in particular, so that the CD can focus on mission, goals, and the camp programme.

4) GENDER ISSUES AND "SAFE SPACE"

This is a very sensitive issue and I am quite reluctant to bring it up. I am aware it would be easier to let it drop, but I also consider it even more important to speak up about this issue. Coming from a Central European country, I probably have different views on many of these issues, and sometimes we have different standards. We are more sensitive about certain things and less sensitive about others. Likewise, our campers and staff from Africa, South America, and Asia are different from us and from each other. I know for a fact that many Asian and African campers are very uncomfortable about the way Americans talk to their "elders" but are also very uncomfortable speaking up about this. I realise that since CRS is in America, regulated by American laws, and the most vocal and assertive members of the community are nearly always American, the general culture of Camp seems to be American. I also realise that there have been a special kind of discourse about and racial and gender sensitivity, issues political correctness and the like, and only now do some intellectuals claim

publicly that some of these causes have perhaps gone too far.² I do not wish to pass judgement about the direction this whole controversy in American (and, increasingly in European) society is taking, but I wish for us to consider how it effects a leadership programme.

In Europe, we usually don't have to tread on eggshells when speaking to members of a different sex/gender. I will not give any recommendations this time as to what camp culture should or should not do about these issues. Although sensitivity to the needs of others is one of our main goals, **hypersensitivity** I believe may cause great harm. Naturally it is really difficult to draw the line between just the right amount and too much sensitivity in any given issue.

Challenging the boy campers' way of thinking about girls is certainly important, especially when it is not respectful. At the same time, several staff members felt compelled to challenge every syllable boys uttered about girls. It is usually safe for girls to express their sexuality. In the spirit of diversity, we encourage all LGBTQIA individuals to freely express themselves, which is a truly admirable thing to do especially because some of our participants come from countries or homes that do not appreciate diversity as well as we do at Rising Sun. I also have got personal reasons to appreciate the kind of compassion we all show towards all racial and sexual minorities. At the same time, somehow when boys express their sexuality, there is a chance many will automatically considered it threatening. Because the boys felt judged (just for being boys) by the staff calling them out, and did not receive adequate instruction as to why and how their thoughts and self-expression could be construed as inappropriate, they were less inclined to be open to new ideas. Many teachable moments were lost this way.

Occasionally, there have been instances of what could be construed as reverse sexism. During the group mid-season evaluation, when person in charge of the discussion effectively told the male staff to wait for every other female to speak before they spoke. If a male counselor recommended (or were even of the opinion) that females wait until all the guys finish talking, it would have caused a public outrage – and for good reason. I was rather shocked by this particular piece of instruction, and had a hard time deciding what the “culturally adequate” way to react would be. I do concede that male and female communities have different dynamics, and that there is palpable difference between how male and female utterances are perceived. At the same time, these issues should be approached more carefully, without risking of alienating around half of the staff.

The only conclusion I can somewhat confidently make is that leaders cannot entertain the possibility of being hypersensitive. They often have to put up with criticism, disapproval, (hopefully only) verbal aggression and many other insults to their dignity. The one thing they do not do is play victim. They don't blame others; they assume responsibility.

Studies confirm what common knowledge held for thousands of years: **challenges and adversity builds a truly exceptional character**. Our misguided repetition and misuse of the idea of “safe space” completely undermine leadership training. **We emotionally baby our**

² Please check the Links section for articles relating to hypersensitivity. The term and the potential dangers of this phenomenon are not the fruits of my own fancy.

future leaders. We suppress conflict rather than **teach how to deal with conflicts.** We do everything in our power to comfort homesick kids, but do not help them learn how to deal with discomfort. Worst of all, especially at the girls' camp, we use evening programmes on feminism and body image to instil victim mentality rather than empower them to deal with these problems as leaders. We pay lip service to leadership while we emphasise a false sense of "niceness". **I believe this completely undermines our mission and should be addressed.** Raising awareness of all issues is certainly important, and we should continue to bring these issues up, but we should only deal with these issues as leaders.

Recommendations:

- **Get rid of the victim mentality** in our approach and teaching, set high expectations, help campers solve their own problems, and **focus on leadership** (i.e. teach campers how to overcome adversity) in all discussions and other teachable moments.
- Create challenges and adversity, somewhat artificially if needed in order to **promote true leadership as opposed to mere coordination tasks** (which is what being a Sachem is gradually becoming).

5) "SAFETY" AND THE PROGRAMME

The most obvious thing that **interferes with leadership** is our Health and Safety Manual. Many aspects of our H&S strategy are important to follow and quite neutral to our programme, but **the ones that are detrimental should be critically examined.** Following the law is one thing, but coming up with policies that are not required by law and address no real health risks is an excellent way of **crippling our own programme.**

A good (though admittedly not a very important) example would be the "buddy system" at the pool. The buddy system (with swimming buddies and periodical buddy checks) has been designed for waterfronts that have non-see-through bodies of water. It is also designed to avoid any lost swimmer emergencies. In a pool such as ours, there can be no lost swimmers because you see the bottom of the pool at any given moment. The buddy system is a completely unnecessary safety precaution that is bothersome but does not make the pool safer in any imaginable manner.

Our own overactive imagination has created non-existing safety concerns. I was very happy to hear that **the Foundation is already re-examining many of our safety rules** and will hopefully be able to get rid of at least some of our unnecessary burdens. I would certainly recommend that supervision requirements (especially those that completely undermine the whole point of vigils, for instance), wood chopping and many others be re-examined from the point of view of common sense and **actual risks vs. imagined risks.**

Recommendations:

- Continue to **re-examine the Health and Safety Manual** and make sure none of the non-essential restrictions remain – I can only applaud the Foundation for agreeing to start doing this.

6) THOUGHTS ON THE CONSECUTIVE 4-WEEK SESSIONS AND CO-LOCATION

I have briefly touched upon the difficulty of the current version of the programme. I am quite aware that nobody thought this an ideal solution, even if this seems to be a financially sustainable option.

I have visited the Red Hook Campus and was extremely put out by what seemed like years of neglect. I also learned how scarce the resources to keep the place afloat had been. I do not know why the Red Hook campus was allowed to deteriorate so, nor can I offer recommendations as to what could be done to get the campus back into shape. I can only offer recommendations about the programme.

Co-location of girls and boys has been offered as a possible alternative to the 4-week seasons. Having spent 10 years and watching many “interactions” of the two camp populations always seemed for most counselors as **unwelcome interruptions** to both the programme and the community. We have always remarked how boys and girls both change: **friendships almost became secondary; sensitivity to the needs of others loses its importance as they were running to get the attention of the other sex. This is partly why I would not advocate a co-ed programme.**

The unfortunate side-effect of running two programmes after one another, despite all intentions and efforts, is that each session gets **a different kind of attention**. It takes a few weeks for new staff to understand what the programme is all about, and especially, how they may be the best counselors they can possibly be. It is usually the second half of the season that both staff and campers start taking the summer seriously (a funny illustration of this was the boys discovering writing on the wall saying Camp starts on week 5 - “oh, well, that is just too bad.”). Much of the first week is focused on settling in, and quite a few days at the end are dedicated to clean-up: either to leave the site clean for the girls or for closing. This means that there is very little time left for meaningful Camp programme.

Another problem was that despite our extraordinary efforts, **the first session felt very much like a test run** with the only difference that we did not really have the time to consistently fix how things went.

A great shortcoming of the boys' session was **the absence of leadership coaching strategies** – something that would have greatly benefitted our budding young leaders. I frequently felt that **the boys were going on autopilot** because we did not manage to focus on how to do meaningful coaching. Somehow there was **no time or opportunity to adjust our course, recognise problems and fix them**. There was no opportunity to see where we were going or to really focus on what needed to be done to provide a meaningful (leadership and any other kind of) experience. A good example would be the hikes.

Outside circumstances forced us to do one day hikes. They worked really well as an outing, but provided very little of the leadership or team building experience we would expect to gain from a longer hike. We recognised the problem, yet we kept doing one-day hikes instead of changing them. We assumed we had learned from our mistakes, but only so that the hikes could be done well when the girls came. Unfortunately, there were many examples of problems we could not fix before the girls arrived – not because we did not want to, but because there was simply not enough time. As a result, **the boys did not get nearly as much out of the (even the 4-week long) season as they could have!**

On week 2 of **the girls' session**, I feel that we finally started getting ideas regarding how to focus on coaching (at least it seemed to me that we all thought we turned over a fresh leaf and could finally find motivation to fix the problems of the previous session), but **the staff has by then become fatigued and a little emotionally disengaged**. Every counselor knows that during a regular season, staff have the lowest energy on week 5 and 6, which was just about when the girls arrived.

When talking to the core staff in the spring, **we were all very excited about the possibility of experimentation and all the potential discoveries that might have come out of it**. I have not heard what kind of message we have been able to take away this time. We have not managed to question our own assumptions sufficiently and ended up trying to make the 7-week program happen only during 4 weeks. Having arrived later and then gone on 3 hikes, I only got the chance to work on the boys' leadership education on their last week. I have tried to make leadership training opportunities better for the girls by helping them question their assumptions, creating guidelines on coaching for both staff and campers, and being involved in the coaching more, but time seems to be quite short anyway. **There are a lot of leadership positions handed out, but very little self-starter leadership is being taught or practiced. This simply takes more time.**

7) FOUNDATION, VISIT TEAM, BOARD PRESENCE ON CAMPUS

Since this year has been an experiment in many ways, the Foundation and Board should have made it a special priority to **observe the success of the changes**. There should have been special goals set for this season and, as much as possible, **special measurements** instated to report on the successes and difficulties of the 4-week programme. I missed the first Visit team, but I have been told they only spent a few hours on site during the boys' session, most of which was spent on a meeting. **The Visit Team should have spent as much time as possible on site: observing, probing, helping the CD and new staff as much as possible (if and when needed)**. Meetings on different possible ways to run the programme in the future (questions for the programme committee to ponder) could be done on site, but should not be interfering with the visit team's ability to do their job of observing and reporting back on the programme. The surveys that were handed out did no better to elicit the truth. I don't see how they could tell whether this was just a great summer camp, or whether our campers are learning and practicing actual leadership. Also, the Visit Team should help the staff in problem finding and problem solving, and should be more open to hearing if things do not go as well as one hoped for.

The Foundation Staff were, at least occasionally visible, but **members of the Board of Directors ("BOD") and Members Advisory Council ("MAC")** (with a perhaps a few exceptions) **were scarcely to be seen**. Alumni day is not the best time to observe the community, either. There were crucial lessons to be learnt by the BOD and the Foundation, and many of these lessons were not learnt. Reading staff reports, even my own, does not help anyone understand what is really going on. Many of the BOD and MAC members have a long history and great experience with CRS. Sharing their experience and seeing the results of their sometimes difficult decisions is something that no long distance relationship can substitute.

Recommendations:

- There should be planned and much more **tight communication between Foundation, BOD (and MAC), and the programme staff**: the BOD, the programme committee, the Executive Director (“ED”) and the CD should plan and set clear objectives for the Visit Team: how to look at the programme, what to focus on, how to measure the success of the 4-week programme, how they can be of help to the staff and CD etc.
- **Members of the BOD and MAC should spend more time at camp.** They could be used as valuable resources, excellent role models, and a way of the CRS community to be involved in the life of the campers.
- The Programme Committee should be made up of members who have been on staff, are experienced educators, and/or know about leadership education in particular. Deciding on the Programme without having this perspective can lead to misconceptions about what is important.

III) CLOSING THOUGHTS

Being a part of Rising Sun, even if it is “just” a great summer camp, is a great experience. I am very grateful that I have been given the opportunity to return. However, I often felt out of place, thinking that we could have done so much more to make these seasons work. Despite the well-planned and executed staff training, I still often felt that **the staff was not ready to take on the large responsibility to counsel future leaders**, but also that many of the kids, though exceptionally intelligent, few would be possible candidates to be leaders of their respective fields.

I realise I have very little influence on the future of CRS and the Foundation, but I am a great believer of the education of future leaders, and also in Freddie’s mission. I also think that **the Foundation needs to change direction in more ways than one with the programme staff and the location as much as resources allow.** The way I envision the ideal CRS programme is as follows:

- **Two separate locations;**
- **At least 7 weeks;**
- A good mix of young and **mature, competent staff** who can ensure **continuity** and who **model** the dedication to our 4 goals and values in their own lives;
- Campers who do actually have got the potential to be world leaders in their field;
- **Genuine leadership replacing the victim mentality** we seem to have inadvertently advocated lately;
- Replacing “crisis management” with much more effective leadership and management styles;
- **A strong programme with the kind of reputation that attracts the kind of staff and campers as described above.**

I do hope that Rising Sun comes out of these difficult times better understanding what it stands for and with the alumni united for not only the survival, but also the thriving of our much beloved Camp.

Warmest regards,

Attila AKA "TT"

IV) LINKS

In this section, I have listed a few links of research papers and other resources.

SIZE OF THE TEAM

- <http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article/is-your-team-too-big-too-small-whats-the-right-number-2/>
- <http://www.thriveinc.com/team-siz/>

A fairly well researched paper promoting smaller groups:

- <https://blog.bufferapp.com/small-teams-why-startups-often-win-against-google-and-facebook-the-science-behind-why-smaller-teams-get-more-done>

ROLE MODELS

General importance of role models:

- <http://www.rootsofaction.com/role-models-youth-strategies-success/>
- <http://www.rootsofaction.com/what-is-a-role-model-five-qualities-that-matter-for-role-models/>

This article claims that the male role models do not have to be men, but I don't think this is very well argued, or at least I would like to look into the research more before making up my mind:

- <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/our-gender-ourselves/201204/does-male-role-model-actually-have-be-man>

Role models and age:

- http://www.anzmac.org/conference_archive/2007/papers/Bridson_2.pdf

VICTIM MENTALITY AND HYPERSENSITIVITY

Could not find really well researched papers on this one, but some of them are obviously thought provoking:

- <http://www.parncutt.org/victim.html>
- <http://www.insead.edu/facultyresearch/research/doc.cfm?did=50114>

One even claims victim mentality is a myth, but this paper seems to be also very poorly researched:

- <http://helpwithinreach.org/the-myth-of-victim-mentality/>

Some very thought provoking, though perhaps not necessarily scholarly articles regarding hypersensitivity:

- <http://www.zerohedge.com/news/2015-06-07/professor-speaks-out-how-coddled-hyper-sensitive-undergrads-are-ruining-college-lear>
- <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/09/the-coddling-of-the-american-mind/399356/>
- <http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/Opinion/2015/06/04/Why-College-Professors-Are-Afraid-Teach-Millennials>

This particular book and blog by Lenore Skenazy is a most interesting take on the vicious circle of the “bubblewrapping kids” culture. It also highlights the difference between perceived risk and real risk:

- <http://www.freerangekids.com/>
- http://www.amazon.co.uk/Free-Range-Kids-Self-Reliant-Children/dp/0470574755/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1450610641&sr=8-1&keywords=free+range+children

ADVERSITY

It is true that not everybody who goes through adversity, difficult challenges or trauma comes out of the experience with growth, but it seems the ones that managed to pull through are overrepresented among the highly successful. No researcher claims, perhaps because they do not dare to, that we should put our students through adversity, but difficult challenges can and should be engineered at camp. Some of the following papers and articles are quite obviously better researched than others:

- <http://news.wfu.edu/2012/10/23/overcoming-adversity/>
- <http://blogs.scientificamerican.com/beautiful-minds/turning-adversity-into-creative-growth/>
- <http://news.heartland.org/newspaper-article/2014/12/13/how-children-learn-overcome-adversity>
- <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/media-spotlight/201402/can-traumatic-experiences-make-you-more-creative>
- <http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052702303496104575560261828332840>

LEADERSHIP

A useful and easily accessible resource:

- <http://www.cengagebrain.com.au/content/9781133926382.pdf>

Resource for leadership styles – should our campers and staff fill this in before arrival???

Some data based on surveys:

- <http://www.kent.ac.uk/careers/sk/leadership.htm>

Leadership development:

- <http://www.amazon.com/Future-Leadership-Development-Applied-Psychology/dp/0805843426>
- <http://careerrocketeer.com/2012/12/top-ways-to-improve-your-leadership-skills.html>

The Leadership Journal with well researched and serious scholarly articles:

- <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/journal/10489843>

An interesting set of articles on male vs. leadership:

- <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/caveman-politics/201208/where-are-the-female-candidates>
- <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/caveman-politics/201111/do-we-really-prefer-taller-leaders>
- <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/caveman-politics/201112/are-you-sure-we-prefer-taller-leaders>

SINGLE-SEX EDUCATION

Most research sees very little to no difference co-ed and single-sex education as measured in test scores and other academic measurements.

A good intro:

- <http://www.apa.org/monitor/2011/02/coed.aspx>

A good summary containing little detail:

- <https://thesanfordschool.asu.edu/acces/evidence-based-answers-4>

The most well researched paper (actually standing up to scientific scrutiny):

- <http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/releases/bul-a0035740.pdf>

A well researched paper advocating single-sex education:

- <http://www.austinisd.org/sites/default/files/announcements/D-White%20Paper%20Final%209.12.11.pdf>