

**CRS ALUMNI SURVEY  
REPORT**

**Prepared by Jerry Murphy, CRS'48-49  
June 2015**

**SURVEY RESEARCH ASSOCIATES  
Marketing and Research Consultants**

13850 Goodman  
Overland Park, KS 66223  
Phone/Fax: (913) 851-4030  
e-mail: gmstudy@sbcglobal.net

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND .....	3
HIGHLIGHTS OF FINDINGS.....	5
SECTION I	
ALUMNI DONATION PATTERNS AND INTENTIONS .....	10
ESTIMATES OF ALUMNI DONATIONS .....	11
FUTURE INTENTIONS WITH RESPECT TO DONATIONS .....	15
Increment Based on Stated Intention to Double Annual Donations .....	17
SECTION II	
ALUMNI ATTITUDES AND SENTIMENTS RELATIVE TO	
CURRENT LAJF ISSUES AND PLANS .....	21
ATTITUDES TOWARDS OPTIONS TO INCREASE REVENUES.....	22
ATTITUDES TOWARDS OPTIONS TO DECREASE COSTS .....	26
ATTITUDES TOWARDS CO-LOCATION ALTERNATIVES.....	27
ALUMNI SENTIMENTS WITH RESPECT TO POSSIBLE CHANGES .....	29

## BACKGROUND

In the first week of April, 2015, LAJF sent an email invitation to a worldwide sample of the CRS community, inviting them to participate in an online survey related to current strategic planning being done by LAJF.<sup>1</sup> 2,716 survey invitations were initially delivered by email. At the cutoff point for the survey (May 18, 2015), we had 636 completed interviews to work with. The data processing firm that hosted the on-line survey reported that there were 1,155 hits on the survey link and of these, 636 (or 55%) completed the survey. This is an unusually high response to an online survey.

The characteristics of the respondents who completed this survey reflect a good cross section of the Camp Rising Sun Community. The survey sample represents a core group of 2,716 members of the CRS community who are actively engaged with Camp Rising Sun in a number of ways. This is shown in the following table which illustrates how alumni responding to the survey have been engaged. It should be clarified that Table 1 does not show frequency of engagement. For instance, the line, *"made a financial donation to CRS"* includes alumni who made one or more donations over a five year period.

**The report which follows is divided into two sections. Section I discusses alumni donation patterns and intentions. Section II discusses alumni sentiments and attitudes towards a number of current strategic plans and related issues.**

**Table 1**  
**Alumni Engagement**

<b>In Past Five Years:</b>	<b>Total Sample</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
Been in touch with CRS friends	84%	78%	95%
Accessed LAJF or CRS websites	77	74	82
Made a financial donation to CRS	68	70	66
Read online version of SUNDIAL	66	68	63
Read print version of SUNDIAL	61	62	60
Accessed CRS through social media	56	46	72
Attended any alumni events	55	51	63
Visited a CRS Campsite	37	37	38
Participated in a regional Alumni Association	36	33	44
Served on a LAJF Board Committee	11	13	8

---

<sup>1</sup> The survey was designed and analyzed by Jerry Murphy, '48-'49. Jerry was originally hired, trained, and employed as a survey researcher in 1956. Over the ensuing 60 years, he worked as a senior research executive for a number of internationally-known firms, and also founded and ran his own survey research firm. Jerry is particularly appreciative of the contribution to this project by Tim Conners, who served as project sachem, and Christina Busso, who participated in all phases of the study.

**Table 2**  
**Characteristics of CRS Alumni Survey Respondents**

<b>CRS Affiliation</b>	<b>Percent<sup>2</sup></b>
Former campers	93%
Former staff members	24
Board Committee Members	13
Current or former Board members	7
<b>Camp Attended</b>	
Red Hook	62
Clinton	31
Stendis	7
<b>Current Residence</b>	
United States	65
Eastern	45
Western	11
Central	8
Europe	27
Other International	6
No answer	2
<b>Age</b>	
15 to 24	27
25 to 39	31
40 to 59	21
60+	22
<b>Income</b>	
Under \$76,000	54
\$76,000 to \$175,000	29
\$176,000 to \$275,000+	17

<sup>2</sup> In this and other tables, totals may add to 99 or 101%, due to rounding error.

## HIGHLIGHTS OF FINDINGS

### Donations

The survey findings on donations are very relevant to fundraising strategy. From our perspective, fundraising can be analyzed as a marketing scenario in which data on past history, key target markets, current economic climate, and estimated market potential are examined. **The survey indicates that in the past five years, the Foundation has generated an annual average of \$650,000 in donations.** A large proportion of these donations (at least 25%) have come from a handful of very generous donors.

**Estimated Annual Donations to CRS Past 5 Years**

Alumni Segment	Estimated Donations	Percent of Donations
<b>Total Donation past 5 years</b>		
<b>Under \$1,000</b>	\$60,300	9%
<b>\$1,000 to \$,9999</b>	\$198,700	31
<b>\$10,000 to \$49,999</b>	\$227,100	35
<b>Core Sample Subtotal</b>	\$486,100	75%
<b>\$50,000+ Donors</b>	\$164,000	25
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$650,100</b>	<b>100%</b>

Within the alumni core group, certain segments have contributed a significantly larger share of total donations. Specifically:

Older alumni (age 40+) account for 81% of donations, with alumni over 60 accounting for almost half (46%).

Alumni with incomes over \$76,000 account for 83% of the donations, with alumni incomes over \$175,000 accounting for over half (53%).

Red Hook alumni account for 92% of core group donations

### Estimated Increment in Donations

Table 10 shows the **estimated increment in donations** that could be realized based on the stated intentions of the alumni at each of three donation levels. Overall, a possible increase of \$178,000, amounting to an increment of 37% might be realized. This does not include donations at the \$50,000 plus level.

**An increase of 37% is considerably higher than professional fundraisers might typically anticipate. However, it is our belief that CRS alumni have an atypical passion for the CRS mission and can be motivated to incrementally contribute this much, or more. This is seen in the table below.**

<i>Past-5-Year Donation Level</i>	<i>Percent of Segment</i>	<i>Estimated Increment in Donations Based on Stated Intent (\$1,000s)</i>	<i>Percentage Increment</i>
Less than \$1K	74%	39.4	65%
\$1K to \$9999	23	87.1	44
\$10K to \$50K	3	52.4	23
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>178.9</b>	<b>37%</b>

### **Reasons for Having Reservations about Doubling Donations**

When asked whether they were willing to double donations a sizable segment (39%) indicated they were willing to do so. Another (44%) were uncertain. In response to an open end question on this subject a segment (18%) tied their uncertainty to concerns about current Camp plans or issues that have not been resolved. Approximately 12% tied their reservations to concerns about how good a job the Board or Foundation is doing

Compared to Clinton alumnae, Red Hook alumni were much more vociferous in their comments and seem more concerned with what is going on (or not going on). We also noticed that critical or negative comments among alumni under 30 were very sparse.

### **Attitudes Towards Options to Decrease Costs**

Alumni were asked to indicate whether they were favorable, unfavorable, or uncertain in their attitudes toward a number of options to decrease costs. These options included closing one site, shortening programs to 4 weeks, running Boys' and Girls' programs on alternate years and co-locating Boys' and Girls' programs at a single site.

None of these options are favorably viewed by a majority. Least popular are the ideas of closing down one of the sites and running 4-week programs for Boys and Girls in successive months. The majority is also opposed to running the boy's and girl's program on alternate years, or reducing the number of campers from 120 to 60.

**Alumni are divided on the idea of co-location of a boy's and girl's Camp at a single site. However, more are unfavorable (44%) than favorable (34%). These results are shown in the table which follows.**

Possible Options to Decrease Costs	Unfavorable	Uncertain	Favorable
Closing down either the girl's or boy's Camp until funds can be generated to reopen.	67%	20%	13%
Closing down one of the current sites and running separate 4-week boy's and girl's programs on one site in successive months.	63	15	21
Closing down one of current sites and running the boy's and girl's programs in alternating years.	56	16	28
Permanently reducing number of campers from 120 to 60.	51	23	26
Co-locating boy's and girl's Camp at a single site, maintaining single-gender programs, run concurrently, to offset operating costs.	44	21	34

### Attitudes Towards Co-location Strategies

Alumni were also presented with four alternative co-location strategies. **Only one of these options received more favorable than unfavorable response. That was the option which read:**

*“Co-locate Camps at Red Hook site. Sell Clinton site and use funds from sale toward renovation of Red Hook site.”*

**A plurality (43%) is favorably disposed to this option and a lesser percentage(30%) is unfavorable (30%). A significant percentage (26%) is uncertain.**

**The other three co-location options received more unfavorable than favorable response. Close to a majority are opposed to all three. These results are shown on table which follows.**

Co-Location Alternatives	Favorable	Uncertain	Unfavorable
Co-locate Camps at Red Hook site. Sell Clinton site and use funds from sale toward renovation of Red Hook site.	43%	26%	30%
Co-locate camps at Clinton site. Sell Red Hook site, and use funds from sale to renovate Clinton site.	23	32	45
Sell both Red Hook and Clinton sites, and use funds to purchase a <b>new out-state site</b> suitable for two single gender programs with some shared facilities, and where operating, maintenance and renovation costs would be significantly lower.	28	22	49
Sell both Red Hook and Clinton sites, and use funds to purchase a <b>new in-state site</b> suitable for two single gender programs with some shared facilities, and where operating, maintenance and renovation costs would be significantly lower.	26	24	50

**Alumni Sentiments with Respect to Possible Changes** Alumni were shown eight statements designed to reflect current sentiments related to possible changes in CRS programs and site locations. Responses to these statements range from majority agreement to majority disagreement. On several statements alumni are sharply divided. **Of the eight statements reflecting alumni sentiments, alumni are virtually unanimous in agreeing with two:**

*“LAJF should keep the program true to the original program as designed by Freddie.”*

*“LAJF should be able to interpret the mission and make modernizations to the program based on what’s best for campers.”*

On the remaining six statements, alumni are more divided.

<b>Alumni Sentiments With Respect to Possible Changes</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>
LAJF should be able to interpret the mission and make modernizations to the program based on what's best for campers.	78%	14%	9%
<b>LAJF should keep the program true to the original program as designed by Freddie.</b>	76	12	12
Moving the Camps should only be considered as a last resort for maintaining the future viability of the Camp program.	59	15	27
LAJF should consider developing an off-season facility at one of the camp sites for use by alumni families and friends	52	30	17
The camps can be moved anywhere; it’s not the location that matters.	45	12	43
I will support whatever the board deems necessary based on financial feasibility	42	26	33
If the Red Hook Camp must be closed, keep the core facilities for use for alumni retreats, recreation and special events.	41	27	31
Keep the Camps at present sites and run the same programs until the endowment runs out.	13	11	77



## Comparison of Red Hook and Clinton Alumni

### Co-location

With respect to possible co-location strategies, there was considerable difference in attitude between Red Hook and Clinton Camp alumni:

- The majority of **Red Hook** Camp alumni are in favor of co-location at Red Hook.
- The majority of **Red Hook** Camp alumni are unfavorable toward co-location at Clinton
- The majority of **Red Hook** Camp alumni are unfavorable toward co-location at any new site.

Close to a majority of **Clinton** Camp alumni (47%) are opposed to Red Hook co-location and are divided down the middle with respect to co-location at Clinton.

Co-location Alternatives	Red Hook Camp Alumni	Clinton Camp Alumni
Co-locate Camps at Red Hook site. Sell Clinton site, and use funds from sale toward renovation of Red Hook site.		
Favorable	54%	27%
Uncertain	24	26
Unfavorable	21	47
Co-locate camps at Clinton site. Sell Red Hook site, and use funds from sale to renovate Clinton site.		
Favorable	15%	36%
Uncertain	33	27
Unfavorable	52	37

### Sentiments about Change

Red Hook and Clinton alumni are virtually in agreement with most sentiment statements. The exception is the statement,

*“The Camps can be moved anywhere. It’s not the location that matters.”*

As shown below. The majority of the **Red Hook alumni disagreed** with this statement. The majority of the **Clinton Camp alumni agreed**. It would appear that the Red Hook alumni are more tied to their original Camp site than the Clinton alumni.

	Red Hook Alumni	Clinton Alumni
The Camps can be moved anywhere. It’s not the location that matters.		
Agree	38%	<b>51%</b>
Neutral	12	12
Disagree	<b>50</b>	37

**SECTION I**

**ALUMNI DONATION PATTERNS AND INTENTIONS**

## ESTIMATES OF ALUMNI DONATIONS

The survey sample represents a core group of 2,716 members of the CRS community who are actively engaged with Camp Rising Sun in a number of ways. 68% of survey participants claimed they had made a financial donation to CRS in the past five years. It is reasonable to project the raw numbers generated in the survey to the core group of 2,716 alumni who were invited to participate in the survey. This is simply done by multiplying raw numbers by the ratio:

$$\text{Sample universe } 2,716 \div \text{Survey sample } 637 = 4.26$$

Using this multiplier, we can estimate total donations over the past years among the core alumni group and specific segments of this core group.

**This exercise yields an estimate of annual core group giving of \$486,100 without including \$50,000 plus contributions. Three participants in survey indicated they had contributed a total of \$820,000 in the past five years which works out to an additional \$164,000 per year (over five years). Adding \$164,000 into the total yields an estimated average of \$650,000 a year in donations in the past five years from the CRS community.**

**Table 3**  
**Estimated Annual Donations to CRS Past 5 Years**  
**Based on Survey Findings**

<b>Alumni Segment</b>	<b>Estimated Donations</b>	<b>Percent of Donations</b>
<b>Total Donation past 5 years</b>		
<b>Under \$1,000</b>	\$60,300	9%
<b>\$1,000 to \$,9999</b>	\$198,700	31
<b>\$10,000 to \$49,999</b>	\$227,100	35
<b>Subtotal Core Sample</b>	\$486,100	75%
<b>\$50,000+ Donors</b>	\$164,000	25
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$650,100</b>	<b>100%</b>

This estimate is very much in line with the donation data prepared for the SPC by LAJF in June, 2015 and the data shown in SUNDIAL. These parallels validate the accuracy of the survey.

## Share of Total Contributions by Core Alumni Segments

Within the alumni core group, certain segments have contributed a significantly larger share of total donations. Specifically:

Older alumni (age 40+) account for 81% of donations, with alumni over 60 accounting for almost half (46%).

Alumni with incomes over \$76,000 account for 83% of the donations, with alumni incomes over \$175,000 accounting for over half (53%).

Red Hook alumni account for 92% of core group donations.

**Table 4**  
**The Contribution of Specific Core Segments**  
**To Annual Alumni Donations**

<b>Core Alumni Segment</b>	<b>Estimated Average Annual Donation by Core Segments (1,000s)<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Percent of Donations</b>	<b>Average Annual Individual Donation (Dollars)</b>
<b>Camp Attended</b>			
Red Hook	\$423.5	0.92	\$418
Clinton	31.8	0.07	68
Stendis	4.5	0.01	48
<b>Age</b>			
15-18	\$5.4	0.01	\$25
19-24	6.9	0.01	32
25-39	79.1	0.16	153
40-59	170.4	0.35	506
60+	221.6	0.46	642
<b>Income</b>			
Under \$76K	\$66.1	0.17	\$97
\$76-175K	118.6	0.30	284
Over \$175K	209.2	0.53	1,002

<sup>3</sup> In computing core alumni group averages, the donations of three alumni who contributed more than \$50,000 were excluded, because they skew the findings. Their contributions will be taken into account in the section on estimated future donations.

### Average Annual Donations by Specific Core Alumni Segments

Total contribution by core segments is contingent upon size of group. For instance, there are many more Red Hook than Clinton alumni. Therefore, it is useful to examine average size of individual contributions. Average donations ranged from \$25 for recent campers to \$1420 for board members. The average annual donation for total core sample was \$297. Average Contributions from US alumni is three times higher than International. Average donations from 60+ alumni and alumni with incomes over \$175,000 are significantly higher.

These findings are illustrated in the tables which follow. Also included is a table on average income, broken by various alumni segments. This income information can be of use in prioritizing target markets for fundraising.

**Note that average annual donations from highest donor level is \$4,100 (excluding \$50,000+ donors)**

**Table 5**  
**Average Contributions by Specific Segments**

	<i>Made Donation Past 5 years</i>	<b>Average Total Donation Over 5-Year Period (Dollars)<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Average Annual Donation (Dollars)</b>
<b>All Alumni</b>	68%	\$1,487	\$297
<b>Core Alumni Segments</b>			
Red Hook Campers	72%	\$2,090	\$418
Clinton Campers	66	\$342	\$68
Stendis Campers	62	\$240	\$48
<b>Relationship to Camp</b>			
Board (past and present)	85%	\$7,100	\$1,420
Board Committee Member	91	\$4,070	\$814
Local Alumni Association	80	\$1,750	\$350
<b>Residence</b>			
US	71%	\$1,970	\$394
International	63	\$571	\$114
<b>Age</b>			
15 to 18	66%	\$127	\$25
19 to 24	66	\$162	\$32
25 to 39	70	\$767	\$153
40 to 59	73	\$2,531	\$506
60-plus	69	\$3,211	\$642
<b>Income</b>			
Under \$76,000	67%	\$485	\$97
\$76,000 to \$175,000	76	\$1,421	\$284
Over \$175,000	75	\$5,011	\$1,002
<b>Total Donation Past 5 Years</b>			
Under \$1,000	100%	\$250	\$50
\$1,000 to \$9,999	100	\$2,620	\$524
\$10,000 to \$49,999	100	\$20,500	\$4,100

<sup>4</sup> In computing core alumni group averages, the donations of three alumni who contributed more than \$50,000 were excluded, because they skew the findings. Their contributions will be taken into account in the section on estimated future donations.

**Table 6**  
**Average Annual Income**  
**Of Specific Core Segments**

<b>Alumni Core Segment</b>	<b>Average Income*</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Attended Red Hook</b>	\$115,000	65%
<b>Attended Clinton</b>	\$66,000	27
<b>Attended Stendis</b>	\$35,000	08
<b>Income</b>		
Under \$76,000	\$33,000	55%
\$76,000-\$175,000	\$119,000	29
Over \$175,000	\$249,000	16
<b>Resident of US</b>	\$112,000	65
<b>Outside of US</b>	\$56,000	32
<b>Age</b>		
19-24	\$32,000	15%
25-39	\$77,000	36
40-69	\$151,000	21
60+	\$119,000	22
<b>Years Attended Red Hook</b>		
Prior to 1965	\$123,000	15%
1965-1989	\$161,000	19
1989+	\$77,000	26
<b>All Alumni</b>	\$93,000	100%

## FUTURE INTENTIONS WITH RESPECT TO DONATIONS

### Intended Donations in Next Several Years

Findings about future intentions with respect to donations are very positive. When asked whether they will donate more, the same amount, or less to CRS in the next several years, a majority (53%) answered “more,” and a high proportion (40%) indicated they will donate “the same” amount (40%). **Only 8% reported they will donate less.**

These results are shown below for the total sample, and also by age, income, Camp attended and donation level. It can be noted that the proclivity to give more is strong among most segments, and particularly strong among younger alumni.

Older alumni (60+) are most likely to report they will give the same amount, and less likely to report they will give more. Major donors are more prone to report they will give less (23%), although a high proportion (38%) reports more.

**Table 7**  
**Future Intentions With Respect to Donations**  
**In Next Several Years Will Donate**

	Same Amount	More	Less
<b>Total Alumni</b>	40%	53%	8%
<b>Age</b>			
15 to 18	37%	58%	5%
19 to 24	30	68	3
25 to 39	37	60	3
40 to 59	34	56	9
60+	59	25	16
<b>Income</b>			
Under \$70K	37%	56%	7%
\$70K to \$175K	44	49	7
Over \$175K	44	46	10
<b>Attended Camp</b>			
Red Hook	32%	65%	3%
Clinton	38	57	5
Stendis	28	67	5
<b>Total Donation Past 5 Years</b>			
Under \$1,000	38%	55%	7
\$1,000 to \$,9999	48	42	10
\$10,000 to \$49,999	38	38	23

### Willingness to Double Annual Donations

When asked whether they were willing to double their donations to CRS, results are also very positive. More than twice as many alumni responded “Yes” (39%), as opposed to “No” (17%) to this question. At the same time, a significant percentage (44%) indicated they were uncertain about doubling their donations.

The willingness to double donations is at about the same level across most core segments, hovering around 40%. Exceptions to this are related to age. Respondents in the 25 to 39 year old age group are more likely to indicate a willingness to double donations. Younger (15-19) and older (60+) and over are less likely to commit to “doubling”. Major donors are much less likely to commit to “doubling.”

**Table 8**  
**Willingness to Double Annual Donations**

	Uncertain	Yes	No
<b>Total</b>	44%	39%	17%
Male	43	39	18
Female	47	39	14
<b>Age</b>			
15 to 18	59%	32%	10%
19 to 24	45	43	12
25 to 39	41	49	10
40 to 59	35	44	21
60+	49	21	30
<b>Income</b>			
Under \$70K	45%	39%	15%
\$70K to \$175K	40	42	18
Over \$175K	34	44	23
<b>Attended Camp</b>			
Red Hook	41%	40%	18%
Clinton	48	40	12
Stendis	46	38	15
<b>Total Donation Past 5 Years</b>			
Under \$1,000	46%	39%	15%
\$1,000 to \$,9999	37	44	19
\$10,000 to \$49,999	31	23	46



### Increment Based on Stated Intention to Double Annual Donations

It is possible to estimate the potential increment in annual donations among the core alumni sample. If the core sample adheres to their stated intentions, they will show a 37% increase in annual donations, which totals to an annual increment of \$178,900. The calculations to reach this conclusion are shown in Tables 9 through 11.

In Table 9, the **estimated donations** for the alumni sample, broken by three donation levels, are shown. Note that the total donations add up to \$486,000. Also note that 88% of donations are from those giving \$1,000 or more

**Table 9**

<i>Core Segment Past 5 Year Donation Level</i>	<i>Percent of Segment</i>	<i>Estimated Donations Past 5 Years (\$1,000s)</i>	<i>Percent of Donations</i>
Less than \$1K	74%	60.3	12%
\$1K to \$9,999	23	198.7	41
\$10K to \$50K	3	227.1	47
<b>TOTAL</b>	100%	<b>486.0</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 10 shows the **estimated increment in donations** that could be realized based on the stated intentions of the alumni at each of three donation levels. Overall, a possible increase of \$178,000, amounting to an increment of 37% might be realized. This does not include donations at the \$50,000 plus level.

It can be noted that the lowest level donors indicate the greatest percentage increment (65%). The next greatest percentage increment indicated is by donors at the \$1,000 to \$9,999 level (44%). This level also shows the greatest overall increase in absolute terms, and therefore is a very important target market.

**An increase of 37% is considerably higher than professional fundraisers might typically anticipate. However, it is our belief that CRS alumni have an atypical passion for the CRS mission and can be motivated to incrementally contribute this much, or more.**

**Table 10**

<i>Past-5-Year Donation Level</i>	<i>Percent of Segment</i>	<i>Estimated Increment in Donations Based on Stated Intent (\$1,000s)</i>	<i>Percentage Increment</i>
Less than \$1K	74%	39.4	65%
\$1K to \$9999	23	87.1	44
\$10K to \$50K	3	52.4	23
<b>TOTAL</b>	100%	<b>178.9</b>	<b>37%</b>

Table 11 **combines the estimated past donation level with the estimated possible increment.** This results in increase in total annual donations from \$486,000 to \$665,000 from core alumni group.

**Table 11**

<i>Past-5-Year Donation Level</i>	<i>Percent of Segment</i>	<i>Total Estimated Past Donations Plus Intended Increment</i>	<i>Percent of Donations</i>
Less than \$1K	74%	99.7	15%
\$1K to \$9,999	23	285.7	43
\$10k to \$50k	3	279.5	42
<b>TOTAL</b>	100%	<b>6649</b>	<b>100%</b>

### **Reasons for Having Reservations About Doubling Donations**

When asked whether they were willing to double donations a sizable segment indicated they were uncertain (44%). Given the importance of raising donations, we analyzed the responses to an open-end question, in which alumni were asked to explain their uncertainty. Responses were broken out by Camp attended. The responses, some of which ran on for several paragraphs, were coded and tabulated.

Three categories of responses emerged:

- Personal/financial considerations
- Reservations about Camp plans/program
- Criticisms of LAJF

Among alumni, the most frequently stated reservations about doubling donations related to the respondent's personal financial situation. Many alumni mentioned their limited resources or uncertainty about future income. Students mentioned their financial stress and some retired alumni cited their reduced income or limited pensions. A common theme was willingness to donate more if circumstances improved.

Approximately 18% of alumni tied their uncertainty about increasing donations to concerns about current Camp plans or issues that have not been resolved. Approximately 12% tied their reservations to concerns about how good a job the Board or Foundation is doing

Compared to Clinton alumnae, Red Hook alumni were much more vociferous in their comments and seem more concerned with what is going on (or not going on).

We also noticed that critical or negative comments among alumni under 30 were very sparse.

These findings are shown in more detail in Table 12.

**Table 12**

**RESERVATIONS ABOUT  
DOUBLING ANNUAL DONATIONS TO CRS**

*Q. Are you willing to **double** your own annual donation to CRS?*

	Red Hook Alumni Answering NO/Uncertain Percent	Clinton Alumni Answering NO/Uncertain Percent
<b>Reasons for Answering No or Uncertain:</b>		
<b><u>Financial considerations</u></b>		
Limited resources/budget	24%	20%
Retired/retiring/limited/fixed income	11	---
Can't predict income/future	11	10
Will/would like to donate more in future	9	25
Have other charities	7	1
Still student/limited means	6	26
<b>Miscellaneous</b>	-	7
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>89%</b>
<b><u>Reservations about Plans/Program</u></b>		
Need clear plan/Need good plan/plan that I/alumni like	8%	7%
Must keep same sites/same 7-week program	6	---
Must resolve current tension/issues	4	---
Miscellaneous comments about change	6	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b><u>Criticisms of Board/LAJF/Camp</u></b>		
Lack faith in Board/organization	6%	---
Need transparency/better communication	4	---
Need to do better job financially/reduce costs	6	--
Miscellaneous/negative experience at Camp	7	5
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>(Base: Total answering No or Uncertain)</b>	<b>(140)</b>	<b>(69)</b>

**SECTION II**

**ALUMNI ATTITUDES AND SENTIMENTS RELATIVE TO  
CURRENT LAJF ISSUES AND PLANS**

**ALUMNI ATTITUDES AND SENTIMENTS  
RELATIVE TO CURRENT LAJF ISSUES AND PLANS**

**In Section II attitudes towards a number of current strategic plans and related issues are discussed. These include:**

Attitudes Toward Options to Increase Revenues  
Attitudes Toward Options to Decrease Costs  
Alumni Suggestions for Raising Money  
Attitudes Toward Alternative Co-location Strategies  
Agreement With a Series of Alumni Sentiments  
Suggestions for Increasing Alumni Support

Findings among total sample are shown first, and then results among core alumni segments, where significant differences, or in some cases significant similarities exist are discussed in more detail. These core segments are:

Red Hook Campers  
Clinton Campers  
Recent Board Members (2000-2015)  
Earlier Board Members (Prior to 2000)

## ATTITUDES TOWARDS OPTIONS TO INCREASE REVENUES

Alumni were asked to indicate whether they were favorable, unfavorable, or uncertain in their attitudes toward a number of options to increase CRS revenues. Of the seven options covered, the majority of alumni are favorably disposed toward five.

Alumni are strongly in favor of launching a major capital fundraising campaign, recruiting and training alumni from every Camp year to become involved in fundraising, and running major fund raising events. They also are strongly in favor of doubling alumni donations and finding new alumni donors who will pledge \$100,000 or more.

They are less certain about requesting local alumni associations to double their annual donations. A majority are either uncertain or opposed to charging needs-blind tuition.

These results are shown below.

**Table 13**

<b>Possible Options to Increase Revenues</b>	<b>Favorable</b>	<b>Uncertain</b>	<b>Unfavorable</b>
Launching major capital fundraising campaign among alumni to cover needed site repairs and renovations.	78%	17%	5%
Doubling current <b>annual</b> alumni donations from current level of \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 to help offset current annual depletions.	65	29	6
Finding new alumni donors who will pledge \$100,000 or more to LAJF.	63	29	8
Recruiting and training alumni from every Camp year to become Involved in fundraising.	59	29	12
Running special fundraising events in Dutchess County and elsewhere.	54	33	13
Requesting local alumni associations to double their annual donations.	41	42	16
Charging needs blind tuition to offset increased annual operating costs (giving high priority to diversity)	19	31	50

## **Discussion of Alumni Responses to an Open-End Question: Suggestions for Raising Money**

Alumni were given the opportunity to respond to three open-end questions related to strategic planning. One of these was entitled “Suggestions for Raising Money.” It should be stated at the onset that the responses to these open-ended probes were rich and varied. The author of this study has conducted numerous, open-end, unstructured, in-depth surveys, and has never seen such a rich, detailed and conscientious approach to a series of open-end questions as occurred in this survey.

A number of alumni wrote carefully thought-out essays, and it was common to see one to three paragraph-long answers. We read through these responses and set up code categories to capture some of the major themes that emerged. The open-end question on raising revenues (for CRS) resulted in seven major response categories and 42 subcategories.

The major categories that were suggested, and the share of response for each are as follows:

<b>Code Categories</b>	<b>Share of Response</b>
Tactics Suggested	22%
Enlisting alumni help in fundraising	21
Seeking help outside community	22
Changes in foundation/community environment that might lead to more donations	17
Raising funds through local associations	10
Utilizing Camps off season	8
Greater use of community resources	4

It should be also stated that the absolute percentages stated relative to these codes should not be construed to represent the level of alumni agreement with these ideas. What they do represent is the salience of ideas i.e., what is foremost on the minds of individual alumni.

A significant portion of respondents might strongly agree with any number of these ideas if they were presented to him or her directly. Moreover, an idea suggested by only one alumnus might have very positive impact if it were implemented.

The results of this question on raising revenues, is shown in Table 14 for reader perusal. At a later date, the actual verbatim comments will be compiled and bound in a report for all to view.

**Corrected Table 14**  
**MONEY RAISING SUGGESTIONS**

<u>Suggested Tactics</u>	<b>Percent</b>
Go after affluent alumni	5%
Get alumni to tithe/agree to graduated increases/ automatic monthly deductions/charge alumni dues	4
Run Capital program	3
Let alumni know every little bit helps	3
Charge tuition to attend camp	2
Explore ways to reward donors.	1
Sell naming rights	1
Have staff member whose sole focus is fund raising	1
Have ED whose major focus is fund raising	1
Kick-start programs	1
Improve planned giving program	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>22%</b>
<u><b>Enlist Alumni Help in Fundraising</b></u>	
Recruit fundraisers from each year/each decade/in general	6%
Recruit alumni fundraising talent	3
More fundraising events/combined with fun	3
Do telephone banks/phone trees	2
Set up fund raising competition between years	2
More fundraising events	2
Find ways to contact lost alumni/ get them reengaged	2
Stage a gala awards event annually/celebrity event	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>21%</b>
<u><b>Seek Help Outside Community</b></u>	
Seek foundation donations	7%
Forge relationships with wealthy potential donors outside of alumni community/elsewhere	4
Enlist the support of camper families	3
Seek corporate donations	2
Get involved in grant writing	2
Seek help from in Rhinebeck/Red Hook/Duchess County	2
Hire outside professional fundraisers	1
Enlist the support of family friends	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>22%</b>



**Corrected Table 14(continued)**  
**MONEY RAISING SUGGESTIONS**

<b>Changes in Foundation Environment Which</b>	
<b><u>Might Lead to More Donations</u></b>	
Reduce expenses/overhead	8%
Greater alumni engagement	4
Greater Transparency	3
Governance reform	2
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b><u>Raise Funds Through Local Associations</u></b>	
Charge local associations with fundraising goals	3%
Charge rental or admission fee for local events	
such as concerts/art shows/auctions/garage sales	3
Have fundraising events/fun events	2
Expand international network of fundraisers	2
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b><u>Utilizing Camp Sites to Raise Revenues/ Charge Rental</u></b>	
<b><u>or Admission Fee for Off- Season Site Use</u></b>	
For non-alumni events/retreats/seminars	4%
For wedding receptions	2
For alumni events/retreats/seminars	1
For Vacation camping by alumni	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b><u>Greater Use of Community Resources</u></b>	
Identify alumni skills/resources which can be donated	
to reduce overhead costs/equipment	3%
Sell camp art /artifacts	1
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>Base: total comments</b>	<b>(277)</b>

## ATTITUDES TOWARDS OPTIONS TO DECREASE COSTS

Alumni were asked to indicate whether they were favorable, unfavorable, or uncertain in their attitudes toward a number of options to decrease costs. These options included closing one site, shortening programs to 4 weeks, running Boys' and Girls' programs on alternate years and co-locating Boys' and Girls' programs at a single site.

None of these options are favorably viewed by a majority. Least popular are the ideas of closing down one of the sites and running 4-week programs for Boys and Girls in successive months. The majority is also opposed to running the boy's and girl's program on alternate years, or reducing the number of campers from 120 to 60.

**Alumni are divided on the idea of co-location of a boy's and girl's Camp at a single site. However, more are unfavorable (44%) than favorable (34%).** Results among all alumni are shown in Table 15 below.

**Table 15**

Possible Options to Decrease Costs	Unfavorable	Uncertain	Favorable
Closing down either the girl's or boy's Camp until funds can be generated to reopen.	67%	20%	13%
Closing down one of the current sites and running separate 4-week boy's and girl's programs on one site in successive months.	63	15	21
Closing down one of current sites and running the boy's and girl's programs in alternating years.	56	16	28
Permanently reducing number of campers from 120 to 60.	51	23	26
Co-locating boy's and girl's Camp at a single site, maintaining single-gender programs, run concurrently, to offset operating costs.	44	21	34

**Among Board groups, there is little variance in attitudes toward co-location as a cost reduction option. An exception is that recent board members are significantly more in favor of this option. Prior Board members are significantly more opposed. And it is important to note that opinion of board members is divided on this issue.** This comparison is shown in Table 16 below.

**Table 16**

Possible Options to Decrease Costs	All Alumni	Recent Board Members	Prior Board Members
		2000-2015	Prior to 2000
Co-locating boy's and girl's Camp at a single site maintaining single gender programs, run concurrently, to offset operating costs			
Unfavorable	<b>44%</b>	15%	<b>55%</b>
Uncertain	21	31	13
Favorable	34	<b>54</b>	32

## ATTITUDES TOWARD CO-LOCATION ALTERNATIVES

Alumni were also presented with four alternative co-location strategies. **Only one of these options received more favorable than unfavorable response. That was the option which read:**

***“Co-locate Camps at Red Hook site. Sell Clinton site and use funds from sale toward renovation of Red Hook site.”***

A plurality (43%) is favorably disposed to this option and a lesser percentage is unfavorable (30%). A significant percentage (26%) is uncertain.

The other three co-location options received more unfavorable than favorable response. **Close to a majority are opposed to all three.**

**Table 17**

Co-location Alternatives	Favorable	Uncertain	Unfavorable
Co-locate Camps at Red Hook site. Sell Clinton site and use funds from sale toward renovation of Red Hook site.	43%	26%	30%
Co-locate camps at Clinton site. Sell Red Hook site, and use funds from sale to renovate Clinton site.	23	32	45
Sell both Red Hook and Clinton sites, and use funds to purchase a <b>new out-state site</b> suitable for two single gender programs with some shared facilities, and where operating, maintenance and renovation costs would be significantly lower.	28	22	49
Sell both Red Hook and Clinton sites, and use funds to purchase a <b>new in-state site</b> suitable for two single gender programs with some shared facilities, and where operating, maintenance and renovation costs would be significantly lower.	26	24	50

### Comparison of Red Hook and Clinton Alumni

With respect to possible co-location strategies, there was considerable difference in attitude between Red Hook and Clinton Camp alumni.

- The majority of **Red Hook** Camp alumni are in favor of co-location at Red Hook.
- The majority of **Red Hook** Camp alumni are unfavorable toward co-location at Clinton
- The majority of **Red Hook** Camp alumni are unfavorable toward co-location at any new site.
- Close to a majority of **Clinton** Camp alumni (47%) are opposed to Red Hook co-location.
- **Clinton** Camp alumni are divided down the middle with respect to co-location at Clinton.
- A plurality of **Clinton** alumni are opposed to co-location at any site.

These findings can be interpreted as evidence that Red Hook alumni are much more tied to their former Camp site than Clinton alumni.

The results are shown in Table 18 below.

**Table 18**

	All Alumni	Red Hook Camp Alumni	Clinton Camp Alumni
Co-locate Camps at Red Hook site. Sell Clinton site, and use funds from sale toward renovation of Red Hook site.			
Favorable	43%	54%	27%
Uncertain	26	24	26
Unfavorable	30	21	47
Co-locate camps at Clinton site. Sell Red Hook site, and use funds from sale to renovate Clinton site.			
Favorable	23%	15%	36%
Uncertain	32	33	27
Unfavorable	45	52	37
Sell both Red Hook and Clinton sites, and use funds to purchase a <b>new site outside New York State</b> suitable for two single gender programs			
Favorable	28%	23%	34%
Uncertain	22	21	23
Unfavorable	49	56	44
Sell both Red Hook and Clinton sites, and use funds to purchase a <b>new site in New York State</b> suitable for two single gender programs			
Favorable	26%	20%	33%
Uncertain	24	23	24
Unfavorable	50	56	42

## ALUMNI SENTIMENTS WITH RESPECT TO POSSIBLE CHANGES

Alumni were shown eight statements designed to reflect current sentiments related to possible changes in CRS programs and site locations. Responses to these statements range from majority agreement to majority disagreement. On several statements alumni are sharply divided.

The vast majority agree (78%) that *“LAJF should be able to interpret the mission and make modernizations to the program based on what is best for campers.”* A large majority (76%) also agree that *“LAJF should keep the program true to the original program, as designed by Freddie.”*

A majority (59%) agree with the statement, *“Moving the Camps should only be considered as a last resort for maintaining the viability of the Camp program.”* At the same time, very few (13%) agree with the statement, *“Keep the Camps at the present sites and run the same programs until the endowment runs out.”*

Alumni are divided down the middle with respect to the statement, *“The Camps can be moved anywhere; it’s not the location that matters.”* 45% agree and 43% disagree. They are also divided on the statement, *“I will support whatever the Board deems necessary based on financial feasibility.”* 43% agree with this statement, but 33% disagree, and 26% declare neutrality.

A majority (52%) agrees that LAJF should consider developing an off-season facility at one of the Camp sites for use by alumni families and friends.

Results among all alumni are shown in Table 19.

Table 19

**ALUMNI SENTIMENTS WITH RESPECT  
TO POSSIBLE CHANGES**

<b>Alumni Sentiments With Respect to Possible Changes</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Disagree</b>
LAJF should be able to interpret the mission and make modernizations to the program based on what's best for campers.	78%	14%	9%
<b>LAJF should keep the program true to the original program as designed by Freddie.</b>	76	12	12
Moving the Camps should only be considered as a last resort for maintaining the future viability of the Camp program.	59	15	27
LAJF should consider developing an off-season facility at one of the camp sites for use by alumni families and friends	52	30	17
The camps can be moved anywhere; it's not the location that matters.	45	12	43
I will support whatever the board deems necessary based on financial feasibility	42	26	33
If the Red Hook Camp must be closed, keep the core facilities for use for alumni retreats, recreation and special events.	41	27	31
Keep the Camps at present sites and run the same programs until the endowment runs out.	13	11	77

## **Discussion of Alumni Responses to an Open-End Question: Suggestions for Increasing Alumni Support**

Alumni were given the opportunity to respond to three open-end questions related to strategic planning. One of these was entitled “Suggestions for Increasing Alumni Support.” It should be stated at the onset that the responses to these open-ended probes were rich and varied. The author of this study has conducted numerous, open-end, unstructured, in-depth surveys, and has never seen such a rich, detailed and conscientious response to a series of open-end questions as occurred in this survey.

A number of alumni wrote carefully thought-out essays, and it was common to see one to three paragraph-long answers. We read through these responses and set up code categories to capture some of the major themes that emerged. The open-end question on increasing revenues (for CRS) resulted in six major response categories and 30 subcategories. The major categories that were suggested, and the share of response, were as follows:

<u>Code Categories</u>	<u>Share of Response</u>
Improve Communication	24%
Improve Relationships with Alumni	24
Increase Number of Alumni Events	16
Strengthen/ increase number of local/regional associations	13
Increase Transparency	10
Governance	9

### **Overview of the Support Comments**

In discussing improvement in communication, alumni primarily discussed improving opportunities for networking and contact between campers and various Camp segments. They also had suggestions for increased use of digital media, social media, and suggestions were also made about improving the directory, database and website.

In discussing how relationships with alumni can be improved, a strong theme was letting alumni know that they are needed, that their help is needed, and that their ideas and advice are welcomed. The ideas to find the disengaged and bring them back into the fold, and appointing Camp year agents to reconnect with Campmates were also brought up.

Alumni expressed a strong need for more alumni events and more fundraising/association/social and “fun” events. In this connection, the idea that the Foundation should recognize and encourage the growth of local associations was strongly expressed.

In the area of transparency, a strong theme was that the Foundation should do more open in the sharing of problems and solutions to problems as they occur. In the area of governance, the main idea expressed was the need for increased representation and the election by the alumni of several representatives on the Board.

**Table 20**  
**Suggestions for Increasing Alumni Support**

	All Alumni
<b><u>Improve Communication</u></b>	
Improve networking/Connecting with other alumni/Maintain personal contact	6%
Make more use of digital media/social media/video clips	5
Create more channels of communication between:	
Campers from same years	3
US and International	2
Younger alumni who need advice /and older	2
Alumni living in same geographic areas/occupations	2
Improve directory/database	2
Improve website	2
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>24%</b>
 <b><u>Improve Relationships with Alumni</u></b>	
Let alumni know they are needed /ask for their help /get them engaged	7%
Let alumni know their opinions are valued /ask for their advice and ideas/ Do more surveys like this one	4
Find the disengaged and bring them into the fold	3
Appoint camp year agents to connect with campmates/reminisce/solicit donations/share concerns	3
End squabbles	3
Don't be condescending /be more approachable/less corporate	2
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>24%</b>
 <b><u>Increase Number of Alumni Events</u></b>	
Increase number of Alumni events in general	7%
More fundraising events/combined with fun	3
More local association events	2
More fun purely social events	2
Have offseason events at campsites	2
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>16%</b>
 <b><u>Strengthen/ increase number of local/regional associations</u></b>	
Foundation should recognize associations more, increase visibility/encourage growth	8%
Regional associations should reach out to alumni in their areas/be more than a camper selection source	4
Don't lose young alumni/older alumni/sign them up/ get them engaged	2
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>13%</b>
 <b><u>Increase Transparency</u></b>	
<b>Be more open / share problems/solutions/plans/as they occur.</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>Don't give the impression of closed door decisions</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Build trust by sharing detailed financial information/plans</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>10%</b>



(Table 20 – Continued)

<b>Governance</b>	
Increase representation on Board	3%
Have representatives elected by alumni join Board	3
Governance culture needs reform	1
Have Board elected by alumni	1
Have local associations nominate potential Board members	1
Subtotal	9%
Base :Total Comments	258

**COMPARISON OF CORE SEGMENTS  
WITH RESPECT TO SENTIMENTS COVERED BY THE SURVEY**

Of the eight statements reflecting alumni sentiments, alumni are virtually unanimous in agreeing with two:

*“LAJF should keep the program true to the original program as designed by Freddie.”*

*“LAJF should be able to interpret the mission and make modernizations to the program based on what’s best for campers.”*

On the remaining six statements, alumni are more divided. These differences are discussed with respect to Red Hook and Clinton alumni, and recent and prior Board members.

Red Hook and Clinton alumni are virtually in agreement on five out of six statements. The exception was the statement, *“The Camps can be moved anywhere. It’s not the location that matters.”* As shown below.

	<b>Red Hook Alumni</b>	<b>Clinton Alumni</b>
The Camps can be moved anywhere. It’s not the location that matters.		
Agree	38%	<b>51%</b>
Neutral	12	12
Disagree	<b>50</b>	37

The majority of the Red Hook alumni disagreed with this statement. The majority of the Clinton Camp alumni agreed. It would appear that the Red Hook alumni are more tied to their original Camp site than the Clinton alumni.

A comparison of Red Hook and Clinton alumni with respect to these six statements is shown in Table 20, which follows.

**Table 21**

**AGREEMENT WITH ALUMNI SENTIMENTS**

<b>Agreement With Alumni Sentiments</b>	<b>Red Hook Alumni</b>	<b>Clinton Alumni</b>
Moving the Camps should only be considered as a last resort for maintaining the future viability of the Camp program.		
Agree	63%	58%
Neutral	15	17
Disagree	23	25
The Foundation should consider an off-season facility at one site for use by alumni families and friends.		
Agree	52%	52%
Neutral	31	29
Disagree	17	20
If the Red Hook Camp must be closed , keep the core facilities for use for alumni retreats, recreation and special events.		
Agree	43%	43%
Neutral	27	29
Disagree	31	29
I will support whatever the Board deems necessary based on financial feasibility.		
Agree	41%	42%
Neutral	25	28
Disagree	34	30
The Camps can be moved anywhere. It's not the location that matters.		
Agree	<b>38%</b>	<b>51%</b>
Neutral	12	12
Disagree	50	37
Keep the Camps at present sites and run the same program until the endowment runs out.		
Agree	15%	11%
Neutral	12	9
Disagree	74	80

**COMPARISON OF RECENT AND PRIOR BOARD MEMBERS  
WITH RESPECT TO SENTIMENTS COVERED BY THE SURVEY**

**In contrast to Red Hook and Clinton alumni, recent and prior Board members are much more divided with respect to alumni sentiments. There are marked differences in agreement between these two subgroups.**

**Recent** Board members are significantly more prone to agree with the following statements:

*“The Camps can be moved anywhere.  
It’s not the location that matters.  
”*

*“I will support whatever the Board deems  
necessary based on financial feasibility.”*

**Prior** Board members are significantly more likely to agree with:

*“Moving the Camps should only be considered as a last resort  
for maintaining the future viability of the Camp program.”*

*“The Foundation should consider an off-season facility at  
one site for use by alumni families and friends.”*

*“Keep the Camps at present sites and run the  
same programs until the endowment runs out.”*

The single greatest difference in agreement between the two subgroups is on the statement:

*“Keep the Camps at present sites and run the  
same programs until the endowment runs out.”*

None of the recent Board members agree with this statement. A large segment of the prior board members (42%) agree with this statement. These contrasts can be seen in table 22 which follows.

**Table 22**

	<b>Recent Board Members</b>	<b>Prior Board Members</b>
	<b>2000-2015</b>	<b>Before 2000</b>
The Camps can be moved anywhere; it's not the location that matters.		
Agree	<b>85%</b>	<b>40%</b>
Neutral	0	13
Disagree	15	47
I will support whatever the Board deems necessary based on financial feasibility.		
Agree	<b>69%</b>	<b>29%</b>
Neutral	15	22
Disagree	15	48
Moving the Camps should only be considered as a last resort for maintaining the future viability of the Camp program.		
Agree	46%	59%
Neutral	8	18
Disagree	46	23
If the Red Hook Camp must be closed, consider keeping the core facilities for use for alumni retreats, recreation and special Events.		
Agree	<b>31%</b>	<b>44%</b>
Neutral	31	26
Disagree	38	30
The Foundation should consider an off-season facility at one of the Camp sites for use by alumni families and friends.		
Agree	<b>25%</b>	<b>40%</b>
Neutral	33	38
Disagree	42	23
Keep the Camps at present sites and run the same program until the endowment runs out.		
Agree	<b>0%</b>	<b>42%</b>
Neutral	8	13
Disagree	92	45