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ABSTRACT

Organized recreation programs for school children during the summer months have developed rapidly in the past decade. Resident camping and playground programs have constituted the essential areas of study. Inadequate attention has been given to the development of summer day camping as a specialized recreational service in the field of camping. With this situation in mind, this thesis has been prepared to study the acceptable standards of practice in day camping and to evaluate the current Vancouver situation in the light of these standards.

Information embodied in this thesis, in addition to those sources cited in the Bibliography, was obtained from the answers to two questionnaires which provided the material to evaluate facilities, program, and leadership in the in-city programs of five Red Feather recreation agencies. Additional data was obtained from interviews with summer program directors. The written material of the Day Camp Committee, Group Work Division, Community Chest and Council was also used.

In view of the present confusion as to the essential differences between the various forms of summer program, and the limited appreciation of the function of day camping, it was felt that a study of the current Vancouver situation would be of reference value.
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Components of The True Day Camp

Since the turn of the century, considerable attention has been given to developing summer camping for children of all ages. Resident camping has gradually developed from a haphazard though earnest effort to provide a healthy outdoor experience where children could be kept occupied, to a specialized field providing leisure time opportunities for individuals and groups to derive maximum educational and recreational benefits.

This gradual development has shown the contribution camping can make in organized leisure time services, but it has also shown that greater attention must be given to its values if the full potentialities of camping are to be realized.

Gradually the many public, semi-public and private agencies and organizations involved in sponsoring summer camping are developing common aims and objectives. They are defining methods whereby the camping program can be of maximum service in helping children achieve social and emotional as well as physical growth.

Organized camping is a comparatively new field. In its development there has been a strong tendency to
confine an appreciation of its intrinsic values to the physical location of a resident camp. The gradual emphasis on high standards of facilities, program and leadership has been based on the assumption that these standards apply only to this area of camping.

It is felt that this sharp focus on the resident camp ignores the fact that camping is a specialized area of recreation which can be offered in a variety of settings, of which resident camping is but one. It is therefore suggested that organized camping be viewed as the framework in which standards of practice are developed; these standards would vary according to the particular services of various forms of camping, such as resident camping or day camping.

This present study is based on the assumption that day camping is a specialized area within the field of camping. It has received insufficient attention in terms of the values it affords and the standards that must be maintained in the development of adequate services.

Day camping incorporates many of the objectives of other forms of camping, but is unique in the physical setting used.

"Day Camping is defined as an organized outdoor experience in group living, conducted on
a daytime basis. It is generally carried on in a close-to-home situation, so that the camper may sleep and eat his morning and evening meals at home, and yet, during the day, participate in a program related to living in and enjoying the out of doors." ¹

Within this physical structure there is a general objective which guides its development.

"Day camping should be a means through which children come to know living at first hand, through which they may develop individual freedom and initiative while they learn to live in groups. At the day camp the child should learn to feel at one with the world of nature, to assume responsibility, to use leisure time rewardingly. Day camping should aim at creative play and creative education." ²

The roots of day camping are found in the need to provide organized recreation in heavily industrialized city areas. In its origin there were similar components to the beginnings of resident camping where the main goal


was to remove the children from the smoke and heat of the city and bring them to a healthier environment close to nature.

In resident camping these goals tended, for many years, to slow down the recognition of the considerable values of camping beyond this basic achievement of providing fresh air. This attitude has also affected day camping, for it was regarded as a compromise between smoke and fresh air; at least one could provide a healthy environment in the day time.

This attitude can be found amongst many writers on summer day camping. R. E. Carlsen, for example, says that: "day camping is a compromise to communities who recognize the need for camping yet cannot afford to support regular camp total expenditure."

This approach to Summer Day Camping is in itself one of the major factors which is preventing the development of good day camp practice. It is, in the main, a negative approach, and an approach which immediately produces limitations in the work done and the financial support of interested groups. It is reduced to a form of camping that is seen as a compromise, and not a project which has a unique contribution to make in recreation services.

3. Ibid, p. 13
In some countries, particularly the United States, day camping has developed enough to be studied by itself. It should be offered because of the kind of experience it affords and in conjunction with the needs of a particular community. This attitude however, demands a high degree of understanding of the components of day camping, its standards and values and its contribution to the recreational services of a community.

The American Camping Association, an organization comprised of representatives of public, private and semi-public agencies involved in organized camping, has, for many years, assumed the responsibility of setting standards of requirements and performance in organized camping. Its leadership in this area has been recognized in North America as the most valid and progressive work in the camping field.

Because of the rapid expansion of various programs under the name of day camping, administered by many kinds of agencies both public and private, it was felt that the term was being too loosely applied. At the request of the American Camping Association, the Chicago section of the Association appointed a committee in 1945 to formulate standards. A preliminary report was presented in 1945 and revised in 1948.

These standards have been set up under four headings; program, facilities, health and leadership,
and these are utilized in the following discussion. Leadership, however, will be examined in separate chapter, for the criteria concerning this major area demands particular consideration.

These standards would thus be related to every aspect of day camping. In turn, day camping, its advantages and limitations will be viewed in relation to total recreation services offered by recreation agencies. With this background of the function of day camping attention will be given to the development and present level of services in day camping in the Red Feather Recreation Agencies in the City of Vancouver.

Program

"The only sensible criterion for an outdoor program would be: we will do those activities which can best be accomplished in the out of doors rather than those activities which can be carried on as well, or better, in the home or school. With this goal and with the necessity to use native materials for building their camp homes and cooking their own meals, the campers will find that nature study has become integrated with all their activities."

The emphasis and the basis of day camp program is that it is primarily concerned with outdoor living.

The planning and philosophy entailed in offering programs in summer day camp combine two main features. The outdoor setting provides the environment, and nature provides program resources.

Elaboration on the last statement shows that summer day camp program entails an understanding of indigenous camping; that is, use of natural available resources. It involves a conscious attempt to avoid those programs which can be offered in an indoor setting or which involve prefabricated equipment. Imagination, resourcefulness and flexibility are demanded. A quick glance at various areas of day camp program bear out this statement. Among possible programs would be: camp-craft, arts and crafts, overnight trips, nature study, music, archery games, dramatics, waterfront activities, and special events. The majority of these activities can be offered in any setting. In themselves they are not necessarily outdoor activities. Arts and crafts, for example, cover a wide area. Their chief value in this setting, however, is when natural resources such as pine cones, shells, flowers, and leaves are used to develop creative skills and interests. Competitive games necessitating considerable equipment, again, are not the focus in summer day camp; instead organized games should be created and adapted to the outdoor setting, and to the resources available.
The principles of program content must be based on real camp life. They must be sufficiently flexible to meet day to day interests and needs. They should provide a continuing experience, making possible creative activity which will stimulate new interests and skills. This unforced continuity allows one natural experience to lead to another.

This need for flexibility has numerous implications in the area of planning program. Creative use of natural resources and provision of opportunity for continuing experiences demands organization of program and grouping of campers in such a way that individual interests and natural resources may be used to best advantage. Grouping in small units affords the opportunity for all activities to be directed toward the central theme of outdoor living.

Program planning should therefore evolve on three levels: - first, all camp activities planned on the basis of group representation, which would focus on special events to create unity in the total camp group. The second level is the interest group, where emphasis is on teaching and developing appreciation of specific activities, permitting sufficient variety to meet individual campers interest. The third and most important level is the small group unit. The total camp group would be broken down into small units, on the basis of
friendship association, interest and age. Under continuing leadership, considerable leeway should be provided to allow small unit activities and individualized interests.

Mabel Lyman Jobe suggests the following criteria for evaluating the organizational form of the summer day camp program:—

1. Is the program the result of democratic planning in small groups?
2. Does the program permit and encourage individual differences and use of special talents?
3. Do the activities used make the children aware of the natural resources and broaden their creative and imaginative skill?
4. Does the activity offer opportunity for learning something which would not be learned otherwise?
5. Are activities selected which have a carryover into permanent hobbies in the home or school?
6. Are external rewards or coercion necessary or are children motivated by interest in the activity?
7. Are children prompt and eager to come to camp?

Facilities

One of the difficulties in setting up summer day camp is finding adequate space to provide the kind of experience desired. Few communities will be in a position to acquire a site which meets every required standard and desirable natural feature. Consequently some distinction should be made between the necessary standards to be considered in choosing a day camp site and the desirable features which increase the value of the site. Although such a distinction is made, it is important to recognize that creativity and flexibility improve the site which has some limitations.

The essential criteria for the selection and location of the camp site are as follows:

1. Adequate space for a balanced and suitable program. This entails the need for open areas for games, freedom from hazards and sufficient shady and sunny areas.

2. "Primitive" camp area. Adequate natural setting is essential in offering a camp-craft program. It should be a location where wood is available, where fires may be built, and where outdoor cooking and experimentation with camp crafts, using

natural materials, may be carried on.

(3) Convenient public transportation. Fifty to sixty minutes should be the maximum time involved in reaching the camp site. The number of participants who can hold their interest, and can be adequately handled is substantially reduced if a longer period of time is needed to reach the destination. Attention should be given to the cost of transportation, the possibility of acquiring chartered buses and to the minimization of the walking necessary in reaching the camp site.

(4) A plentiful supply of safe drinking water. Where safe drinking water is not available at the camp site, it may be hauled in daily. This, however, imposes certain limitations which can only be minimized if good transportation facilities are provided.

(5) Adequate toilet facilities. In isolated areas pit latrines will suffice. One unit is sufficient for twenty people. Handwashing

facilities must also be provided.

(6) Seclusion. Isolation has a direct bearing on the freedom of the camp program, the development of camp spirit, and the provision of adequate supervision. In securing isolation, however, it is important for the site to be easily accessible by car, foot, or telephone.

(7) Health. This entails adequate provision for good drainage, adequate refuse disposal, and a site which can be kept clean.

Any considerable deviation from these standards in locating a site will impose severe limitations in the day camp. The essential point, however, is for those groups involved in setting up day camps to recognize and accept these standards as essential. Realistically it is frequently necessary to deviate, to some extent, for a period of time. Every effort should be made to improve the situation and develop the level of standards at the earliest moment possible.

There are several desirable natural features and camp facilities which have a very valuable contribution to make in the success of day camping.

(1) Adequate and safe swimming location. This would entail an area free from hazard, gradually slanted towards deeper water, in a location where adequate safeguards are possible.

(2) Natural beauty. Woodland, streams, hills, lakes, natural resources of interest are desirable characteristics in improving camp spirit, developing a love of nature and providing program resources.

(3) Shelter. Some central coverage is an important factor as storage space, shelter from rainy weather and in assisting children to adjust to an outdoor experience. The type of shelter will vary considerably according to the number of campers involved, the degree of use of the camp site, and the frequency of overnight trips. The Adirondack type of shelter is frequently sufficient to meet the needs. This type of shelter may be erected with ease by the campers themselves and consequently may be built by each unit group.

(4) Fire place, Council Ring, Tables and Benches. Such camp facilities are closely related to the needs of the groups involved and the program evolved. They offer an important con-
tribution, where trees and frames are available. They assist in creating unity within the camp, and are valuable tools in program planning. There is frequently a tendency amongst camp leaders to react negatively to setting up accommodation which provide any degree of comfort in camp setting. This attitude ignores the positive values of making camping as comfortable as possible, and a realistic recognition of strong individual variations in ability to cope with living in the outdoors. This kind of camp facility can be built by the campers under adequate leadership; it creates a feeling of pride and accomplishment and a sense of ownership, and provides a healthful degree of comfort within the camp site.

Equipment is another important area within camp facilities. Adequate attention should be given to this. In the field of resident camping, the study of essential equipment has progressed to a high degree of understanding of the advantages of adequate equipment in exposing campers to a variety of outdoor programs and making adequate provision for individual differences.

There is a tendency to regard day camping
as a more primitive experience in the outdoors, and therefore to consider that less equipment is necessary. There is danger here in imposing upon the campers an adult woodsman's attitude toward the level of interest and ability expected of the individual. It also tends to impose an adult level of creativity, and ingenuity in camp life. In the main the child's creativity will concern those areas which are recreational in quality rather than those concerned with eating, building shelters, and providing adequate sanitation.

A combination of recommendations of Mabel Lyman Jobe in her book, *The Handbook of Day Camping*, and the list of materials suggested by the American Camping Association is presented as the desirable equipment for day camp program.

1) First Aid Equipment.

2) Sanitation and Maintenance:—

   (a) disinfectant
   (b) water basins
   (c) soap
   (d) toilet paper
   (e) matches
   (f) fire-fighting equipment

3) Campcraft:—

   (a) heavy cord and carpenter's twine
   (b) axes
   (c) hammer and assorted nails
   (d) scout knife
   (e) pliable bailing wire
   (f) knapsacks
(4) Cooking (for headquarters):-
(a) large pot with lid
(b) large frying pan
(c) coffee pots
(d) two flat wash buckets or dishpans.

(5) Cooking (for each unit):-
(a) pot with lid to fit
(b) large spoon
(c) large knife
(d) several paring knives
(e) small skillet
(f) can opener
(g) mixing bowl
(h) baking tin
(i) matches

(6) Handcraft: -
(a) paper
(b) scissors
(c) crayons
(d) water paint
(e) brushes
(f) paste
(g) coping saws and blades
(h) embroidery thread and raffia
(i) thread
(j) needles
(k) burlap

(7) Nature: -
(a) nature encyclopedia and guide books
(b) magnifying glass
(c) plaster of paris
(d) cheesecloth
(e) carbon tetrachloride for killing 12, 13 insects

In studying the above list, differentiation should be made between equipment which is elaborate

12. Mabel Lyman Jobe, op. cit., p. 46
13. Reynold E. Carlsen, op. cit., p. 15
and minimizes individual initiative, and that which is essential. The former should be regarded as the tools which assist in greater development of program, but should not be used unless the program evolved demands the equipment. Exposure purely through the use of equipment therefore would inevitably defeat the purpose of program in day camp.

Health and Sanitation

The environment of resident camping, the complete removal of the child from the home and the need to be prepared for any emergency have resulted in the gradual development of high standards of health and sanitation in this setting. Increasingly it has become a legal necessity to meet standards of cleanliness and medical supervision in the resident camp.

In some parts of the United States, these same standards are essential in day camping. This, however, has tended to be a matter of governmental insistence on adequate health standards rather than a unified acceptance by day camp agencies of the necessity of maintaining these standards.

Necessary standards of health and sanitation in day camps are:

(1) Facilities and areas must be kept in good
condition. The site should be inspected before the opening of camp for the elimination of any existing hazards such as poison ivy, unguarded cliffs, deep water, traffic danger, etc., and should be inspected regularly thereafter.

(2) Need of good food and equipment
(3) Need of first aid expert in day camp
(4) Need of convenient telephone and method of transportation for emergencies.
(5) Need of staff personnel to focus on health habits and fill out daily health forms for each camper.
(6) Supervision of sanitation facilities.
(7) Adjustment of program and personalized activities, balancing quiet to meet individual and group needs for rest and relaxation.
(8) If perishable food and milk are kept in camp, provision must be made for keeping them cool. Milk must be kept at a temperature not in excess of 50°.
(9) Unless a city water system is used, written approval of water used must be obtained from local department of health. Ample water must be available for all purposes. Tests should be made within two weeks before camp opens,
and periodically thereafter.

Facilities for water disposal, such as latrines, drains and showers, must be adequate and so located that the drainage will not contaminate the water supply.

(11) Latrines must have pits that are fly tight, and must be kept clean at all times. Hand-washing facilities must be provided at the latrines. There must be one unit to every twenty persons.

(12) Campers should require medical examination before attending camp. Few camps to date have insisted on this. Gradually, however, day camps are taking the precaution of providing forms for a medical report as a part of the camp records.

Every effort should be made to see that high standards of health and sanitation are an integral part of day camping. There is nothing more useless than focusing on methods of assisting individuals to achieve social and emotional adjustment in a recreational setting if one simultaneously ignores the importance of health and physical needs.

This discussion of standards in the areas of
program, health and facilities, represents the basic qualifications that must be met in offering day camping. They form the nucleus in planning a day camp project and indicate the areas that are unique in this form of camping.

These standards provide the guide by which day camping can be studied as a specialized area within a recreation agency and the advantages and limitations it affords. With an understanding and appreciation of high standards in day camping as a project of a recreation agency, consideration would then turn to the leadership involved. A day camp program needs a firm base and an understanding of its particular values; but the leadership of the camp will determine the degree of success in the operation of the camp.
CHAPTER 11

Social and Administrative Implications of Day Camping

Day camping can be organized and offered by groups, committees and associations not involved in other recreation services. It may be set up under the auspices of several agencies in the community. It may be operated by the recreation department of park commissioners, by school or youth organizations or by a group of interested citizens.

However the primary concern is with those agencies and groups which, in developing recreational services, have included summer day camp as a specialized area. In focusing the study of day camping in this way, particular consideration can be given to its relatedness to a year round program, rather than as a specialized unit detached from other community services.

It is felt that in this way the particular values of day camping can be recognized and that better use can be made of the opportunities afforded to relate day camping to total agency objectives. This is particularly important in the carry over value from summer to winter program in offering a total recreation experience.
The basis on which the emphasis is on agencies offering day camping as a part of a total program is the advantage integral in day camping in developing community relationships and in strengthening the total agency program. Continuity is a basic and essential requirement in recreation work. Short term programs, unrelated to other services, will be of more limited value than a program geared to offering a specialized experience as a part of a recreation service.

An ever-present problem in recreation is the difficulty in relating the many specialized services that are developed to the general services laid down in the agency policy. There is a tendency for a selected group to enjoy the specialized services without feeling any relatedness to the total agency or other services offered. This minimizes the unity in an agency membership and narrows considerably the experiences that can be gained in an agency program.

Applying this problem to the field of organized camping, one immediately sees one of the greatest difficulties in the area of resident camping. Hedley S. Dimock has pointed out that "we have long recognized that one of the greatest limitations of the summer camp as an educational agency lies in its separation from the continuing life of the camper in the community. Unless this gap can be bridged, much of the potential effectiveness of the camp will not be achieved; the camp experience will remain but
an isolated and fleeting episode rather than a permanent contribution to the education of the individual."

This difficulty in resident camping takes the form of lack of contact with the community and an element of lack of reality in the experience. Care must be taken to see that the individual's experience does not become an isolated dream of summer respite which has no carryover in the child's year around environment. Channels must be sought through which the child's home and community life can be related to his camping experience.

There is need to consider this problem in resident camping in relation to the situation in day camping. A clear recognition of the factors affecting these two fields of camping ensures a realistic approach in setting up program and a realization of the positive framework within which the service may be offered. It should be pointed out that no attempt is being made to suggest that one area of organized camping is more valuable than another. The emphasis is rather on the values of day camping which resident camping does not share, and therefore the contribution of day camping as a field in camping in relation to individual, group and agency needs.

(1) In day camping, the child divides his time between day camp and his family. This is possibly the

essential part to be considered in working in a day camp situation. The growth and development of the child in this situation is dependent on adequately relating home factors to the day camp and vice versa. It means working with the family as well as the child. It affords the opportunity to develop, in the child, interests that may be continued in the home environment.

Psychologically, it must be recognized that the attitude of the child is markedly different from those he experiences in a resident camp where he is completely removed from the home situation. In the resident camp the setting is new to the child, the activities are new, and he is called upon to be a part of the group throughout his stay at camp. In order to feel secure in this new environment the child tends to intensify his relationships with adults and his peers so that there will be an adequate substitute for the familiar environment he has left behind. Parents visiting days and a full program of activities are needed to minimize feelings of loneliness. Frequently the child experiences a strong desire to receive mail, or may suffer from homesickness.
In the day camp situation the child's attitude and needs are more similar to those in general recreational situations.

The division of time between the camp and the home environment in day camping means that more children can participate. As has been mentioned above, the summer day camp does not require the same degree of adjustment as does the resident camp. This means that a physically handicapped or emotionally maladjusted child is more capable of adjusting to this situation. Insecure children who are not ready to leave home may nevertheless profit from a camp program. Similar problems are found in the need of readiness for a group experience, but the security of familiar environment and the sustaining contact with the home enables the child to integrate his day camping experiences with his daily life. Longer camping periods may be offered to all children. The limited financial expenditure involved permits greater participation and longer camping periods. It diminished the need to limit camp periods to ten days where the child having gained his first glimmer of what camping means, is bustled back to the city again. This question of time is an important part of the process
involved in the child's adjustment to camp activities and in the building of relationship with campers and leaders.

Day camping is usually a co-educational experience. Although the sexes may be separated in specific activities to meet their varying interests at particular age levels, there is nevertheless sufficient opportunity for boys and girls to play or work together in some activities. This is another area where, in resident camping, there tends to be an unnatural element since resident camps are usually open to one sex only.

The day camp lends itself to close co-operation with the community. Arrangements for camp sites, transportation, parent planning groups, are all integral parts of summer day camping and in turn demand close community cooperation. Community resources must be used to their fullest if an adequate program is to be offered.

The limited equipment and permanent building is a stimulating situation, with good leadership, to the development of creative abilities in the campers. One of the problems found in recreation today is the limited creativeness shown by participants. Children have become
more dependent on fabricated toys, expensive athletic equipment and adult leadership skills to entertain them, rather than adapting creatively the resources at hand to meet their needs and interests. Day camping can meet this challenge if its activities are in an outdoor setting.

Summer day camp provides the opportunity for greater continuity of leadership and individual participants. This is an extremely important factor which frequently receives insufficient consideration. Generally fifty percent of the leadership involved in the camp is employed in the year-around program. A portion of the campers will be participants of the total agency program. This sustained continuity enables the staff to focus to a greater extent on individual needs and variations and provides greater insight into the level of development of the group as a whole.

These advantages of summer day camp also impose certain limitations. There is a definite tendency towards less regular participation. Since daily participation is voluntary, other community interests may result in irregular attendance which makes it more difficult to stimulate
growth and carry a consistent program. However, with enthusiastic and positive leadership this can be an advantage since it necessitates providing stimulating and varied activities which will hold the interest of the individual and groups involved.

The division of the camper's time between home and camp has been discussed as a factor with many positive values. It must also be recognized that this lack of continuity on a short term basis of twenty four hours has some tendency to dilute the camp effect in the area of creating camp unity. The process of building and strengthening group relations will be a more gradual process and may receive greater setbacks.

The limited time each day also limits the variety of camp skills that can be taught. This should be recognized and development of program should be in accordance with available time, degree of continuity in attendance, and the level of development of camp unity as well as considerations discussed in the previous chapter.

Having established the standards and criteria involved in the various areas integral in day camping, and having briefly reviewed the advantages and limitations of day camping, careful consideration should be given to the dynamic components involved in relating this program to total agency services.
Realistically this philosophy of relating specialized services of the agency to the total agency will cut across every portion of the day camp services. It is particularly important in relation to:

- administration
- finance
- publicity
- the use of records
- development of community relations

Administration

The administrative organization of summer day camping must meet the needs of this specialized area whilst at the same time remaining within the framework of the organizational policy of the agency involved. Administrative channels created to insure successful organization of day camping will not be truly effective if they exist in a vacuum from the remainder of the agency administration.

There is need for the board of directors to understand the various aspects of the summer day camp and to assume the responsibility for sanctioning its development. Beyond this there is need for a special committee to be more directly involved with the planning, financing and program development. This might take the form of a parent advisory committee where the function would include program planning, advice to camp director, developing camp publicity, providing volunteer staff and parent
education. It might take the form of a day camp committee of the operating agency, usually appointed by the operating agency including representatives of various youth serving agencies. Its function may include public interpretation, recruiting, finance etc..

The specific form and function of a committee would be determined by the policy and the needs of a particular agency. Basically it is necessary for the adequate development of the day camp that a special committee concerned with the various aspects of camping can be delegated the authority to function in this area and be responsible to the board for its decisions.

There is a dual need for such a group—adequate development of community participation in day camping projects and the need to provide democratic channels of participation in planning so that the camp will meet community needs.

Mabel Lyman Jobe has outlined the following points as suggestions for the work of the planning committee.

(1) Studying community needs
(2) Planning camp objectives
(3) Maintaining public relations
(4) Recruiting participants for the camp
(5) Making financial plans
(6) Giving leadership in such special events as hikes etc.
(7) Publicising camp program
(8) Seeking community financial support

Miss Jobe, in suggesting the areas of concern of such an advisory group, indicates that its participants should include parents, citizens, director, counsellor, one or two campers, and representatives of recreation and education boards in the community.

The camp director works directly with this advisory committee. He represents the direct link between the camp group and the committee. In the same manner in which the advisory group is responsible to the board of directors, so would the camp director be responsible to an agency executive in a higher position of authority. Since there would be considerable variation within agencies, it can only be stated that the employed director should be responsible to a permanent agency staff person to ensure that the camp development remains within the bounds of agency function, finance etc..

Within the administrative organization, provision must be made to maintain a direct line from the director, assistant director, specialists, counsellor, volunteer and camper. These channels permit the development of planning in a circular movement at any point between the director and the camper and vise versa. Further breakdown of responsibilities within the administrative organization will be discussed in Chapter Three.
Finance

Within the sphere of financing, the costs of operating a day camp fall roughly into four groups; equipment, salaries, daily milk supply and transportation.

These considerations should be given adequate attention and should be carefully related to the standards presented in the preceding chapter. There is a distinct danger in feeling that day camping is a good thing for an agency to develop because it costs so little. With this as a primary philosophy, the results are approximately parallel.

Whilst it is true the costs of day camping are considerably less than in resident camping, it is by no means an inexpensive program. A camp in which high standards are maintained expense is essential, particularly in terms of securing adequate leadership.

At the same time, realistically, the majority of agencies will be affected by the factor of financial expenditure in planning summer programs, and the program offered will be determined in large measure by the funds available for its development.

The financial question must also be developed in relation to the total agency budget, so that the allot-

ment to camp operations does not drain disproportionately from funds specified for other agency services. This is an ever present danger in developing specialized services. One frequently finds that following allotment to specialized services, services where frequently the publicity involved attracts greater attention than the regular services, the financial picture resulting demands decreasing regular services which have proved necessary in meeting community needs. Thus such a program should not be undertaken at the expense of other agency services unless community needs warrants such a plan.

A day camp should not be undertaken if the necessary funds to maintain adequate camp standards are not available. Acceptance of the philosophy of day camping, the standards developed, and a recognition of the contribution this program can make in a social agency will contribute to determining whether the community needs warrants the financial expenditure in a particular agency. Alternate program should be selected if the costs demanded in a good summer day camp cannot be met.

Salaries for camp personnel constitutes the greatest expenditure in day camping. Although this applies in most areas of recreational services, it is increased to some degree in this situation by the need of close supervision and highly skilled leadership. As in other areas of recreation, volunteers or personnel hired on an honor-
arium basis have a definite and important contribution to make. However they can not substitute for an adequate number of skilled personnel. Adequate salaries must be paid if adequate personnel is to be secured. This realization is gradually being accepted in resident camping and greater attention is being given to budgeting for camp salaries. The earlier philosophy that camping provided a vacation for prospective counselors is being replaced by the recognition that good employment practices affects the calibre of work produced. Day camping must profit from this experience and budget for the expenditure.

The discussion in chapter one indicates that expenditure is involved in providing adequate equipment and facilities. Without this budget allotment to equipment, undue pressure is put upon leadership to develop program and health standards without assistance. Within this area of equipment, consideration should be given to financing the building of permanent facilities discussed earlier.

Consideration should also be given to insurance coverage in day camping. It is advisable to carry such protection covering all major hazards, and such areas as fire, public liability insurance, and automobile liability.

There is inevitably extreme variation between agencies setting camp fees. Care should be taken to insure that the fees are in accordance with the ability of the community to pay them, and yet sufficiently high to insure
a sense of belonging and responsibility towards the camp program.

Considerable variations occur in methods of collecting fees. In some instances a minimum fee is set and daily the camper brings his money for milk and transportation. In other instances one fee is set to cover registration, milk and transportation. The first method frequently presents less problems to a family incapable of paying the fees in one sum. However it presents insurmountable problems when the child forgets, loses or spends this money. The second method is probably a better one, but adjustments should be made for those families incapable of paying the total sum at one time.

Publicity

Publicity is an important consideration in summer day camp planning, for it serves many purposes. It provides the opportunity to acquaint the public with the purpose and program of the camp. It develops community understanding and support of the program and it is an effective method of reaching those families where there is a need for such a program but a lack of knowledge of resources.

Publicity, in the main will be an individual consideration, in each agency. In some instances the primary focus will be on increasing the number of participants. Its main emphasis may be on interpretation. Yet again it
may be mainly for the purpose of acquainting the community with the agency activities. It may combine these three factors.

Responsibility for publicity should be specifically assigned to a staff person but maximum effort should be made to involve a committee, such as the parents group, in this area of planning.

A good publicity program should be planned and presented before the opening of camp. As in other areas, publicity in day camping may include newspapers, radios, posters, photographs, movies or speaking programs.

Use of Records

In every area of group work, and camping is no exception, the use of records to gain understanding of the development of individuals and of groups is an important process. Without some form of recording, the significant factors in the activities of the individual and the group as a whole tends to be minimized or lacking in objectivity.

The central aim of camping is the desirable social, emotional and physical growth of individual. Growth, however, demands understanding, objective guidance and direction. One of the chief tools by which the leadership can provide this direction is the full use of recording techniques to gain appreciation of the needs of the
In planning the camp schedule, adequate time should be allowed for the leadership to complete individual and group records, and receive adequate supervisory assistance in making use of the material brought out in this way. Camping is one of the few areas in recreation where the individual is in a group setting for such a long period of time. This creates specific factors which increase the importance of recording as a technique to assist the individual to benefit from the camp experience.

(1) Number of campers who are experiencing for the first time the daily need to share cooperatively in a full day's schedule.

(2) Contact throughout the day with an adult person but the need to share that person with other members of the group. In such a program the leader inevitably functions in situations, such as assisting in preparing meals, which are associated with the function of the mother person in the home. There is continued necessity for the leader to be objective in understanding the role he plays with each individual and the individual's needs that can be met in a group situation.

(3) It is frequently difficult to divide the total
camp registration into natural groupings based on friendship associations previously formed by the members themselves. Registration in day camp is affected by the summer plans made by the parents, consequently the individual will frequently find himself associating with different children in the summer than those with whom he associated in the winter. It is frequently necessary to assist individuals to find their place in the group and to encourage group awareness of their group identity.

Regardless of careful registration, it is frequently the parent who decides that the child is attending camp, and not the child himself. This may be because the parents are taking a holiday trip or are not in a position to take care of the child during the day when school is closed. To some degree this situation varies from the recreational program where the child comes voluntarily of his own choice. In this situation there is a tendency towards having a number of children who have never had any group experience, feel they are on the fringe of the group and feel they have been rejected by their parents because they have been sent to camp.
Camp sites in a quiet out of doors setting frequently brings many new experiences for a child whose contact with nature has been limited. To many this is, initially, a frightening experience. Camp activities may be completely different from activities usually undertaken. This novelty will be stimulating and exciting to many children, but it will tend to increase the insecurity of the child who has difficulty in adjusting to his group and new environment.

Where sustained contact is maintained with the parent group during the summer it is important to have considerable awareness of the strengths and limitations of the individual child if the staff is to work cooperatively with the parents in the positive development of the child. Parents frequently send their children to camp with specific desires as to what they should learn. This may vary all the way from learning to swim, learning to drink milk, or to develop a liking for playing with other children. Considerable understanding of the child and his home environment is needed if the staff is to interpret camp values and the progress the individual is making.
The length of the day camp, and the continued hours spent in a group environment reveals individual behaviour difficulties and needs to a greater extent than in most recreational situations. There is greater opportunity for the leadership to assist the child in meeting his needs but there is also the danger of attempting too intensive therapeutic assistance. There is need to evaluate continuously the degree of assistance that can be given on an individual basis and where the focus must be on assisting the group as a whole. There is need to distinguish between the kind of help that will give the individual support, and the kind of assistance that opens up personal problems without assisting the individual to overcome these problems. Adequate recording will provide the guide by which the leadership can evaluate the kind of assistance needed, and the degree to which the individual and the group can benefit from this help.

Many of the children registered in summer day camp will take part in the winter activities of the agency. Frequently however there would be a change in the leadership involved in changing groups. Recorded material will be helpful to a
new leader in understanding the behavior and interests of the child.

(9) It may be found advisable to refer an individual from the camp to a case work agency for individual treatment. Here recorded material on the child's behavior, plus factual material found in registration forms will assist in making a good referral.

These nine points would be only a portion of the dynamic situations which arise in day camping accentuating the need for good recording habits.

Mabel Lyman Jobe suggests the following cumulative folder for each individual camper containing:

1. The registration information
2. The physical ability and health record
3. Anecdotal record of behavior
4. Counselor summaries of the child's personal and behavior habits and his progress in each period of camping.
5. Copies of the camper's reports mailed to the home
6. Correspondence related to the camper
7. Records of all interviews
8. Records of camper interests, activity participation, special abilities and level of achievement in certain activities.

Such an approach to working with the camper group will make the difference between objective under-

4. Ibid, p. 91.
standing of the leadership work in camp and a haphazard daily contact with the membership.

Developing Community Relations

Day camping provides an excellent opportunity for the development of community relations. At the same time it may also be said that the development of day camping is largely affected by the development of community relations.

This essential area of community relations includes questions involving the total community and the specific area offering day camping.

(1) Does a study of the community indicate a need for summer day camps? Where? How many are needed?

(2) Is there a need for day camp groups to join forces to develop standards, to improve program or to develop facilities?

(3) Is there close cooperation and understanding with the administrators of publically owned facilities in terms of finding suitable sites, or providing adequate transportation?

(4) What community facilities are available, and how can they be obtained? How can they be expanded?
(5) Are joint training courses for training camp leaders advisable?

(6) Is the purpose and value of day camping recognized by the community? Is there need for some central group to assume the responsibility of interpreting this program?

(7) Within the smaller community or neighbourhood, are such organizations as schools, churches, or youth groups concerned and involved in developing day camping? Have all groups been reached that should be informed, with a program that is of interest to each?

(8) What follow up techniques have been used to retain contact with cooperating groups?

(9) Does the immediate community assist with publicity and finance? Can adequate volunteers be found in the community?

(10) Is there sufficient community response to set up an adequate day camping advisory committee, a parents advisory committee, or a day camp committee of the operating agencies?

(11) Do the parents participate in planning, join in program, and in other ways demonstrate their interest in the day camp?

These questions make clear that summer day camp-
ing demands vision considerably beyond the confines of agency isolation and a concern for the development and cooperation of the community.

The tangible needs in day camping for community cooperation provides positive opportunities to develop this community organization. The proximity of the camp to the community, the daily departure of the camp group brings camp more realistically to the attention of the public. The close proximity of the camp, and the division of the campers hours between home and camp makes the parents more readily available, and with careful planning, directly concerned.

From an organizational point of view, the planning of day camp must allow sufficient time for the leadership to participate in community groups involved in developing day camping. The leadership must also concern itself with the development of committee groups responsible for the particular camp. Thirdly, adequate time must be provided to work with the parent group, collectively and individually, so that they will assume adequate responsibility within the total group and so that they will continually gain understanding of the camp purpose and the individual development of their particular child.

This work with the parent group demands skill and time but it is essential if the individual camper is to benefit from the camp experience. It has been stated
earlier that one of the advantages of summer day camp is that the child divides his time between the home and the camp thus providing a more realistic experience than that offered in resident camping where the child is completely removed for a short period of time. In the main, this is not an advantage if the camp leadership does not develop continued contact with the parents. Home visits before and during camp, parent study groups and parent participation in specific program are amongst the tools whereby the division of time between home and camp provides a positive experience to both child and parent in the day camp program. This contact with the parent in summer program is one that they frequently welcome. The hours that the child is away from home, parent concern over a program in the forest involving the use of such equipment as axes, their feeling over the desirability of such activities as overnight hikes provides a much greater concern and interest in the program than is usually exhibited in winter activities offered by the agency. Adequate interpretation must be given, moving gradually to parent participation, building an interest not only in this summer program, but an interest which will carry over to year around agency programs.

This same factor will apply to all community relations developed around summer day camp. Since this study is primarily concerned with agencies offering day
camp as a portion of their entire program, it will follow that community contacts developed will have a bearing on the total agency and year around services. In yet another way the day camp will thus contribute to making the agency a vital part of the community and an organization which can build on the expressed needs and interests of that community.

Consideration has been given in this chapter to the particular advantages and problems of offering day camping as a specialized area within an agency structure. This has involved brief consideration of the areas of administration, publicity, finance the use of records and community relations.

These considerations must be seen in relation to the question of standards in health, facilities, equipment and program. They are interdependent if best use is to be made of the values and opportunities of a valid day camp.

The standards of practice and the unique values of summer day camping as a specialized service within an agency program provide a structure in which considerable benefits may be gained by individuals, groups, agencies and communities. The essential factor, however, which will determine the degree to which these potential strengths are brought into play is the camp leadership. The crux of the success or failure of the day camp is in the hands of the leadership.
CHAPTER 111

The Importance of Leadership in Day Camp

One of the essentials of summer day camp is the selection, training, supervision and assigning of responsibilities to the day camp leadership. In fact, in the realm of personnel lies the crux of the success or failure of a camp; for ultimately development of camping is dependent upon its leadership. This includes the quality of leadership provided, its function in the camp situation and the guidance and training given to personnel. This, in turn, will determine the quality of services rendered, and the value of the camping experience to the individual and to the group.

Closely related to this focus on the importance of leadership, is the conception that the central aim of camping is the desirable growth of individuals. Growth of the individual is dependent on more than such aims as a 'recreational experience' or an 'educational experience'. Growth demands understanding and objective guidance and direction. These enable the individual to develop skills and abilities, stimulate latent interests, develop friendship associations and participate in democratic planning. They involve interaction between individuals and the group.
as a whole.

The essence of camping is its group life. It makes camp effective instrumentally in the development of satisfying needs, interests, desires, attitudes and habits of conduct.

In the philosophy and the choice of leadership, as well as in the training of personnel within the specific setting, lies the opportunity to develop this central objective in camping. It involves a philosophy applicable to recreation in all settings, of which camping is but one. In essence it deals with the group work approach to camping.

What is group work in camping? "Group work in camping may be said to be a conscious directive force, generated by the interactions of leaders, campers and groups, which aims at the creation of a dynamic environment that will provide opportunities for the constructive release of the powers of the individual and the group. It is oriented to educationally sound objectives that include the maturation of the individual on all fronts - physical, mental, emotional, and social. It relies for its effect on a creative combination of all the forces in the camp residing not only in the leader, who is most important, but also on the camper, the group, the social process, the camp environment and the purpose of activity as well".

With the development of this group work philosophy, the field of camping has developed considerably, and new implications for camping have emerged. The group work method, aimed at developing the maximum potentialities in camping, seeks to insure for the camper a constructive group experience through a consciously directed democratic process. With activities viewed as means, the group work method represents guided group living, in the achievement of which certain basic conditions are considered essential. These essentials would be; educationally productive groupings, recognition of the worth of each individual, democratic participation, and a leadership trained to fulfil these conditions.

These conditions represent criteria by which one can measure the progress of camping in the use of the group work method. The formulation and general acceptance of these criteria constitute one of the outstanding achievements in the camping field. There has been growing awareness of the role of the group in 1) providing the milieu for growth and satisfaction through the maximum of interaction, self-direction and self-responsibility; and 2) establishing the framework for the psychic interplay of individuals whereby their status and acceptance can be achieved and their emotional needs be met.

Staff capacity to implement the group work method has lagged far behind our knowledge of this method.
The leader's personality and human relations skills are the basic instruments for achieving effective human leadership and for establishing desirable relationship with campers.

Inevitably, the selection and training of leaders is closely interwoven with the prospective number of campers involved, the administrative assignment of responsibilities and the program anticipated. Although these factors may vary considerably in individual day camps, a comprehensive framework of standards has been reached so that in the forthcoming years leadership in day camping can assume greater responsibility in developing the values of this area of camping.

In terms of selection of camp personnel Mabel Lyman Jobe has summarized the qualifications of leadership in the following way:

"A day camp leader is one who enjoys creative outdoor work with children."

Taking each word of this statement separately she goes on to describe the essential qualities with descriptive notes.

1. Enjoy—happy, relaxed, interested, and objective.
2. Creative—resourceful, imaginative, intelligent, self-confident, initiative.
3. Outdoor—camping interests—skills—security in outdoor setting.
There is a threefold emphasis in this outline of Mabel Lyman Jobe's. It includes an understanding of 1) the personality of the individual leader, his motivation and degree of maturity 2) his program and organizational skills in a camping setting, 3) his understanding of and ability to work with individuals and groups.

Thus, in selecting personnel, it is more usual to find the adequate leader among those persons who have some experience in working with groups, who have a variety of program skills—adults whose educational background is sufficient for them to have gained some objective understanding of children and of themselves.

It is understandable, to some degree, that no fixed standards have been set of desirable minimum age or educational background of leaders. The qualifications desirable are too dynamic to permit the setting of this particular kind of standard. There is a marked tendency, however, to avoid this area because of greater accessibility and lesser financial cost of very young leaders, and because of a limited appreciation of the function of leadership in camping. If the emphasis could be laid on the

2. Mabel Lyman Jobe, op. cit., p. 57
aspects of emotional maturity, objectivity, and understanding of self and of the children with whom one is working, the problem would not arise.

An understanding of the motivation of the individual leader in becoming a day camp staff member is an important factor. It is not as important as in resident camping which involves a twenty-four-hour-a-day interest, and where the number of leaders is usually greater. It will, nevertheless, have a strong bearing on the quality of leadership, staff unity and camp atmosphere. This can be seen by remembering that counsellors do not come to camp all sharing common interests, as do the campers (all of whom anticipate having a good time) but with a wide variety of motives. Mr. Blumenthal suggests that these motives include the desires:

(1) to get away from home
(2) to earn money
(3) to have a rest
(4) to improve himself
(5) to make social contacts
(6) to have an inexpensive vacation and
(7) to serve youth.

The wise director who is group-conscious in selecting staff, keeps in mind the extent to which the camp can satisfy the needs and interests of the counsellors. He will recognize that the individual leader must, in addition to having something constructive and positive to give,

be in a position where he can learn and benefit from his camp experience.

This dual focus should provide the basis for training counsellors: i.e. the development of the training program to enable counsellors to give the kind of leadership desirable, and provide the opportunity for the leader to broaden his knowledge and skill for his personal satisfaction.

This pre-camp training has strong values in preparing the staff for this work, and in creating staff unity. Here the counsellors would not only learn skills, but would themselves live daily in small groups. They should be shown how they may live simply in the outdoors, preparing their own meals, keeping house in the open, and planning their own recreation.

The National Recreation Association has suggested the following topics as those which should be included in a leadership training course for summer day camp:

1. Objectives and methods of recreation
2. Objectives of day camping
3. The campers (a) as individuals (b) as members of a group (c) attitudes toward camp and camp activities.
4. Staff responsibilities
5. Program

The Settlement House at North End Union, Boston, has outlined their course on a somewhat different basis. They have suggested several worthwhile additions to a training course. This course was organized for summer leaders who included specialists, resident and non-resident volunteers, and neighbourhood leaders. This course included:

1. Keeping records  
2. Program planning  
3. Discipline and Child Behaviour  
4. Picnic program planning  
5. Arts and crafts  
6. General First Aid Hints  
7. Planning summer nature work  
8. Bringing Country to the City  
9. Folk dancing, Musical games  
10. What to do with odds and ends.

Care should be taken to see that this training course provides sufficiently dynamic experiences for the counsellor to gain understanding of himself in relation to the total camp setting. To some measure, this can be achieved through discussion on topics such as: what makes a good counsellor? What activities are we prepared to teach? What do we need to learn in order to guide a well rounded program?

Any of the topics mentioned briefly will contribute to the value of leadership in day camping. The essential factor, however, is that definite time should be set aside before the opening of camp for a training program. A full week is desirable, and four consecutive days should be the minimum time allotted for this purpose. This training is particularly necessary for the new counsellor, but has definite value for the total leadership group. It should include volunteers and part-time specialists. In this regard it should be pointed out that frequently we tend to view individual leaders with previous camp experience as fully prepared to move directly into their work. There is need to understand what that previous camping experience has entailed, and recognize that orientation to the present work cannot be dismissed as unnecessary because of previous experience.

Supervision of camp leadership throughout the camp session is imperative. Training of staff personnel is never a *fait accompli*. Both individual and group supervision throughout the camp period greatly affects the quality of leadership given. There is need for continuous evaluation of the individual work being done, and discussion of the individual leader's changing function and role in regard to the small group unit, the total camper group and the staff group. There is need, also, to discuss the progress of the small group, the problems and limitat-
ions present. It is important for the individual leader to feel the security involved in the provision of opportunity for supervisory conferences. This area will not be discussed extensively since the same focus is involved as in all phases of recreation.

Classification of leadership responsibilities, in addition to selection, training, and supervision, is an essential consideration. The breakdown and assignment of personnel responsibilities, adequate organization of duties involved, gives a comprehensive framework and provides the basis for a valuable summer day camp program.

In the main, the general areas to be considered would be those of the director, group leader, specialist and general leaders. Depending on the size of the camp, the following figures are accepted as standards in day camping:

(1) One leader to every group of six to ten. OR one experienced person and one student with fifteen.

(2) For a camp of thirty -- a director with one group and three adult counsellors OR a director supervising four or five. younger counsellors with smaller groups.

(3) For a camp of sixty -- a director and an assistant-director, and eight leaders.

(4) For a camp of 100 children -- a director, two assistant-directors -- When the camp is as large as this it is preferable to break the camp into two or three divisions, with division leaders supervising four or five counsellors.

Although the above figures include the varying proportions of leaders to campers the following section indicates the area of responsibility of staff personnel, which would apply, to a large extent, regardless of the number involved.

**Director**

(1) Promotes community relations, coordinates services of all assisting agencies and volunteers.

(2) Plans all work with an official supervisory board or advisory council.

(3) Selects and obtains camp facilities and materials.

(4) Selects all staff or recommends them for selection.

(5) Trains and supervises camp leaders, maintaining high morale.

(6) Supervises maintenance staff, clerical workers, and total camp personnel.

(7) Plans camp policies with camp staff and board.

(8) Trains for and supervises camp evaluation programs.

(9) Evaluates own administrative work.

(10) Works with children as needed.

(11) Organizes and supervises health and safety programs.

(12) Keeps records and makes reports at definite intervals.

**Assistant Director**

(1) Organizes supplies

(2) Acts as secretary and treasurer for the camp.

(3) Plans and organizes special all-camp events.

(4) Gives first aid and makes detailed health reports to parents and administration.

(5) Serves as safety director, checking hazards.
Specialists

(1) Help in organizing pre-camp training course.
(2) Conduct work shops and demonstrations, in both pre-camp and in-service training.
(3) Work in the camp, subordinate to the director, helping counsellors and campers.
(4) Direct leadership of groups in area of specialization.
(5) Assume planning and administrative responsibilities for their special phase of camp program.

Group Leader

(1) Continuous direct leadership of a group.
(2) Keeping of records of the group.
(3) Leadership in program, health, interests and problems of the individual and the group. Responsible for guiding the activities and experiences of the group.
(4) Assists in planning total programs in which the group is involved.

General Counsellors

(1) Assist in all-over activities--planning and direct leadership.
(2) Assist in specialist program.
(3) Assist in development of program.
(4) Assist in coordinating program interests of small group units.
(5) Assist director where necessary in the program area.

It is highly desirable that all staff members have a clear understanding of their responsibilities and of the relationship to be maintained with each other. There should be a job analysis for each staff member. There should be a definite understanding of the relationship of jobs to one another. Adequate attention must also be given to careful assigning of responsibilities in order not to

load particular staff members unduly, nor to assign responsibilities beyond the individual's capacity or in areas in which the leader is not involved.

Care should also be taken by the director in seeing that the individual staff member plays a functional role in the administrative organization. There is need for cooperative staff planning; objectives communally reached, in which the counsellor has free and extensive participation, are more apt to be sincerely accepted. The counsellor's function, is not mainly that of a technician working within the limited sphere of his speciality. It is, rather, in the totality of his behaviour as a social being in relation to all others in camp, campers and non-campers alike - the emphasis should be placed. Thus the leadership responsibilities is as important as the careful organization of the duties entailed.

The effective use of leadership in day camp is dependent on the development of high standards of personnel practice in the selection, training, supervision and assigning of responsibilities within the camp administration.

The effective use of leadership is essential because staff personnel guides the process of interaction between individuals and between the group as a whole so that the group experience will be a positive one. The leadership enables the individual and the group to develop skills, abilities, latent interests and to take part in
democratic planning.

Adequate understanding of standards in regards to facilities, program and leadership in a recreation agency offering a day camp program, will provide an agency service which will have a great contribution to make in leisure time activities of individuals and groups. Applying these standards to specific summer programs offered in the City of Vancouver, there will be opportunity to see the degree to which day camping has developed in this city and the level of standards maintained.
CHAPTER IV

Facilities

In the City of Vancouver, 38,000 school children enjoy two months holiday each summer. During this holiday season, the time these children have for recreation is greatly increased and the need for supervised leisure-time activities is enlarged accordingly. At present there are 30 public playgrounds and 28 camps, between them capable of accommodating 5,000 children during a summer. These facilities and the programs thus far organized around them are not sufficient to meet the summer recreation needs of 38,000 children.

Gradually, recreation agencies are sharing the responsibility to develop summertime activities in Vancouver. In the fall of 1949, five Red Feather recreation agencies offered summer programs in the city for the particular memberships and local communities they serve. Recreation agencies generally are showing a growing recognition of their responsibility for children's summertime activities. However, there has been little systematic investigation of what kinds of summer programs would be most beneficial, while standards of practice are far from having been established in this field.

As later study will indicate, there is only one agency in the city that is carrying on a program that may
be fairly defined as a summer day camp program. There are, however, four other agencies presenting programs, elements of which may be classified as summer day camp programs. Since the summer day camp activities of these agencies are elements of a larger program, it is proposed to describe the full program of these four agencies, including those activities which may be rightly called summer day camp activities, as well as the program which is fairly defined as a summer day camp in the previously cited agency.

At December, 1949, five Red Feather agencies had offered a summer program in the city. These include the Y.W.C.A., Vancouver East Y Community Branch, Alexandra Neighbourhood House, the Y.M.C.A. Central Branch, Jewish Community Centre and Gordon Neighbourhood House.

The Vancouver East Branch of the Y.W.C.A. has been operating a summer program for nine years. In 1949 this program was opened throughout the month of July three days a week to girls between the ages of 7 and 13. Sixty were registered in the program and the average daily attendance was forty-nine.

Alexandra Neighbourhood House has offered a summer program for seven years. In 1949 this program was open throughout the month of July. Activities were scheduled four days a week, two half days and two seven-hour days. The forty-seven boys and twenty-seven girls totaled
seventy-six members registered in the program with an average daily attendance of forty-four. Participants included children between the ages of six and twelve.

The Jewish Community Centre first offered a summer program in 1949. The program ran six weeks from July 1st and the camp was divided into two three-week periods. There were thirty boys in the first camp and forty in the second. Average attendance was thirty. This program was carried five days a week and seven hours a day for children between the ages of five and nine.

Summer programs have been offered at the Y.M.C.A. for eight years. In 1949 a program of six weeks duration beginning the first week of July was open to boys between nine and fifteen years of age three days a week. The total registration was 186 and the average daily attendance was 110.

Gordon Neighbourhood House has offered a summer program for three years. In 1949 the program was divided into two parts on an experimental basis. One program was developed for children between the ages of six and nine, which was called the "midget" program. A second program called the "junior camp" was for children between the ages of nine and twelve.

The midget program was conducted throughout July for twenty-five registrants, fourteen being boys and eleven
girls, the average daily attendance being eighteen. It was a half-day program carried on five days a week. The junior camp, open throughout July, had a registration of twenty-six, twenty boys and six girls. The average daily attendance was twenty. This program was available five days a week, two of which were half-days, while the remaining three were seven-hour days.

In 1950 a questionnaire was returned by the agencies mentioned above and these replies indicate the summer day camp activities carried on by them during 1949, and they are the source of the description which follows.¹ This description is comparative and related to three topics, facilities, program, and leadership.

Facilities

There is probably no recreational activity in which facilities are of such great importance as they are in relation to summer day camping. The term facilities is here used to denote site, surroundings, natural resources and equipment. Although it is true that the quality of program and leadership outweigh the importance of facilities, it is also true that adequate facilities provide a positive basis on which to build program, and provide the setting in which leadership can assist the participant to develop interests and skills. The character of the facilities

¹. See Appendix "A"
determines whether the program is to be indoor or outdoor, a camping program, a games program, or an athletic program. In camping, the recreation activities possible are so dependent on the facilities available that the variety and quality of a camping program is sharply limited by them. Yet, strangely enough, the summer day camp budgets of these agencies contain no allotment of funds for facilities. In all five agencies, registration and camp fees covered the cost of program, equipment, milk, and transportation while staff salaries and building maintenance costs were drawn from the yearly Community Chest grant or from the Jewish Community Council.

Participant fees varied. In three agencies the registration fee was $1.50 for non-members and $1.25 for members, with an additional charge of 15 cents a day to cover the cost of milk and transportation. One camp charged $3.00 for registration in addition to the daily milk and transportation fee of 15 cents. The Jewish Community Centre set a much higher fee, a general fee of $5.00 a week and a fee of $1.50 per week for transportation.

It is interesting to note that each agency has borne leadership and maintenance costs, while relying on participant fees to cover the costs of program, equipment, daily milk supply, and transportation. In the majority of agencies the camp fee is low enough to permit great numbers
of children to participate but too low to provide both program and equipment. Cost of permanent equipment cannot be borne by participant fees but must be borne by the agency.

The questionnaire requested directors to list outdoor and indoor facilities used, and to rate them as good, medium, or poor. Outdoor facilities and equipment were rated in accordance with the criteria presented in Chapter 1 as regards the selection and location of site and the character of equipment.

It is notable that there is extreme variation in the degree to which the outdoor facilities characteristic of day camping (as compared with indoor facilities) are employed. One agency has all its facilities outdoors. Gordon House developed a camp site in the University Endowment Lands for junior camp. Gordon House midget camp and the Alexandra House program used the playgrounds adjacent to Gordon House and Alexandra House as their central locations, using the buildings for a portion of the program and for some of the necessary equipment. The three remaining agencies used their building and indoor equipment as the central program site, thus limiting outdoor facilities to swimming programs and specific outdoor trips.

Accordingly, a tabulation of agency self-rating of outdoor and indoor facilities (Table 1) includes general headings permitting each agency to answer those questions
which apply to their own agency under the columns "indoor" and "outdoor." The final column indicates the number of programs to which a particular question applies. It is to be noted that, since Gordon House has two distinct programs, they are tabulated separately, making six programs in all.

Table 1. Detail (a Classification) of Facilities (six programs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITY</th>
<th>OUTDOOR</th>
<th></th>
<th>INDOOR</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of Agencies Using a Specific Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate open space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming facilities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking water</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping equipment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage space</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table indicates several interesting facts. The major point is that both outdoor and indoor facilities are rated as inadequate. The outdoor camp site is regarded as "medium," while both agencies using the playground have rated the site as "poor." The agency using an outdoor camp site has rated highly their shelter, cook facilities, and degree of privacy, but adequate drinking water, swimming facilities, open space and camping equipment are matters that need improving. Both agencies using playgrounds have rated their facilities as "poor" or "medium" in all activities in which outdoor facilities are used.

Indoor facilities are rated as "good" only as regards shelter, cooking facilities, and drinking water. Except as regards cooking facilities, the answer to these three questions applied to an indoor program merely indicate that the roof doesn't leak and that there is drinking water in the building. In matters of importance, namely adequate central site, storage space, adequate play area, and privacy indoor facilities were rated "poor."

It is interesting to note that all agencies have rated swimming facilities as "medium." All used public beaches, with the exception of one agency which uses its indoor swimming pool. It is surprising that in a city with so many beaches no move has been made to obtain swimming area affording greater privacy and to provide adequate
supervision of swimming programs through cooperation of the agencies in need of swimming facilities.

This tendency to low rating indicates agency dissatisfaction and inadequacy of facilities for summer program. In particular it indicates the inadequacy of the playground as the central outdoor location for summer program. The agencies which have heretofore used playground facilities are obliged to decide whether to carry on an indoor summer program or obtain the facilities without which experience has shown an outdoor summer program cannot be carried on.

As regards indoor facilities, it is difficult to estimate the degree to which the low rating applies to inadequacy of building facilities on a year-round basis, or the degree to which this is particularly applicable to the summer program. Essentially this will mean the difference between attempting to make the indoor facilities as serviceable as possible, or a decision that indoor facilities are insufficient to meet the summertime interests of the program participants. This question is closely allied to agency program and choice of activities. If the emphasis is on outdoor activities attention should be given to raising the standards of indoor facilities. At present the specific indoor facilities included in the above rating and the number of agencies which use these specific facilities
are as follows:

3 gym
3 kitchen
1 woodwork room
2 library
1 indoor swimming pool
2 auditorium
3 arts and crafts room
3 club room

The general inadequacy of program facilities, coupled with the fact that most agencies are obliged to shift their activities from one room to another and one outdoor location to another, imposes serious limitations on program. It centres the responsibility completely on the leadership to provide continuity and creative interest for the program participants who are either using inadequate facilities or are moving from place to place.

It raises a doubt as to whether agencies offering summer programs have attached due importance to the provision of suitable facilities. For example, agencies using playground areas adjacent to the agency building have consistently rated their facilities as "poor," except on the point of adequate cleared space. These flat, black-top surfaces do not, in themselves, provide any stimulus to program, or any natural resources. They involve transporting equipment from the building, moving participants back into the building, or leaving the playground to develop program possibilities. This constant shifting of environ-
ment prevents the participants from developing knowledge of the environment and the possible program resources. It also tends to make the participants dependent on the leadership for ideas. In constantly shifting the area, the group remains at the exploration stage and never gets to know one area well enough to develop the program possibilities the area might allow. The result is that program is constantly adapted to the setting, rather than the program evolving from the setting.

This suggests that agencies offering summer programs should carefully evaluate their facilities in relation to the reasons why they have chosen them. If adequate attention is given to this, agency standards will be set up before offering the program and action will be taken to see that these standards are met. Program should not be planned without regard to facilities. To meet recreation needs, facilities as well as program and leadership must be adequate.

In reviewing the list of agency facilities it is obvious that there is only one agency which has selected facilities adapted to day camp needs. The junior camp at Gordon House is the only one where an outdoor site in a "primitive" area has been selected, and where outdoor facilities are used. Therefore this agency program is the only one that can be discussed specifically in relation to
standards set up in Chapter 1 regarding facilities.

Previous discussion has presented a list of necessary standards for the selection and location of the camp site. Agency self-rating, additional interviews, and study of the site rate the facilities in the following manner:

1. Adequate space for a balanced and suitable program. (medium)

2. "Primitive" camp area providing adequate natural setting. (good)

3. Convenient public transportation. (medium)

4. Plentiful supply of fresh drinking water. (poor)

5. Adequate toilet facilities. (good)

6. Seclusion. (good)

7. Health, i.e., adequate provision for good drainage, adequate refuse facilities, and a site which can be kept clean. (good)

It is obvious that the above standards incorporate several features which are difficult to obtain in any one site within convenient public transportation of a city recreation agency. In order to develop a camp site in an outdoor setting where sufficient wood was available, where fires could be built, and where outdoor cooking and experimentation with campcrafts using natural materials could be carried on, Gordon House adopted the University Endowment Lands as a campsite, notwithstanding its remoteness from public transportation and the necessity of carrying the
daily water supply. Also it provided an ideal setting for nature study, many unique opportunities for program experience, and a wholesome outdoor setting conducive to development of a camping program.

On the other hand, this site did not afford adequate space for free play, and the water supply had to be carried on foot two miles through the woods each day. The children were obliged to travel for three-quarters-of-an-hour by public conveyance, making two transfers en-route and then walking two miles in order to reach the campsite. A similar return journey had to be made at the end of the day and it was necessary to supervise the children during two-and-a-half hours of travel each day. Another limitation is that the nearest swimming facilities are three miles from the camp.

These troubles can be ameliorated only by increased agency expenditure. Revenue from registrant fees is not sufficient to bear the costs of improving camp facilities. Indeed, the amount allotted for summer day camp equipment by the Gordon House budget is so small as to necessitate extremely temporary camp equipment. Since no permanent structures can be built, each year the campers must erect anew the necessary shelters, council rings, benches, and like furnishings. Moreover, only the minimum of campcraft equipment essential for the camping program can be provided.
It is evident therefore that the principal shortcomings of the university site can be overcome only by substantially increased agency expenditures.

An important difficulty would be overcome if water were piped to the site, but this would require considerable capital expenditure. The hiring of busses for transportation of the children would be a great improvement, but would substantially increase operating costs.

While such expenditures can improve the summer day camp facilities offered by Gordon House, they are only ameliorative and do not constitute a radical solution of the problem of Gordon House, or of the agencies concerned as a group. In the long run, and seen from the point of view of these agencies, the most fruitful and economical solution must lie in a cooperative endeavour on the part of these agencies in sharing the capital costs of a central site and smaller adjoining sites, and in sharing the costs of equipment and transportation.
CHAPTER V

Programs

"The only sensible criterion for an outdoor program would be, we will do those activities which can best be accomplished in the outdoors rather than those activities which can be carried on as well, or better, in the home or school." 1.

The essence of day camp program is outdoor living. In this outdoor setting the natural resources of the environment provide program possibilities. A general list of activities that could be developed include campcraft, over-night trips, nature study, dramatics, swimming, music, and special events. The essential characteristic in these programs is the contact with the outdoor setting which permits varied activities, all of which would develop according to individual and group interests.

A day camp develops the activities mentioned above. However, since there is only one day camp in the five agencies, the questionnaire was devised to list both outdoor activities (in the order of their importance in a day camp program) and the various activities which might be

included in a general recreation program. Each agency has marked the activities included in its program and the number of times each activity was offered in a single week. The table therefore shows the sum total of activities offered in the five agencies' summer programs, the number of agencies that have offered each specific activity and the frequency of that activity.
Table 2. A Classification of Activities
(six programs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>Frequency Offered</th>
<th>Total Number Agencies offering each activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>daily</td>
<td>3 days a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campcraft</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal games</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Crafts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight trips</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sing song, music</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatics</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tours to Scenic Spots</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial visits</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hikes (walks)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table indicates the extreme variation of activities offered in Vancouver summer programs and the great differences of emphasis on the number of times an activity is scheduled. There is no primary emphasis on outdoor camping activities. Instead, the agencies have combined elements of outdoor and indoor programs, athletic activities, and programs in which participants use city commercial recreation facilities.

The three activities regarded as important by all the agencies are arts and crafts, informal games, and swimming. Beyond this, each agency has developed its own particular activities since all others mentioned above are offered in two or less programs, or else they are offered so rarely that they could scarcely be regarded as an activity in the sense of developing interest and skill of the participant.

Since there are such discrepancies in the kinds of programs developed in the five agencies, it is necessary to take each agency program in turn to understand which activities are emphasized and how the total program of that agency is developed. Therefore the daily schedule of each agency program is included to describe specific activities and to show the framework in which activities are offered.
Vancouver East "Y"

The six activities emphasized in this agency in the order of frequency in which they are offered are arts and crafts, informal games, music, swimming, industrial trips, and hikes. The program, one day a week, is devoted to industrial visits, movies, roller-skating, or similar activities. In the remaining two days the program is divided in the following manner:

Daily Schedule

9:30-9:45; Arrival at building. Attendance check. Announcements.
9:45-10:45; Crafts (half the camp)
           Games (other half of camp)
10:45-11:45; Games (reverse of above)
           Crafts (reverse of above)
11:45-12:45; Lunch; clean up; sing song.
12:45-1:30; Travel to beach
1:30-3:30; Swimming, games, hikes.
3:30-4:30; Return to building.

The major activities and the above daily program schedule indicate that there are elements of outdoor, indoor, and commercial recreation activities in the summer program of the Vancouver East "Y". The emphasis is on general recreation activities since, with the exception of outdoor swimming, all the activities are offered in a winter recreation program. There are few camping activities, and there is little imaginative use of outdoor
resources and facilities.

The combination of activities from various fields of recreation into this one summer program creates a confusing situation. There is insufficient continuity in the kind of activities offered to stimulate individual and group interests. The activities chosen provide opportunity for individual enjoyment but no opportunity for the individual to develop his ability or skill. The program is, therefore, with the exception of arts and crafts activities, purely recreational in nature.

In addition, the program structure is such that there is no provision made for varying group interests. The total participant-group functions as one unit except in the morning crafts and games period where the group is sub-divided. The sole merit of this system is that it permits the agency to include a large number of children in the program.

Gordon House Junior Camp

The six activities emphasized in this program in the order of frequency in which they are offered are campcraft, nature study, informal games, cooking, arts and crafts, and swimming. The two half-day programs in the week are devoted to arts and crafts and swimming. In the three seven-hour days the program is divided in the
following manner:

**Daily Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30;</td>
<td>Meeting at Gordon House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00;</td>
<td>Arrival at camp site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-12:00;</td>
<td>Camp divides into groups to build shelters, arrange camp, explore, free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-12:45;</td>
<td>Lunch, sing song, story telling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45- 2:45;</td>
<td>Nature study, first aid, camp craft, exploring and games.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00- 4:30;</td>
<td>Leaving camp and returning to Gordon House.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gordon House has a sustained campcraft program as the basic activity, with nature study and outdoor cooking important adjuncts. One day is set aside for swimming and arts and crafts, but, in the remainder of the week, activities develop from the camp setting, participants' interests, and leadership guidance. The period set aside for interest groups is extremely flexible and several choices are available to participants. They may develop their own activities, may participate in instruction groups, or may join other groups and individuals in a different activity.

The swimming and craft programs are not held in the camp setting since the limitations of the site preclude such activities. This fact is regrettable for it disrupts the continuity of the camp experience, and there are two
days in the week in which the camp functions as a total unit rather than in small groups.

Regardless of these limitations, it is a well balanced day camp program, with varied outdoor activities including ample opportunity for the individual to develop camping skills.

Gordon House Midget Program

The six activities stressed in this program are informal games, music, arts and crafts, story-telling, swimming, and nature study. The morning is divided so that certain activities are offered daily, whilst others are scheduled specific days of the week as follows:

**Daily Schedule**

9:00; Arrival
9:00-10:30; Games, sing song, story telling.
10:30-12:00; Crafts (2 days)
            Swimming (1 day)
            Nature Study (1 day)
            Hikes and special trips (2 days)
12:00; Camp closing.

Although the program schedule shows a variety of outdoor programs the limitations lie in the fact that the participants function as one program unit, and individual and group interests cannot vary to any degree from the program structure. The schedule indicates that the playground is the central site for
the first half of each daily program, and the group leaves the site for the second part of the morning. This division limits the degree to which participants can pursue interests stimulated from earlier program experiences of the day. It is interesting to note that activities chosen for the second part of each morning are primarily outdoor day camp activities.

Since the emphasis has been placed on out of door activities in this Midget Program, Gordon House should develop this program further, incorporating facilities desirable in day camping, and scheduling activities to permit greater leeway for individual and group interests.

Jewish Community Centre

There are four programs regarded as essential in this agency: informal games, swimming, music, and dancing. Any other activities offered are limited to the days in which bad weather necessitates providing program substitutes. The program is divided as follows:

Daily Schedule

9:30; Arrival. General meeting.
10:00-12:30; Active games.
12:00-1:00; Lunch and rest hour.
1:00-4:00; Swimming and games.
4:00-4:30; Clean up and closing.
The program at the Jewish Community Centre is neither a day camp nor a summer program since it has not developed organized or varied activities. It is an informal recreation program in which the total stress is on enjoyment. It does not provide stimulation to make use of natural resources, increase skills, or to develop group and individual interests. The agency is not offering activities which a child could not enjoy in his own free play with his neighbours. There is limited opportunity for the child to widen his appreciation of program possibilities and to develop his understanding of how to work and play with others.

The agency has had the problem of adapting summer program to the interests and abilities of children between the ages of 5 and 9. To develop group relations and group responsibility at this early age is difficult. The short interest span of this age group creates problems in program. Nevertheless a stimulating outdoor program for such an age group is possible providing there is sufficient variety to hold the interests of the members.

Better organization of activities at the Jewish Community Centre would provide for stimulated and continuous interests resulting in satisfactory summer leisure-time experiences.
Y.M.C.A.

The six activities listed in the Y.M.C.A. summer program in the order of frequency are: gym, arts and crafts, informal games, industrial visits, sports, and swimming. The following indicates the framework in which these activities were offered:

Daily Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00-9:15</td>
<td>Arrival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15-9:45</td>
<td>Devotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45-12:00</td>
<td>Industrial trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-3:30</td>
<td>Hobbies, library, gym, sports, indoor swimming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30-4:30</td>
<td>Country Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00-9:00</td>
<td>Special events (once weekly) i.e. movies etc..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the main, this indoor program is a continuation of the winter program. It is primarily a sports centred program, in addition to mass activities of an educational nature. The many agency facilities have been placed at the disposal of this summer program, and consequently a wide variety of activities are offered in the afternoon. Although the structure does not permit the development of small natural groupings within the membership, the variety of interest groups permit considerable individual choice.

It is regrettable that such a large proportion
of time is spent indoors in the summertime, and that no attempt is made to develop activities which are limited to the summer season. For the many participants who come to the agency the year-round this condition means limited opportunities. However, the agency operates two summer camps, which provide a variation from the winter program.

Alexandra Neighbourhood House

Informal games, arts and crafts, fishing, swimming, nature study, and music are the major programs at Alexandra House. The program schedule as follows is divided so that two specific activities are developed for the total group, and additional activities are geared to the interests of the small group:

Daily Schedule

9:00; Arrival. Each group plans the day's activities.
9:30-12:00; Arts and crafts (2 days)
            Informal games (2 days)
            Closing.
9:30-4:30; Each group heads off with unit leader to such activities as fishing, swimming, nature study and exploring (2 days a week)

The Alexandra House program presents several interesting factors. The site chosen is not an environment
conducive to day camping. At the same time the activities are predominantly those found in day camping (although the basic activity, camp craft, is offered to a very limited degree). This program is possible because the central camp site is used only for arts and crafts, informal games, and music. In the remainder of the activities each small group in camp, together with a unit leader, leaves the site for such activities as swimming, hiking, nature study, and fishing.

The activities, therefore, are extremely varied as participants will choose where they want to go in addition to choosing what they want to do. There is a tendency towards limited continuity and learning experience in these activities. For each group is constantly visiting new places and planning different activities. Without a camp site to provide the setting in which program is developed, it is almost impossible to stress continuity in program.

Types of Groupings in Program

The kinds of activities offered in these five agencies and the scheduling of these activities are in part affected by the manner in which the total camp participants are divided into groups. The previous discussion of agency programs indicates that two programs emphasize the division
of the camp into small natural groupings based on friendship bonds between members. In two other programs the participant group is divided according to age and interest. In the two remaining programs there are no sub-divisions, the camp functions as one unit.

Table 3 indicates the situation which exists in each agency utilizing sub-divisions of the total participant group. The essential factors - the number of new and old campers in the program and the age range of the participants are set forth and seen in relation to the division of the camp into groups and to the development of a camp council.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number new to the agency</th>
<th>Number in previous winter</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Basis on which camp is divided into groups</th>
<th>Basis on which camp council is formed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G.H.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>Each friendship group elects two members to council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.H.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>No council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midget</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>No council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.H.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6-12</td>
<td>Each group elects one member to council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C.C.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>No council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y.M.C.A.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9-15</td>
<td>Council chosen from the total group by secret ballot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Y'</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7-13</td>
<td>No council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In four of the six programs the great number of newcomers indicates that summer program is a community need. This provides an excellent recruiting program for the agency for future year-round programs, and statistically indicates the need for further development of summer programs. However, it presents several problems in the camp itself. It is imperative that the leaders make best use of every opportunity to develop inter-relations so that small friendship groups can develop and function. When a large part of the program is offered to the group as a whole, and at the other extreme, when the program is immediately split up and small numbers go separate ways, it becomes very difficult to provide opportunities for members to get to know one another sufficiently well to develop friendship associations.

In the four programs where the camp is divided primarily by age groups and where three of the four have no camp council, there are limitations on the value of the summer program. No structure is provided to assist individuals to develop their ability to work and play together and to participate in a democratically planned group activity.

The wide age-span in three of these four camps, the large numbers, in these same three programs, and the degree to which the participants function as one group
present enormous problems to the leadership in getting to know the individuals and to understand their interests and needs. For example, it is very difficult to assist the insecure child in this setting. Such a child might be having difficulty in playing with others of his own age. In this de-personalized structure in which he is either in a program where there are large numbers, or he is following his own age group to participate in a specific activity, he has little opportunity to adjust himself to this experience, unless his interests and areas of security coincide with the program organization. It is a setting which could be a negative experience to a child who is uncomfortable in a group.

In these same four programs, the basis of dividing the camp into groups, and the fact that three of the four have no camp council mean that the program is enjoyable and of recreational value, if the individuals have interests which coincide with the activities scheduled. From a structural point of view the emphasis is on program, not on the individual participants. The determining factor, however, will be the leadership. The quality of leadership, the division of leadership responsibilities, and the degree of leadership continuity with individual participants could change this picture considerably.

In the two remaining programs, the emphasis is
on small groups although the situations vary enormously.
In the Alexandra House setting the emphasis has been
placed on the self determination of natural groups in a
decentralized program. It is remarkable that this has been
achieved since the age range runs from six to twelve years
of age. Furthermore, out of a total registration of
seventy-six, forty-seven are newcomers to the agency.
The Alexandra House situation is duplicated in many agency
winter programs where the aim is the development of small
group activities. However, two factors create a difference
in this summer program: 1) the program lasts only four
weeks. This time factor limits the effectiveness of gradu-
ally providing opportunities for natural relationships to
form, and, in turn sub-dividing the total group into friend-
ship units. 2) the de-centralized program with the major-
ity of activities away from the central site limits the
opportunity the individual newcomer has to mix with others
and to decide which group he would like to join.

There is probably frequent shifting of individual
members from one group to another during the summer. Out-
trips of small groups will solidify relationships, but
there could often be some unhappy individual members who
are misfits in a particular group and because of the dis-
tance between groups in this program there would be prob-
lems in exposing these individuals to other groups with
whom they might feel more congenial. These various environmental conditions create a need for exceptional leadership skill if they are to be overcome.

In the Gordon House situation there is opportunity for the total group to participate in all over camp activities, divide into various groups for interest group activities, plus opportunities for friendship groups to develop their own program. The problem of strengthening these small group units and assisting the individual to find the group in which he can best function is minimized because of the program structure and the environment. By building a central camp site, with numerous small sites close at hand, there is opportunity for the individual to shop around, at the same time sufficient scope for the friendship group to remove itself from the total camp group. These small group units develop a sense of belonging and a feeling of accomplishment in building their own shelters and camp equipment. The all over camp projects of building a common council ring and first aid shelter provides a situation which enables the individuals who have not formed relationships to participate together in a program where they can get to know each other and frequently create friendship groups of their own.

It can be seen that the setting itself plays an important role in developing individual and group relationships. The leadership function is that of guiding and
supporting these relationships, rather than having to overcome the environmental factors that prevent their development.

The numbers involved in this camp program are less than half the average registered in other programs. This is partially due to the fact that the agency provided two separate programs rather than including the six to twelve year olds in the one program. In addition, this day camp was an experimental project and no attempt was made to publicize the program or to recruit large numbers. The program structure would permit considerable expansion in numbers without losing any of the advantages seen in this year's experience.

The Gordon House Junior Camp is the one program which meets the necessary standards to qualify as a day camp program. It is the only one in which the principles of program content are consistently based on camp activities and camp life. The program structure and the emphasis on the small group unit is such that this program is in close accord with standards of program in day camping presented in Chapter 2.

Desirable activities in day camp programs have been developed to apply specifically to this form of camping. They form a part of program standards in day camping. The broader elements of standards in program, however, are
those which constitute essential criteria in any recrea-
tional program. Therefore it is alarming to see that the
majority of summer programs rate as inadequate not only in
terms of the particular activities chosen but also in
terms of the general program structure. The majority of
agencies include some activities characteristic in day
camping but they have put inadequate stress on the campers
themselves. The program structure indicates limited
understanding of the interests and needs of the individual
and the small group in program.

There is need for each agency to evaluate its
summer program in relation to the agency's general state-
ment of purpose and function, and to decide whether or not
the present level of development of summer program in that
agency is in accordance with its general aims in recrea-
tional services. Summer program is only one element in an
agency recreation program, but it is a segment of the total
agency program which has an important contribution to make
in the full rounded recreational services of the agency.
Therefore adequate standards are as essential in this
program as in other areas of agency services.
CHAPTER VI

Leadership

In the realm of staff personnel lies the crux of the success or failure of a recreation program, for ultimately the development of program is dependent upon its leadership. The leaders guide the development of program and assist the individuals to grow emotionally and socially.

Adequate leadership in a carefully planned administrative structure can mean the difference between a haphazard recreation experience and an enjoyable program where individuals and groups receive objective guidance and direction.

There are four essential areas of study in determining the quality of leadership in summer program. These include the selection, training, supervision, and division of responsibilities of staff.

Selection

In the selection of staff it is important to know the proportion of paid, part-time and voluntary staff personnel in each agency. The following table indicates into which categories the total staff of an agency is divided, and the total number of paid, part-time and
voluntary leaders in the six summer programs.

Table 4. Staff Engaged in Six Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>Part time</th>
<th>Voluntary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gordon House, Midgets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon House, Junior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra House</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Community Centre</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver East &quot;Y&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y.M.C.A.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Six Agencies</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In three programs the greatest proportion of leadership is voluntary and in the other three there are no volunteer leaders whatsoever. In this regard it is interesting to note that the volunteers are in those programs where the number of participants exceeds sixty.

Opinions vary in these agencies as to the function of volunteers in a recreation program. The proportion of paid to voluntary staff suggests that budget allotment for leadership played an important role in determining the leadership in each agency. In the agency where the total leadership is paid, it is possible that inadequate attention has been given to the values and contributions of voluntary
leadership. In the two agencies where the number of volunteers greatly exceeds paid staff a situation is created in which the paid staff spend most of their time supervising volunteers, or else very limited time is available for volunteer supervision.

Greater attention could be given by these agencies to the proportion of paid, part-time and voluntary leadership in summer program. The balance at present is not conducive to efficient administration.

Information as to the qualifications of leadership is limited to the knowledge that there were seven people with formal education in some branch of work with children in leadership capacity in these programs. This included four social work graduates, two physical education graduates, and one leader with training in education. Five of these leaders were in two agencies, Alexandra House and Gordon House. This is a small proportion since there was a total of forty-nine leaders involved. (It is a particularly small proportion if Gordon House and Alexandra House are excluded for it means a proportion of two to thirty-five.)

There is limited recognition of the importance of adequately trained staff in summer programs.

Training and Supervision

Closely related to selection of staff is the
question of training and supervision of staff members. A pre-camp training course has strong values in preparing the staff person for his work and in creating staff group unity. Supervision throughout the camp period, is in part a continuation of staff training and provides an opportunity for continuous evaluation of the work being done.

All five agencies offering summer program have seen the need for providing pre-camp training courses and continuous supervision for each staff member throughout the program period. All but one program include a leadership training course as an essential part of staff preparation for summer program. These courses varied in length in each agency from a minimum of two days to a maximum of one week. The average length of the training course was three and a half days. Four agencies offered this course just prior to camp opening and one agency held its sessions once monthly throughout the winter. Considering the numbers of staff in each agency, and the number of volunteers, it is natural that these courses vary greatly in content. In all cases the greatest emphasis was placed on planning the camp program, describing the leader's function, and discussing the aims of the summer program.

Every program made provision for individual supervisory conferences. Time available for these conferences varied from three a week to one every ten days. The average
number of conferences was two a week with each leader.

This unanimous agency stress on training and supervision of leadership is important. It indicates the recognition that in order to provide adequate leadership for recreation activities, continuous attention must be given to helping staff develop their potential abilities. The content of these conferences and the relative skills of supervisor and supervisee would be the main factor in determining the values of both the training course and weekly supervision. The quality of supervision given in these agencies is not known. Information is limited to the time devoted to supervision.

Assignment of Responsibilities

Inevitably the assigning of responsibilities will vary in each agency according to the skills and abilities of the staff, the number of campers, the program being offered, and the agency budget. However, the general division of leadership responsibilities break down into the functions of the director, assistant director (or program director), program specialists, unit leader, and general leader. A program specialist is here defined as a staff person skilled in one or two arts or crafts who gives instruction in these activities. A unit leader is a leader assigned to a small group or friendship group whose main
Responsibility is to be with those children and assist in the development of their activities. A general leader is one who assists in interest groups and special events without definite responsibility for an activity or a group.

The following table indicates the number of staff, and the number of them employed in the several capacities indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Ass't. Director</th>
<th>Program Specialist</th>
<th>Unit Leader</th>
<th>General Leader</th>
<th>Total No. of Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gordon House, Midgets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon House, Juniors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Community Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver East &quot;Y&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y.M.C.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Indicates duplicate count
2. The director also serves as a general leader
3. The assistant director also serves as a unit leader.
In every camp one person, the director, is directly responsible for the general administration and supervision of leaders. In three programs the director is also responsible for the program, and in the remaining three this is the responsibility of the assistant director. In four of the six programs the director was a member of the regular staff of the agency. This is a very positive factor for it permits greater continuity in administration and program and prevents summer program from being a special agency service unrelated to year-round planning.

Program specialists have not been emphasized in the selection of leaders. Two camps have secured specialists to give specific leadership in games, folk dancing, and sports. In one agency the same personnel function as unit leaders and as specialists. This involves unit leaders' giving leadership in programs in which they have particular skill, in addition to their work with a friendship group.

The limited number of program specialists is interesting in view of the fact that several agencies have emphasized interest group activities in their program. In the Y.M.C.A., for example, the afternoon program includes several sports, gym and craft sessions, yet there is only one program specialist. Since the administrative leadership is not involved in program, a large portion of this program specialist's responsibility is carried by the seven unit
leaders who are all volunteers. Either minimum emphasis is placed on developing skill in these activities or the general leaders are exceptional people who are capable of giving leadership in many areas.

In the two columns indicating the number of unit and general leaders there is a sharp division in the various agencies. In two programs the emphasis has been placed on unit leaders and in four programs general leaders have been stressed. This involves a clear division in function.

In programs where the emphasis is on unit leaders, it is essential to hire staff and recruit volunteers who are capable of meeting the varying program interests of the small group with which they are working, and assuming responsibility for meeting individual and group needs. Since such a leader is responsible for all the activities of eight or ten children it is essential that this leader have understanding of children and a wide variety of program skills.

Where the emphasis is on general leaders, it is possible to pool the collective abilities of the total number of general leaders and in turn assign each leader to assist in the activities where he can do the best job. Hence it is possible to hire younger leaders and those who, although they lack a sufficient variety of skill and experience to assist a group in all programs undertaken, have one or two specific skills.
It has been said, in discussing program, that the program structure and scheduling of activities in four agencies has emphasized the program rather than the individuals within that program. These same four programs stress general leaders in preference to unit leaders. This increases the depersonalized atmosphere of these programs, for there is no one leader responsible for specific individuals or small groups. Therefore there is no one person to whom the individual, or group of individuals, feels he has the right to turn.

Mabel Lyman Jobe lists the specific responsibilities of the group leader and the general leader; these are adapted to this study to further clarify the different function of each, and to substantiate the above statement.

Group Leader

The group Leader; (1) gives continuous direct leadership in a group.  
(2) keeps records of the group.  
(3) gives leadership in program, health, interests and problems of the individual and the group. He is responsible for guiding the activities and experience of the group.  
(4) assists in planning total program in which the group is involved.

General Leader

The general leader: (1) assists in all over activities-planning and direct leadership.  
(2) assists in specialist program.  
(3) assists in development of program.  
(4) assists in coordinating program
interests of small groups. (5) assists director where necessary in the program area.¹

This outline of the relative responsibilities of unit and general leader clearly indicates the difference between the continuous relationship of the one leader to a group and his concern with every aspect of the development of its members, and the assisting role of the general leader who is involved in some element of program with all the children and responsible for none. Thus it is felt that the use of general leaders only, does not provide a leadership structure in which program participants receive adequate attention.

The emphasis on general leaders also presents problems in supervision. It is difficult to give adequate guidance to a staff person when his responsibilities are varied, ever changing and lacking in continuity. It is difficult to evaluate the strengths of such a leader because his work rarely involves keeping records of group activities which would enable the supervisor to understand the difficulties which he encounters. Moreover, the leader himself will find it difficult to evaluate his own work or increase his ability to give adequate leadership, for

¹. Ibid, p., 58.
he is constantly sharing responsibility with other leaders for the same children.

It should be emphasized that this discussion does not imply that all program leaders should be unit leaders, or that general leaders have not an important role in summer programs. Both have a function. The general leader, however, can never be a substitute for an adequate number of unit leaders.

Proportion of Leaders to Campers

One important consideration in the study of leadership is the number of leaders in relation to the number of campers. Although the proportion would vary with the type of program and the quality and function of leadership, the desirable ratio is one leader to every six to ten children.  

In the following table, the first three columns indicate the total number of registrants, the total number of leaders and the average daily attendance of campers. The next two columns indicate the number of members per leader based on the total registration, then on the average daily attendance.

In the Vancouver East "Y" and the Y.M.C.A., vol-

unteer leaders in program do not give leadership every pro-
gram day. Therefore the figures in brackets indicates the
average number of leaders in each daily program and the
ratio in accordance with this figure.

Table 6. Ratio of Staff to Campers in Six Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Total number of campers</th>
<th>Total number of leaders</th>
<th>Average daily attendance</th>
<th>No. of Campers per leader (based on total group)</th>
<th>No. of Campers per leader (based on average attendance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gordon House, Midgets</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon House, Juniors</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4½</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra House</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Community Centre</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver East &quot;Y&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) total leadership</td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) daily leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y.M.C.A.</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>16½</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) total leadership</td>
<td>(186)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(110)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) daily leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With the noticeable exception of one agency, the proportion of leaders to campers is well within the standards proposed above. Thus ample opportunity is provided for staff to know the needs and interests of the campers. Since these agencies have an adequate number of leaders, it seems regrettable that in most programs, the use of facilities, the program structure and assigning of responsibilities, are not conducive to building understanding relationships with individuals.

In view of the proportion of leaders to campers shown above it is evident that there is no shortage of leaders available in the community for summer programs. The inadequacy therefore lies in the failure of the agency to make the best possible use of the leadership available so as to develop the emotional and social growth of the program participants.

Use of Records

Continuous recording by the leaders in their work with individuals and groups frequently means the difference between haphazard adult guidance, and objective understanding of the emotional and social needs of the child.

Recording enables the camp leader to accumulate knowledge and understanding of individual needs, to eval-
uate the assistance being given to the individual, and it provides a file of information on the individual which is invaluable for future leaders in working with the same child. This holds true in a program of short duration, but is even more applicable when this program is related to a year-round agency recreation program. Without this element of continuity through recording, the child constantly attempts to express his interest to a series of new leaders who know nothing about him. In addition to the harmful effects of this experience to the child, administrative inefficiency results for valuable time is wasted as each new leader attempts to gain understanding of the individual situation.

Consideration must therefore be given to agency recording habits in the summer programs being discussed.

Individual records kept in these programs fall into three categories. In three programs the only individual recording attempted was the identifying information given at the time of registration. This identifying information included: parents' name, address, 'phone number, occupation, the number and ages of brothers and sisters, the age and school grade of the program participant. In one of these agencies the identifying information was limited to name, address and 'phone number.

In two agencies, summary individual records were
kept in addition to this identifying information. That is, a closing summary is written at the end of the camp period indicating the activities in which the individual participated, and general comments on any problems that might have been noticed in the program weeks. A weekly summary was kept on specific individuals where definite emotional problems were noted or where the individual displayed particular abilities and leadership qualities.

There was only one program in which continuous individual records were kept.

It is evident that these agencies have given completely inadequate attention to the importance of recording. The complete dearth of written material about the campers is a serious limitation in four summer programs and should be given immediate attention.

The four programs in which the recorded material on individuals is limited to identifying information, are the same programs wherein the camp functions as one unit for a large proportion of the time. These programs divide the camp into age groups when smaller numbers seem expedient, and they use a great number of general leaders. In practice, it is difficult to keep individual records, for it is probable that no one staff person has sufficient information regarding an individual to record his progress. It would seem possible, however, that staff meetings could be held
in which the staff could pool their information about individuals and subsequently record it. This would perform the dual function of providing some recorded information and would increase staff understanding of individual needs.

This lack of recording further substantiates the previous statement that these agencies have emphasized the program activities rather than the individuals in the program.

In the Junior camp at Gordon House, where continuous individual records were kept, it was the responsibility of the unit leader to fill out agency individual record forms at the end of each program day. This form (headings indicated below) was adapted to the recording of information regarding the emotional and social growth of the individual and his program interests and skills.

| Name ................................................. Date .............. |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| New Interests   | Activities Participated In | Degree of Participation | Status | Symptoms of Maladjustment | Health |
| Use symbol if no further comment is needed. |
| Complete .C. | Passive .P. | Negative .N. | | | |
The particular advantage of this individual record form is that it is direct, concise, and is not time-consuming. It provides a structure in which the salient factors can be recorded, and does not demand a lengthy report on those days when there might be little to add concerning individuals. Its limitations lie in the fact that none of the headings direct recorded remarks concerning positive behavior or adequate emotional growth.

In addition to this daily record, the unit leader compiles an individual summary record at the close of the camp period for each member of his group. This form is divided into six sections:

1. a statistical count of attendance in each specific program activity.
2. interest and progress in each activity.
3. new interests
4. participation in individual and group projects
5. status in the group
6. conclusions

Again, this record form has the advantage of being concise. In fact, it is possibly too abbreviated for it does not provide the space to discuss the growth of the individual as a person - it is always in relation to an activity or to others.

This record form would provide valuable information in understanding the individual, in assisting the
leader to develop his own understanding of the guidance he must give, and in filing adequate individual records for the use of future leaders. It would provide essential information where it is deemed advisable to refer an individual to a casework agency for more extensive individual assistance. It would also be useful to the staff in home visiting, when the child's camping experience is discussed with the parents.

It should be pointed out that these forms used in the Gordon House Junior camp are not presented as ideal individual record forms. Each agency prepares its own form, bearing in mind the ability of the staff to complete these forms, the intended use of the form, and an appreciation of the kind of individual information that is necessary or valuable in giving adequate leadership. Therefore, the forms would vary to some degree. However, the information to be recorded should be in substance that indicated in the above sample.

Group Records

In five programs no group records of any kind were kept. The recorded information is limited to a statistical count of the numbers present.

In one program, a weekly summary group record is filled out. This is the same program in which con-
tinuous individual records are kept. This one-page-form has as its only heading "the development of the group as a whole." In discussing this form with the agency, and in reviewing records, it was found that this limited direction as to desirable material to be included was intended to avoid duplication. Several headings on the individual's form called for information regarding the relation of the individual to the group. Therefore, this group record emphasizes only the inter-relations of the group as a whole, and the general trends in group behavior and group activities. In reading these records and in discussing them with the director of the agency using them, it became apparent that they were little employed for recording the views of leaders as to how group unity might be fostered, or the inter-relations of group members guided. It was found that the environment of a camp site with each smaller unit within a dozen paces of the central council ring, contributed so greatly to creating group unity that the main task became that of helping the individual in each group to gain as much as possible from the experience.

In the five situations in which no group records are kept, it is recommended that these agencies record something more than mere physical presence. Certainly there is such a thing as over-emphasis of recording which leaves insufficient time for direct group leadership. However,
such recording as would be done in the above samples is not time-consuming. It is, on the contrary, time-saving, for it sharpens leaders' understanding of individual and group needs, minimizes the instances in which leaders could give misguided direction, and provides a basis for continuous leadership in agency services to its members.

Committees Involved in Planning Summer Day Camp.

In this consideration of leadership, emphasis has been placed thus far on direct group leadership. There is need to consider the leadership function of agency committees responsible for the planning, financing, and program development of the project. In considering the administrative function in a previous section, emphasis was placed on the need for a special committee to participate in planning the efficient organization of a summer program. The committee was intended to provide opportunity for democratic community participation in summer program projects to the end that the camp might the better meet community needs.

In three agencies (carrying on four programs) there was a special committee working with the camp director in planning summer program. These committees were directly responsible to the board of directors.

In two of these three agencies the responsibil-
ties of this special committee were similar. Its function included: 1) approval of general plans; 2) decision in regard to budget allotments to the summer program; 3) decision in setting the camp fee; and 4) outline of camp objectives. Thus this committee did not limit its function to the purely administrative responsibilities, but shared in the leadership of direct services.

In the two remaining agencies, the planning was done by the staff without lay participation. The camp, and the leaders in particular, have a greater function than that of direct services. It is the business of leaders to get community support and community opinions on the services of the summer program. Varied community representation on a special committee provides greater understanding of community interest, support, and awareness of the aims of summer program.

There is also a psychological factor involved. When the staff personnel works directly with a special committee, there is greater probability that the program is suited to the needs of the community. Without such a committee, there is the danger that the leadership will focus its attention wholly on the program structure and the program itself, to the exclusion of community factors which ought to be considered.

An example of this was found in one agency pro-
gram where the limited number of staff available for the program necessitated limiting the number of registrants to forty. The agency decided that this was the maximum number that could be adequately handled, if high standards were to be maintained. Nothing was done for the other children, who, under this policy, would necessarily be excluded from the benefits of the camp program. However, there was a camp committee. When this plan was presented, the committee representatives from the local school and church expressed concern for the many children in the community who could not be served under the proposed policy. It was decided therefore that additional volunteer leadership would be supplied through the school and the church, which would mean increasing the number of participants while maintaining high standards of leadership. Since community needs could not be wholly met under this plan, the committee also decided to keep adequate lists of the applicants turned away so that the information might be used as an argument for increased provision of summer programs in that area the following year.

This situation illustrates the broader community considerations which are brought into play when the camp leaders and the agency recognize the valuable role of a special committee concerned with summer activities.
Parent Participation

Similar benefits result from parent participation and interest in program. In five programs, the only point at which the parents are involved in the program was the parents' day, held at the close of the camp period. This served the purpose of giving the parents a fleeting glimpse of what their children had been doing throughout the month.

In one program, the Y.M.C.A., the parents took a more active part in program, assisting with transportation, planning and participating in special events. This work assignment helped the parents to feel a vital part of the program, and make a contribution in determining the kinds of programs that would interest the participants.

This lack of contact with the parent group in five programs, is further limited by the fact that only one agency, Gordon House, provided time for home-visiting. In this agency the parents of each child were visited to discuss the program, the child, and the parents' hopes as to what the camp experience would give the child. It also gave the staff some understanding of the home situation of each camper, and indications of the child's needs.

Home-visiting is an important aspect of work with parents, and one which strengthens community relations and gives insight into the needs and interests of program
participants.

In setting up staff responsibilities and staff work loads, the limited work with parents in the programs being discussed, indicates inadequate appreciation of the importance of relationship with the parent group. Instead it is regarded as unduly time-consuming and generally a work which the staff cannot undertake. Actually, home-visiting and parent-participation is like adequate recording habits in that it provides essential materials enabling the staff to have more understanding of its work. Finally, it saves time by furnishing data necessary for informed direction of effort.

Consideration of the function of leadership has included the administrative organization of adequate selection, training, and supervision of leaders. It has been found that in the majority of agencies pre-camp training and continuous supervision has been given. Variations occurred in the number of paid and volunteer leaders, with few agencies showing a balanced proportion between the two. There was a very limited number of staff people in these agencies with formal training in work with children.

In assigning leadership responsibilities each agency recognized the importance of one person assuming final responsibility, but beyond this each agency assigned work loads in different ways. In the majority of instances
the leaders were not responsible for a particular group, although the majority of programs maintained high standards of proportion of leaders to campers.

Extremely inadequate individual and group records were kept in summer activities. There was limited contact with the parent group either in the camp or through home-visiting. On the other hand, the majority of agencies worked with a special lay-staff committee in planning the activities.

This indicates that there was unanimous recognition of the importance of leadership only as regards the number involved and the pre-camp training and supervision given, with growing awareness of the responsibility to the community in the development of camp committees.

Beyond this, agency understanding of the responsibilities of leadership, and the methods whereby this leadership can be effective, is very limited. With great care each agency has trained a staff to do a good job without providing the structure wherein this ability can be used. Without the integration of every aspect of leadership responsibilities discussed, the agency is defeating its purpose. For example, what is the value of hiring one adult for eight children if that leader is with different children each day? What purpose is served by continuous supervision when the leader's responsibilities vary daily,
and when no records are kept?

There is need for each agency to analyze the function of leadership in its program and to relate each aspect of leadership responsibility to the needs of membership, staff, agency, and community. A decision must be made as to whether recreation is purely playtime or whether there is a responsibility to use recreation settings to further social and emotional growth of the members and democratic community participation in planning.
CHAPTER VII

Implications for the Future

Summer day camping gradually came into being as a field of recreation to meet the summer leisure-time needs of city children. Throughout the United States, communities concerned with recreational programs recognized that resident camping and playground programs did not provide sufficient resources to meet recreational needs. These communities repeated the pattern that characterized the early development of resident camping. Summer programs were offered, based on the philosophy that any program is better than no program. Gradually, the fallacy of such an approach to recreational services, and the inadequacies of the summer programs offered, were recognized. Through a national organization, the American Camping Association, these communities pooled their knowledge and experience in summer program, and formulated standards which could guide the development of day camping.

The essential elements, facilities, program and leadership, were incorporated into a clear statement of the necessary standards that must be maintained in day camping. These standards demanded adequate facilities conducive to the development of creative indigenous camping, a varied
program based on outdoor activities developed through the interests of small group units, and a leadership group capable of guiding the emotional and social development of the children through the activities. Clearly, in formulating these standards, the essential goal was the development of a specialized recreational service where trained leadership in a program of a highly creative quality could provide experience significant to each individual participant.

However, these general trends of development represent the highest level of understanding of what day camping should be; and are based on the pooling of information from agencies in various communities in the United States and Canada where day camping has been carefully studied and concerted efforts made to establish high standards of practice. The general trends do not imply that the individual cities or communities in Canada or the United States have reached this level of development. The situation in each community varies. In the City of Vancouver, specifically, both the purpose and the goals of summer day camping are not yet understood and thus not met. A considerable variety of summer programs are offered, but few are based on a clear understanding of the components of different kinds of summer programs, their aims, the methods, and the goals by which the objectives of these programs can be reached.
Instead, the majority of agencies interested in offering summer leisure-time activities have developed a program, taking into account only the agency budgets, the number they would like to have in program, and the winter agency facilities. The result is that some agencies have merely extended their winter program into the summer season, while others have combined features of winter program, summer fun, and day camping, and offered this conglomeration in an effort to provide summer recreational services. There is only one agency which offered a day camp, fully aware of its specialized nature.

Consequently, a primary essential is the need for each agency to study and understand the standards and factors which constitute any summer program. More specifically - and a special implication of the present study - there is need to recognize that the standards and features which constitute a day camp program are different from those of a summer fun program. Once differences are clearly understood, each agency can appreciate the relative values of each program, and offer that which meets the needs of the children served, dependent upon the kinds of services the agency is equipped to offer. Moreover, such clarification would eliminate the present situation in which 'hybrid' programs, consisting of a mixture of day camping and summer fun, are offered. These 'hybrid' programs prevent under-
standing of the relative values of day camping and summer fun programs and serve only to confuse. In themselves these 'hybrid' programs lack direction, do not provide continuity, and hinder the agency from realistically choosing the program it is best equipped to offer.

Once the agency has a clear understanding of the distinction between the two kinds of program, there is need to recognize that a day camp project should not be undertaken if the agency is unable to meet the requirements in terms of facilities, program and leadership. The standards in these three areas do not merely aim at raising the level of day camp practice; their integrated adequate implementation is essential if the values of day camping are to be realized. The degree to which these standards are interrelated and interdependent means that their partial implementation would seriously affect the values of the project.

The standards required have been discussed at length in the first three chapters. It is evident from this that particular emphasis must be placed on leadership since in the final analysis the development of day camp program is dependent upon its leadership. Though cited authorities do not go so far in commitment, it may well be suggested by this study, that the social group worker is the professional person best equipped to see that the standards
of day camping are met to the greatest extent.

The views of a well known social worker may be quoted in elaboration of this point; "Group work arose out of an increasing awareness that in the recreation-education activities which went on in groups there were obviously two dimensions: the stream of activity-games, discussions - on the one hand, and on the other interplay of personalities that creates the group process....To concentrate on one - for example, the activity - without recognizing and checking with the other is like playing the piano with one hand only. Program and relationships are inextricably inter-twined. The group work method developed as social group workers began to see that the understanding and use of the human relations involved were as important as the understanding and use of various types of program!" Thus is the 'way' of group work and group workers.

The nature of summer day camp as a specialized type of program has been emphasized consistently. Therefore it stands to reason that the need for the group worker is heightened in the summer day camp program. Where social group workers are employed in agencies they are in a position to develop standards of day camping and thus conduct a specialized program where the dual leadership focus on creative outdoor

---

activities and the development of human relations can guide the social and emotional growth of the participants. Then day camping becomes a vital part of the total agency program; moreover it proves to be an area which not only has a contribution to make in summer leisure-time activities, but which is definitely related to the agency year-round program.

The Gordon House day camp program in 1949 has proved the values of day camping to the membership, the agency and the community. The agency selected this program with the understanding of its unique values and its contribution as a specialized program within the agency services. There was recognition that the objectives, the program, and the methods of work entailed in day camping were such that a day camp was the kind of summer program in which the skills of the agency's professional social group work staff could best be used. Understanding and cooperation among the staff, the advisory committee and the board enabled the setting up of high standards in every area of the program so that the full benefits of the project could be realized. This Gordon House day camp has proved that in practice the philosophy and standards of summer day camping provide a recreational experience of great benefit to the participants, the agency, and the community. It is worthy of considerable attention in any community offering summer leisure-time
activities. Similar projects should be developed in other Vancouver recreation agencies.

Community Leadership Headed by the Community Chest and Council

What is the most effective method by which community understanding of day camping can be developed, and projects, such as the Gordon House camp, be undertaken in other agencies in Vancouver? It may be granted that each agency has the responsibility of selecting the particular program to be offered, but there is an important function which must be assumed by a group concerned with program development in all Red Feather Recreational Agencies to give leadership in developing community understanding of day camping. Such a group came into being with the establishment of a day camp committee of the Community Chest and Council in 1950. To indicate the present level of understanding and coordination of summer leisure-time activities it is valuable to review the activities of this Committee.

Following the first experimental day camp project in 1949, Gordon Neighbourhood House requested that the Group Work Division of the Community Chest and Council set up a committee to investigate possible sites for summer day camping. Gordon House made this request,
having concluded from its first experimental program in 1949 that summer day camp offered many opportunities for summer leisure-time activities. The agency was capable of making the necessary program plans, but felt that a completely adequate site for the camp could only be obtained through cooperative agency planning and would have to be suited to serve several agencies.

A Summer Day Camp Committee, a special committee of the Group Work Division of the Community Chest and Council, was set up in the winter of 1950. It was composed of representatives of each Red Feather Recreation Agency offering a summer program, or hoping to do so in the near future, together with the Group Work Secretary of the Community Chest and Council. The agencies involved were Gordon Neighbourhood House, Alexandra Neighbourhood House, the Vancouver East "Y", the Y.M.C.A., the Jewish Community Centre, Marpole Community Centre, and the Kiwassa Girls' Club.

Although the Gordon House request resulted in the formation of this committee, the group did not see the location of a common site as their primary function. The extreme variations of opinion as to the kind of summer programs that could be offered, and the limited committee understanding of what day camping means, resulted in the setting up of two sub committees - a site committee and a
committee on standards of day camping.

It was decided that the site committee would investigate suitable camp locations in or near the Greater Vancouver area, but would limit their function to presenting a list of possible sites. This decision was made essentially because it was necessary for the Standards Committee to present a report on desirable standards in choosing a camp site as well as other standards involved. It was also decided in this way, because it was necessary for each agency to choose whether they were interested in offering a day camp and whether they were interested in having one common site.

The sub committee on standards met once a month until it was disbanded in the winter of 1951. In the ten months in which it was active this committee prepared a report on day camp standards concerning facilities, program and leadership, which was circulated to all recreation agencies interested in summer programs. Although by no means as detailed as the standards discussed in Section One the framework was similar. These standards were circulated to provide basic material for each agency as to what summer day camping entailed and the desirable standards of practice. There was, of course, no obligation to follow the outline.

After the summer term in 1950, a report was sent
to each agency which had offered summer activities, and included specific headings which would give some indication of the kinds of summer programs offered, the setting, facilities, and leadership. In addition, suggestions were requested as to areas in which inter-agency cooperation in preparing day camps might be useful. The agencies that completed this report were: Alexandra Neighbourhood House, Alma Branch, Y.M.C.A., Central Branch, Y.M.C.A., Gordon Neighbourhood House, Kiwassa Girls Club, Marpole Community Centre, North Vancouver Memorial Community Centre, Vancouver East Community Y.M.C.A., Vancouver East Community Y.W.C.A., and the West Vancouver Y.M.C.A.

The summary of these reports made on City Summer Activities was presented to the January meeting, 1951, of the Group Work Division of the Community Chest and Council. It was decided at this time that the day camp committee would disband and that a summer program committee would be set up, of which the day camp group would be a sub committee.

This decision was based on the fact that seven agencies offered a summer fun program, two held a city camp program, and one agency had a day camp. (On the basis of criteria discussed in Section One there were nine agencies who had a summer fun program and one agency had a

2. See Appendix "B"
3. See Appendix "C"
day camp.) It was unanimously agreed by the Group Work Division that there was need for a special committee to be set up to study summer programs, and determine what such a program entailed. The sub committee on day camping was to continue its efforts to locate a suitable site which could be used by several agencies, since two agencies indicated a desire to offer a day camp program rather than a summer fun program. (The site committee previously formed had considerable difficulty in suggesting possible sites since there was no indication of which agencies might be interested and therefore the committee had no guide as to what area would be within convenient transportation distance of all agencies interested.)

This Summer Program Committee has not as yet been set up. It is probable that it will not be formed until the fall of 1951.

The problems encountered and the situation seen in the Day Camp Committee, indicates that the situation in 1951 is similar to that seen following the 1949 summer season. Although nine summer programs were offered in 1950, as against the six programs in 1949, the variations in structure, program, facilities and leadership are comparable to those discussed earlier.

The function of the Day Camp Committee of the Community Chest and Council was to report briefly on
desirable standards of summer day camping and forward a report form to each agency based on these standards so that a general estimate could be made of the degree to which day camping had progressed in the City of Vancouver. No attempt was made to evaluate these programs, singly or totally, or to suggest directions for the future. However, the returned report form from agencies offering summer programs indicate agency interest in a cooperatively used site, family participation in day camp programs, and program exchange and preparation of written material.

Although there is some interest in developing a common site, no decision has been made as to whether a site of the kind discussed in preceding sections is desired, or whether the aim is to obtain a large playground area. It is interesting to note that the agencies expressed willingness to discuss family participation and program content—two phases in which there were in 1949 the weaknesses indicated in this paper.

The community problems in developing summer program, and the interest evidenced thus far in the Day Camp Committee of the Community Chest and Council indicates the importance of Community Chest leadership in the development of summer programs and of day camps in particular. Although each agency will make its own decision as to the kind of program to be offered, the committee under Community Chest
leadership will have a vital role to play in clarifying agency understanding of summer fun programs and day camping and in raising the level of standards in these programs.

It is particularly important that the subcommittee on day camping should remain an active part of the summer program committee to publicize the characteristics and values of day camping, and in turn discuss the possible areas of inter-agency cooperation to further day camping in Vancouver. If several agencies were interested in day camp program, several areas could be considered which would limit the cost of the project and help in the development of high standards of facilities and program. These areas might include:

(1) Establishing one large central camp site for all the agencies involved, with smaller adjoining sites to be used by each agency.

(2) Sharing cost and use of expensive equipment.

(3) Sharing a permanent shelter which could be used for program in bad weather and where equipment could be kept.

(4) Cooperating in providing transportation to and from the camp.

(5) Planning inter-agency special events.
Conclusion

This study has surveyed and described the summer day camp as a program within a recreational setting, and a specialization within the camping field itself. Emphasis throughout has been placed on standards, to be worked toward and maintained. With these in mind, all those Vancouver agencies providing any kinds of program which they loosely group under the heading "summer day camp" were examined and evaluated, for the purpose of this study.

At present only one agency of the total number of agencies studied could be given an accreditation in regard to standards in day camping. Not only is this agency operating a valid summer day camp, but it also rates above average in its standing. Gordon House, by virtue of its pioneering in this specialization, with the consequent experience gained, is thus seen as the pace-setter in the total community picture.

However, the development of a summer day camp program, as has been frequently pointed out, should be on a community-wide basis. A beginning in this respect has been marked in the establishment of the Day Camp Committee of the Group Work Division of the Community Chest and Council. Though in the main the work of this committee is rather ineffectual at present, dealing as it has with the
less fundamental aspects, it does not mean that effective work cannot come through this committee. The next stage will depend on the inspiration, interest, and further stimulation that such a valuable specialization in the field of recreation deserves.
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**APPENDIX "A"**

**PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE on SUMMER DAY CAMP**  
(Questions refer to program of 1949)

Agency sponsoring Summer Day Camp_________________________  
Number of years the camp has been operating__________________  
Total number of campers________ Average daily attendance________  
Length of day camp____ No. of hours per week____ No. of hours a day____  
Age groups included____ No. of boys____ No. of girls____  

Please check activities offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campcraft</td>
<td></td>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Crafts</td>
<td></td>
<td>(List others)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check OUTDOOR facilities at LEFT. List INDOOR facilities at RIGHT.

**OUTDOOR FACILITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>MEDIUM</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>INDOOR FACILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camp Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Cleared Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Divide the average camp day as in the example at left

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>Arrival at site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. - 11.30</td>
<td>Interest groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. - 1.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. - 2.00</td>
<td>Clean up. Rest hour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. - 3.30</td>
<td>Interest groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30- 4.00</td>
<td>Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>Camp closing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX "B"

GENERAL QUESTIONNAIRE on SUMMER DAY CAMP
(Questionnaire refers to Day Camp, 1949)

Total number of leaders in summer program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>Specialist</th>
<th>Volunteer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Indicate responsibilities and the number involved as in example at left.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONNEL</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERSONNEL</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist - Program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit (group) Leader</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is the Camp Director employed in the agency's winter program? __________

Do the counsellors receive individual supervision? __________

Is there a pre-camp training course? __________ How long? __________

Indicate number of day camp participants new to agency __________

Number of day campers who participated in previous winter program __________

Indicate headings used in individual records kept __________

What is camp fee? __________ Milk fee? __________ Transportation fee? __________

Is there a camp council? __________ How is it selected? __________

Is the camp divided into groups? __________ On what basis? __________

How is the camp financed? __________

Are parents interested in the program? __________ In what ways do they participate? __________

Is a special committee involved in planning summer day camp? _________

What is its function? __________
REPORT FORM

In the City Summer Activities
1950

1. General
   a. Agency
   b. Name of Project
   c. Total number of registrants
      Girls.... Age Range.... to......
      Boys .... Age Range.... to......
   d. Check social areas in which participants resided.

11. Setting
   How many daily sessions were held?.... Average no. hours per session?....
   How many of above sessions were held at agency headquarters?................
   For certain groups only...........
   How many of above sessions were held away from agency headquarters............... For all registrants........
   For certain groups only...........
   State type (picnic, industrial trip, swim, overnight hike, etc.) and location of program held away from agency.
   For all registrants For Certain Groups
   Type of program Location Type of program Location
Appendix "C" continued

111. Leadership

Definitions

Administrative - agency executive if concerned with summer program and/or any person responsible for general administration, leadership training, program arrangements, recording, financing for while project under authority from agency board or executive.

Group Leaders - persons held responsible for the program of a stated number of registrants in an organized and recognized group, the membership of which is fairly consistent throughout the program period.

Skills Leaders - persons who are employed or volunteer to teach special skills to registrants and who are not responsible for an organized group.

Combination, Group Leaders and Skills Leaders - persons who combine leadership of a group with the teaching of skills to members outside the group.

Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On regular</th>
<th>Employed for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year-round</td>
<td>period of sum-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agency staff</td>
<td>mer program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VOLUNTEER (No payment whatsoever except incidental expense, carfare,)

a. Administrative
b. Group Leaders
c. Skills Leaders
d. Combination
  Group and skills
e. Other

IV. Sub Groups

Name sub-groups (swim club, drama group, pirates, niners, etc.) and state No. of registrants in each and check type of leader used within these groups for the special program of this group (not camp as a whole.)
Appendix "C" continued

V. Summer program as a Whole

Approximately how many sessions of your summer program were operated for the total registrants as one group?

More than one a day? ................
One a day?  ................
More than one a week? ............
One a week?  ................

Describe briefly one such daily session, if any

........................................
........................................
........................................
........................................

VI. Leadership Training

Did you have a pre program leadership course or staff meetings? .................
(If "yes" how many hours meeting did this involve?)  ........................

Did you have daily planned meetings of program staff? .................
(If "yes" how many hours a week did this involve?)  ........................

Content of Leadership Training Program

In an average staff training period what proportions (\(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4}, \text{ whole}\) ) were devoted to following concerns of leaders?
1. Administrative detail (time, place, program material, staff assignments) ................
2. Methods in Group Leadership ................
3. Actual teaching of skills ................
4. Assistance in understanding individual campers ....

Approximately How many periods of individual supervision of leaders with administrator or director were held ..........................
VII. **Home Visits**

Did any of the staff visit the homes of registrants (in regard to your program) in the month preceding program or during the summer program. ............... If "yes" approximately how many home visits were made? ............... 

VIII. **Parent Participation in Program**

Approximately how many parents visited your summer program? ..................
As individuals, to interview director, etc. ............... 
To attend a planned program  ..................

How many parents assisted in administration or leadership (consistent or occasional) .................. 

IX. **Standards**

Your Day Camp or Summer Program and "the Standards for Day Camping".

Rank your program according to characteristics of a desirable day camp as given on page 5 of report.

A - Excellent
B - Good
C - Fair
D - Poor
O - Do not think this is important in our agency.
LF - Limited by inadequate facilities.
LL - Limited because of inadequate leadership.

Characteristics of desirable day camp include the following:

1. A program related to the needs of children and to the natural physical environment in which the camp is located. The program should provide continuity of experience over an extended period to time.

2. Responsible management with clearly defined objectives and the assurance of financial integrity.

3. Competent paid director and a qualified staff.
4. Adequate trained leadership. The ratio of trained leaders to campers should be not less than one to eight.

5. A camp site so located that travel from homes of campers is inexpensive and does not consume too much time.

6. Location and facilities which may vary greatly but which should include opportunities for camp-type activities and safeguards for the health and safety of campers.

7. Basic standards maintained in health, safety, and sanitation both in program and facilities.

8. A program derived from community needs, with responsibility shared by the community.

9. Adequate records and reports.

X. Practicability of Standards

After reading the Report of the Committee on Day Camp Standards, do you think that the achievement or the gradual working towards the achievement of these standards would provide a type of summer program desirable and useful in meeting the needs of your membership or community?

Give reasons for your answer.

XI. Site

Have your summer program staff participants or committees on the basis of this summer experience, any suggestions for the possible site of an Inter-Agency Day Camp in or near Vancouver:

..........................................................
..........................................................
..........................................................
..........................................................
XII. Suggestions for Inter-Agency cooperation in preparation of Day Camps, 1951

On the basis of your experience this summer, what do you feel should be the emphasis of the Day Camp Committee, Community Chest and Council for 1950-51.

1. Work towards site to be used cooperatively
2. Recruitment of leaders
3. Staff sessions on leadership training
4. Records and recording
5. Program exchange and preparation of written material
6. Publicity
7. Study of family participation in day camp program
8. Intake policies in day camps
9. Other
10. Cooperation
SUMMARY OF REPORTS MADE ON CITY SUMMER ACTIVITIES
COMPILED BY THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS
DAY CAMP COMMITTEE
GROUP WORK DIVISION, COMMUNITY CHEST & COUNCIL
VANCOUVER, JANUARY, 1951.

1. GENERAL

a. Agencies reporting:

Alexandra Neighbourhood House
Alma Branch, Y.M.C.A.
Central Branch, Y.M.C.A.
Gordon Neighbourhood House
Kiwassa Girls Club
Marpole Community Centre
North Vancouver Memorial Community Centre
Vancouver East Community Y.M.C.A.
Vancouver East Community Y.W.C.A.
West Vancouver Y.M.C.A.

b. Name of projects:

Day Camp - 1
City Camps - 2
Summer Fun Club or Program - 7

c. Total number of registrants.........................749

Girls - 315   Age range 4 - 16   Average age range 8-12
Boys - 424    "   "  5½-15    "   "   " 7-13

d. All social areas were represented including North and West Vancouver, Burnaby and Richmond except Social Area 15.

11. SETTING

Daily sessions held - total 195, average number of hours per day - 5 hrs.

The questionnaire failed to ask the weekly schedule of each summer operation. It is apparent that most programs were one month in duration which were operated for two to five days a week. Some operated 2 days while others were all day sessions. This information can be obtained and appended to this report.
LEADERSHIP

This section offered some difficulties in the replies for in some cases the administrative staff, the group leaders, and the skills, leaders were one and the same person. The figures show the following:

All agencies had administrative staffs - a total of 15 persons being responsible for administration in 10 camps.

One agency had four workers including supervisor (agency executive) who shared administrative duties.

12 of these 15 administrative positions were carried by members of the permanent staff while 3 persons were employed temporarily for summer program.

9 agencies reported group leaders - a total of 46 persons being classified as "group leaders".

Of these 6 were members of permanent agency staff
18 were employed for summer program or day camp
25 were volunteers

4 agencies reported using "skills leaders" to teach particular skills or interests.

A total of 14 such leaders were used.
4 of these skilled persons were from regular staff
1 was employed for summer program
8 were volunteers.
Appendix "D" continued

TYPE OF PROGRAM

Some programs and locations were used by some agencies for special groups, but were used by other agencies for the entire registered group. There is no classification of these.

ACTIVITIES

Group A - This group of activities was used by the Day Camp and the City Camps primarily, being typically part of the usual camping program.

- Hikes
- Overnight hikes*
- Crafts
- Camp site camping program
- Campcraft
- Group games
- Swimming
- Cook outs
- Sing songs

Group B - The following activities were used by the agencies in their summer program although some of the above were also used.

- Picnics
- First Aid Instruction
- Movies*
- Special evening program*
- Theatre Under the Stars*
- Indian Museum
- Track meet
- Industrial Trips
- Swimming instruction
- Fishing*
- Roller Skating
- Day trips
- Museum
- Sports
- Boat trip
- Experimental-Farm

LIST OF LOCATIONS USED FOR SUMMER PROGRAM

- Stanley Park-Lumberman's Arch
- 2nd & 3rd Beaches
- Lynn Valley-upper and lower
- Public Library Indian Museum
- Harbour and Harrows Boat trip
- Burrard Bridge (fishing)
- Royal Vancouver Yacht Club (trip)
- Vancouver Sun Newspaper
- North Shore Industrial Plants
- C.J.O.R. Radio Station
- U.B.C. Endowment grounds
- Stanley Park Harbour
- Exhibition Park Roller Rink
- American Can Factory
- Alberta Wheat Pool
- Vancouver Province Newspaper
- Lynn Creek
- Capilano River
- Dunderabe Beach
- Mahon Park
- Kitsilano Pool
- White Rock
- Stanley Park Zoo
- Capilano Stadium
- Grouse Mountain
- Hollyburn Ridge
- Whytecliff
- Growers' Farm
- Maple Grove Park
- Sea Island
- McGavins' Bakery
- Associated Dairies
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4 agencies reported that members of their staff included persons who were responsible for group leadership and the teaching of special skills (combination). None of these were permanent staff members
2 were employed for summer
45 were volunteers.

The figures are in some cases duplications, as in one project, three workers shared responsibility in all three areas while in another employed workers moved in different roles from one group to another.

It would appear that in an estimated unduplicated count, that approximately 108 persons were active in the leadership of these 10 projects. Of those, approximately 27 were employed agency staff members or temporary paid workers. 81 were volunteers. By eliminating administrative personnel where relationship to individual groups would be limited, it would appear that the ratio of program leaders to children was approximately 1 to 10. It is hard to reconcile this average with the size of sub groups. (see IV).

IV. SUB GROUPS

Six agencies divided the total registrants into subgroups, ranging from 2 - 6 such groups per agency.

4 agencies did not divide into sub-groups.

The number of registrants in each sub-group varied 7 - 67.

11 groups were led by volunteers, attached to 8 of these were group leaders as specialists.

2 groups were led by administrative staff with group and skills leaders assisting.
3 groups were led by group and skills leaders
7 groups were led by group leaders.

There was a total of 24 sub-groups reported.

V. DECENTRALIZATION OF PROGRAM

The question regarding "summer program as a whole" was poorly worded. It was the intention of the questionnaire to point up to what degree the programs were conducted on a mass recreation base, for all comers, and to what degree programs were planned on a decentralized
group basis. Agencies had natural difficulty in answering this question. Quotation from or summaries of this section may indicate the present lack of trend in this regard.

"Except for announcements each day participants came together less than once a week. We found it very difficult to force 80 people to do the same thing".

"Come together more than once a day".
"As one group for games, bonfire, swimming and track meet".
"No total activities."
"All activities together."
Most activities on small group basis with occasional total group program based on small group experience.

VI. LEADERSHIP TRAINING

Leadership Course - all agencies answered this question showing that 8 agencies held a leadership training course, 2 did not have such a course. These courses ranged from 6 - 15 hours per week. All were held prior to camp except one.

The content of the courses varied but 5 agencies considered administration, 5 considered the individual campers, 3 discussed skills and 1 stated the course was mainly a general exchange of ideas regarding the plans for the summer.

STAFF MEETINGS

All agencies answered: 7 agencies held staff meetings during the program
3 agencies did not have staff meetings.

These meetings ranged from 1½ to 8 hours per week.
All agencies gave individual supervision of leaders.
Individual supervision periods ranged from 6 - 41 periods during the summer.

VII. HOME VISITS

5 agencies reported home visiting.
The replies showed a great variation - from 5 agencies making no home visits to 1 agency making 35 visits
VIII. **PARENT PARTICIPATION**

All agencies stated parents visited as individuals and all but two had planned programs where parents visited.

The total number of parents visiting ranged from 3 in one agency to 160 in another agency.

Parents served as volunteers in 7 agencies, the number ranging from 2 to 40.

Parents did not serve as volunteers in 3 agencies.

IX. **STANDARDS AS AGAINST APPROVED DAY CAMP STANDARDS**

No definite conclusions were tabulated in this section because of the failure of the agencies to relate their answers to Day Camp Standards as such. However, most agencies ranked their summer program high as it related to the questions in connection with their summer program. This is explained by the answers to X.

X. **PRACTICABILITY OF STANDARDS**

All but one agency answered this question. All felt standards were valuable although there were a number of reservations; indicating especially that they did not feel that these standards applied to their agency and its summer program. In question IX, on those questions relating to the camping movement, the rating was generally low.

XI. **SITE**

5 agencies suggested definite sites as follows:

Shore between Ambleside and Capilano River
Hollyburn Ridge
Lynn Valley
Capilano River
Confederation Park
Bridgeman Park or east of Bridgeman Park

2 agencies mentioned places such as Spanish Banks and Ft. Atkinson as being considered but unavailable.

XII. **SUGGESTED EMPHASES FOR FUTURE DAY CAMP COMMITTEES**

These answers show that the greatest interest apparently lies in working:
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1. toward a site to be used cooperatively (7)
2. study of family participation in day camp program (7)
3. programme exchange and preparation of written material (5)

Agencies made additional suggestions, suggesting such matters as integration with other summer activities and work toward improving standards be considered.