

Beyond Pre-Orientation: Using the First-Year Outdoor Program for Custom Education

Conlan Olson
10 May 2020

Abstract

The Harvard First-Year Outdoor Program (FOP) provides group-based adventure experiences that are successful at creating community and self-awareness for first-years. In this paper, I investigate the possibility of expanding FOP programming to create similar outcomes for new populations in new settings in the Harvard community. Drawing on a review of existing literature, interviews with FOP leaders, other student leaders at Harvard, and outdoor education professionals, I describe tools that FOP orientation trips use to achieve their goals, such as immersive experiences and structured activities. I also describe how creating these tools for a custom education program might be challenging because of the different settings and populations that a custom education program would work with. Finally, I outline how FOP might overcome these challenges by conducting outreach and developing new structures.

I affirm my awareness of the standards of the Harvard College Honor Code.

Conlan Olson

For open access via www.husrhe.fas.edu.

Executive Summary

FOP is effective at creating communities and opportunities for self-awareness for the first-years on its orientation trips. Furthermore, these benefits extend beyond the confines of a trip to make a positive impacts on first-years during their time on campus. I found that there are two key components to this ability:

1. Creation of an immersive experience and separate space: FOP trips are able to be away from normal campus life, allowing participants to buy-in and have more intense experiences.
2. Intentional curriculum: FOP trips not only incorporate informal mechanisms for bonding, but also structured group processing activities that are important to achieve the intended outcomes of trips.

There are a variety of challenges in adapting the FOP model to provide programs in other settings, including:

1. The difficulty of creating buy-in amid the distractions of the term.
2. The difficulty of creating buy-in among populations who might not view the outdoors as a valuable education tool (due to historical barriers to access or otherwise).
3. The need to adapt the FOP model to different populations, time frame, and goals.

However, by utilizing FOP's resources such as knowledge, equipment, and trained leaders, FOP could overcome these obstacles to create successful custom education programs by:

1. Conducting outreach and using FOP leaders as ambassadors.
2. Developing strong new curricula.

Introduction

The Harvard First-Year Outdoor Program (FOP) is an outdoor orientation program for incoming first-year students. Every August, FOP runs about 50 trips in which 10-12 first-years spend five days with two to three upperclass student leaders. Each trip has a unique itinerary — some are backpacking trips traversing long routes in the mountains of New Hampshire, some are based out of cabins and farms across the Northeast, and others canoe across the lakes of Maine. Each trip seeks to live the mission of FOP: “to provide group adventure-based experiences that promote the development of social support and self-awareness for first-year students, and

leadership development for members of the Harvard community” (Harvard First-Year Outdoor Program 2020). FOP trips are much more than wilderness trips; they are spaces for people to come together, to share experiences, to celebrate individuals and to form communities.

A FOP trip is the first Harvard experience of more than a quarter of incoming first-years. In this position, FOP is able to bring the positive outcomes from its trips to a large portion of the Harvard student body. In exit surveys, FOP participants report gaining self-confidence, forming close social bonds, and getting new perspectives on college through their trips. FOP leaders frequently cite the opportunity for personal growth as one of the most valuable things about FOP, matched only by the fulfillment coming from creating the aforementioned benefits for first-years. FOP trips, very often, are deeply valuable to first-year participants and leaders alike.

However, FOP is limited in its ability to touch and positively affect members of the Harvard community. Fundamentally, the trips are only offered to incoming first-years. More subtly, but perhaps more importantly, the trips are not universally accessible. Though FOP has, since 2016, given financial aid towards trip fees equal in percentage to the university’s financial aid, trips remain expensive, intimidating, and complicated. Too many first-years feel uncomfortable signing up for a FOP trip, can’t make the logistics work, or pass FOP by because they’re “not outdoors-y.” These problems are perhaps rooted in the view of the outdoors as a playground for white, wealthy, and fit men. Certain aspects of FOP itself also contribute to this inaccessibility and, as a program, FOP is continuously working to improve and do its best to serve all people in ways that are sensitive to a diversity of backgrounds and identities. Harvard and the outdoors are both spaces where not everyone feels a sense of belonging, and as an organization situated at the intersection of these two spaces, FOP faces challenges in including and supporting underrepresented groups such as students of color, LGBTQ+ students, and first-generation/low-income students.

This paper will investigate the concept of expanding FOP programming to include activities other than orientation programs. The belief in the ability of group-based adventure experiences to create positive outcomes for communities and individual participants drives FOP’s programming for first-years; it is natural to ask whether this benefit can be extended to other populations in other settings. The term *custom education* is used to encapsulate these

extended programs, following terminology used by the National Outdoor Leadership School (NOLS). This term emphasizes that the shape and content of these programs are driven by the goals of the participants. Though the core values remain community building and self-awareness, the desired outcomes can be adjusted to fit the needs of different populations. A FOP custom education program might run a retreat for the board of a student organization that provides a space for team-building and strategic planning. It might facilitate an affinity trip for members of a cultural or identity-based organization that allows participants to bond and share past experiences while creating new ones together. It might provide trips designed for Harvard students at other points in their Harvard journeys, such as community building trips for sophomores moving into houses or reflective trips for graduating seniors. This is a partial list — the FOP model might be adapted to achieve any outcomes related to community building and self-awareness for any population.

Though this initiative is rooted in the goal of expanding access to FOP's programming, it also might serve several secondary goals. First, programs during the term would provide continuing leadership development experiences for FOP leaders and utilize FOP's resources, both human and material, during a time when they usually are not used. Second, the act of bringing more people into the outdoors for adventure experiences might work towards making the outdoors a space that belongs to more people. In this way, FOP custom education programs that work with populations who are traditionally excluded from the outdoors might contribute, in a small way, toward changing the problematic story of the outdoors.

In this paper, I will first ask how FOP achieves its outcomes in its orientation trips. Second, I will investigate the implications of this for a FOP custom education program. What positive signs are there for this initiative? What obstacles exist to this initiative? Third, I will ask what a FOP custom education program might look like and what structures FOP would have to implement to successfully build a custom education program. I hope to provide information and plans so that FOP can, in collaboration with its leaders and other populations at Harvard, work towards new programming that brings FOP experiences to more people in new contexts.

Literature Review

To situate this study in the larger field of outdoor education research, I found literature that describes how outdoor education can benefit broad communities. Beames and Ascencio (2008) put the outcomes of outdoor education programs in terms of Putnam's (2000) language of "bridging" and "bonding" social capital. They describe how outdoor education has traditionally been assessed by the bonding social capital it creates; it is easiest to see the strong ties that develop between members of a group, the deep feeling of trust that comes over time, and the heightened effectiveness of a group functioning together over individuals working alone. In contrast to this approach, Beames and Ascencio emphasize the bridging social capital created by outdoor education programs (2008:104). They describe how outdoor education programs situated and contextualized in broader communities can help participants to connect to and care for people in their community. Participants not only bond with their fellow participants, but also develop skills that allow them to connect with people they have not been on a trip with and build a stronger relationship with their entire community.

This framework is encouraging to the potential benefits of a custom education program within FOP. The goals of custom education, in many ways, are to create the bridging social capital described by Beames and Ascencio: custom education seeks to create value not only for a single FOP trip, but for much larger organizations, or even the whole Harvard community. While bonding social capital could certainly still be a goal of custom education — for example, a retreat for the board of a student organization might be largely intended to create mutual bonds between board members — the connection of outdoor education to bridging social capital allows for the possibility of experiences that benefit large populations. For example, a cultural group could create a custom education program that not all members are able to attend, but the experience might help the organization develop a stronger sense of identity and enable those on the trip to connect more deeply with everyone in the broader community. This effect is also present in FOP's current capacity as an orientation program for first-years: FOP trips can be a starting point for friendships or discussions between people who didn't go on the same trip with each other. Beames and Ascencio's formulation of outdoor education as creating bridging social

capital points towards the potential of FOP-like experiences to benefit the larger Harvard community.

Beames and Ascencio also suggest approaches to outdoor education that helps facilitate this effect. They emphasize that outdoor education programs that aim to create bridging social capital must be contextualized in their communities (2008:104). These programs can't disappear into the woods for five days and pretend as if the larger world didn't exist. They must connect with the rest of the world, whether through literal contact with outsiders or through discussions that include the backgrounds of participants and other things from outside the trip space. FOP orientation trips do this through several standardized activities, one on equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) at Harvard and another on fears that incoming first-years have about starting college. This sort of contextualization would be even more important in a custom education trip.

Finally, the Beames and Ascencio's paper motivates the interview with a member of the Harvard Diversity Peer Educators (DPEs) to find out about how DPEs situate their educational programs in the cultures and environments of the client organizations they work with.

Johnson *et al.* (1990) provide further evidence of the potential benefit of FOP-like experiences for other groups on campus by demonstrating that groups that undertake group processing — activities in which both the facilitator and participants held a group discussion to give feedback and assess their functioning — were able to problem-solve more effectively and achieve more in a game. This emphasis on group processing also motivates the interview question given to FOP leaders asking about the importance of formalized processing activities to achieving FOP's outcomes for first-years.

Judge (2005) describes an outdoor education program designed to develop leadership skills in executive business school students. There are several concrete lessons to take from this article. Jones describes how programs with built-in time for debriefing and feedback were more effective than programs with, for example, only an all-day hike (2005:292). Secondly, Jones describes challenges in getting students to buy-in enthusiastically to their outdoor education program (2005:293). Their solution was to make the activities more competitive and evaluative by forming competing teams and giving out awards for exceptional performance in various tasks. This approach doesn't generalize to the goals of a FOP custom education program whose goal is

not to create highly effective executives, but instead to create communities and opportunities for self-growth. However, the problem of creating buy-in is certainly still present. This question motivates interview questions to FOP leaders, professionals, Harvard DPE about this challenge.

Finally, Thayer (2000) describes programs that are effective for improving retention of first-generation or low-income students. One common aspect of these programs is the facilitation of “supportive social communities” (2000:6), which could be created by custom education programs. This provides motivation for the application of a FOP custom education program towards improving the college experience for marginalized groups, such as first-generation/low-income students, who both face greater challenges in college and more limited access to traditional outdoor education programming.

This paper contributes to the existing literature first by studying outdoor education in the special context of an undergraduate university. The people and communities in this space are different than those found at professional outdoor education institutions or graduate schools. Second, this paper considers the process of changing an outdoor education program that is highly adapted to one context (first-year orientation) to new applications.

Methods

In order to answer the question of how viable a FOP custom education program would be and to gather ideas about how it would look, I drew on interviews with FOP leaders, FOP Steering Committee members, outdoor education professionals, and a member of the Harvard DPEs. I also referenced a survey that had already been given to the participants in FOP trips in 2019.

I chose to talk to people involved with FOP to take advantage of their hands-on experience with the power and limitations of FOP orientation trips to better understand what the strengths and weaknesses of the FOP model would be if adapted to a custom education context. In this way, I was able to get very focused information specific to FOP and its unique context rather than relying on general theory about outdoor education. I also spoke to leaders because many of them have connections to other student organizations and communities at Harvard and understand how FOP custom education might fit into the larger landscape of student life. Finally,

I spoke to FOP leaders because of their experience in thinking about outdoor education, orientation, creating curricula, and issues of EDI.

I also spoke to members of the 2019-2020 FOP Steering Committee. These people had experience managing both the mission and logistics of FOP as a program and, as such, had valuable thoughts about the possibility of FOP custom education, the programmatic changes that might come with it, and the way it would fit in to FOP's values.

I recruited FOP leaders and Steering Committee members by emailing out a brief description of my project and asking for volunteers who would be interested in sharing their thoughts. Seven current leaders (of whom two were Steering Committee members) expressed interest and I was able to schedule interviews with five of them (including both Steering Committee members). The interviews were conducted over a video call.

To learn more about what custom education looks like in place where it already exists, I also conducted two interviews with people who had experience with outdoor education (and, to some degree, custom education programs) in both professional and university contexts. These interviews helped me better understand the differences between orientation programs, traditional outdoor education programs, and custom education programs. These professionals' informed opinions and ideas about a FOP custom education program were also valuable. I recruited these people for interviews by reaching out to people with whom I had preexisting relationships.

Finally, I also interviewed a member of the Harvard DPEs to better understand how custom programming for other organizations at Harvard looks for them. The DPEs provide services like EDI trainings for boards or whole organizations, consultations with organizations working on EDI issues, and "diversity dialogues" designed for members of the Harvard community. The DPEs are one of a few organizations on campus that work with other organizations or groups and create programming for clients; they essentially do custom education in the realm of EDI training instead of outdoor education. I wanted to use their experience to learn about how organizations doing custom education could recruit clients, work with them to create goals, and deliver custom programming that balanced the core identity of the DPE organization with the goals of the client. I only interviewed one person from DPE who I was able to recruit for an interview through a mutual friend.

In addition to interviews, I also drew on a survey that had already been given to FOP participants in 2019. The survey was sent to all 422 participants after trips ended. 275 students responded to the survey and, of those responses, 152 were complete (meaning that the participant went through the entire survey and submitted it at the end).

In getting interviews, I relied heavily on preexisting relationships. This might bias the perspectives that I heard towards those of people who I already knew. I also relied on people who volunteered for an interview, which might lead to my interviewees being more excited about the possibility of custom education than the general population of FOP leaders. The survey of FOP participants also might have a bias in those who took the time to respond to the survey. Finally, the number of people I interviewed was also relatively small. I would have liked to talk to more people and reached out to more people from across the Harvard community. This was made more challenging this spring than in other times due to the ongoing coronavirus pandemic.

Findings

The first finding is that FOP trips are effective at creating community among participants. This confirmed that FOP trips are not just fun hiking trips or relaxing breaks for first-years before they start school in the fall. 93% of FOP participants who responded to the survey said that they would turn to a peer or leader from their FOP trip if they had a problem. In interviews, FOP leaders also cited community creation as an important part of FOP trips. One leader said that “FOP trips can be a really powerful community because they build strong relationships that continue beyond the confines of a trip, temporarily and spatially.” It seems that the communities created on FOP trips are not just associations of convenience, forced by the situation of a FOP trip. There are real bonds that form between people on FOP trips. This is a powerful asset for both orientation trips and possible custom education programs.

In addition to creating community within trips, FOP trips also provided for the bridging relationships that Beames and Ascencio describe. 94% of survey respondents said that FOP left them more prepared for social life at Harvard and 90% said that FOP made them more prepared to engage with students of diverse backgrounds and experiences. 89% of survey respondents said that they “feel a sense of community at Harvard,” which could indicate either bonding within

trips or bridging outside of trips. One leader said that FOP trips were able to “teach a set of skills about how to treat other people and how to exist with other people in a community and create spaces which are safe and affirming.” This speaks the ability of FOP community creation to generalize beyond orientation trips.

FOP also provides opportunities for self-reflection and individual growth. 90% of survey respondents said that FOP helped them think about what they want out of college. In a custom education program, this sort of reflection could generalize to allowing participants to think about their organization or a different position in their Harvard journey. A FOP leader described an example of growth “when a FOPper is worried that they might not like be able to complete a hike or...won't be able to complete the rest of the day — and then they do...that growth is a very rewarding experience.” Another interviewee described the “empowerment” that trip participants can get out of an space where “everyone is required to step up and do something that helps the group.” FOP trips are not just walks in the park; they have transformative effects on participants.

These findings validate the ability of FOP to create community and self-reflection. But to understand how this might transfer to a custom education context, it is important to understand *how* FOP does these things. The first asset that makes FOP effective is its removal from normal campus life. Speaking about community creation, a leader said “when you get to campus proper you see kind of a lot more different ideas of what it means to live in a community...I think that FOP being out in the wilderness, kind of extricated from Harvard allows you to have people that you trust model [community] in a very specific and focused way.” Another leader described the power of FOP trips to create a new “reality for the next five days.” The FOP space — as one leader put it, a “headspace where each person is approached with a level of care and wholeness” — enables FOP trips to create immersive experiences that are the basis of FOP’s efficacy.

The population that FOP works with — incoming first-years — makes this immersion easy to achieve. One leader described how first-years are “reaching new transition points...[so they are] super, super keen on opening up and meeting new friends. And so it allows them to engage more fully with experiences.” Another interviewee said that FOP is seen as part of a “symbolic transition” and it is therefore easier to create buy-in among participants. Buy-in is important to creating an intense experience that requires deep trust in your fellow participants, so

the willingness of many FOP participants to buy-in helps FOP trips be effective. Also, participants in FOP orientation trips are in similar points in their Harvard journey (even if they come from very different backgrounds before Harvard) and this provides a seed for bonding.

Another theme that emerged in interviews was the importance of both unstructured and structured time. FOP orientation trips typically use both informal tools (such as time to talk while walking or canoeing) and formal tools (such as planned group processing activities framed by the leaders) to create outcomes. FOP leaders described that, in their experiences, both are important. Many of the memories that most strongly suggest the development of community involve participants chatting spontaneously, laughing together, or finding conversations on their own. But, as one leader said, “really intentional moments can allow people to open up” and be more “vulnerable” than would happen “organically.” Thoughts like these show that, while FOP trips are able to create amazing spontaneous moments, it is most likely not enough to just “throw everyone into a trip and stir” — structured activities are also important.

What do these conclusions about the ways that FOP trips create community and self-awareness suggest about the viability of custom education? The importance of carving out a special space for a FOP trip presents a challenge to custom education trips that might happen during the semester. One of the outdoor education professionals I interviewed said that they usually thought of five days as the minimum time needed to implement the type of curriculum that FOP currently uses. During the semester, it would be challenging to find any space away from assignments, other commitments, distractions, and stresses, let alone five days worth. However, the same person said that “even going on a [day] hike with people who you're working with, I think is bonding...I think [the structure] would just have to be much more down pat.” The FOP curriculum is designed around a five day trip arc and relationships on FOP trips often develop relatively slowly. For a custom education program, new curricula and new trainings for leaders would be very important to get the outcomes in a shorter timeframe. The importance of structured activities would likely be even greater with less time to let the trip develop organically.

Creating buy-in in participants is another challenge for creating a FOP custom education program. First-years entering Harvard often focus on transitioning to college; other populations

in the Harvard community have many more focuses and are less likely to commit fully to one thing. An interviewer pointed out that people from other student organizations might also be embedded in hierarchical power structures in that organization. This might cause tensions in ways that FOP trips usually don't deal with in the first-year populations who go on orientation trips. Another person noted that outdoor education experiences, while valuable, are valuable in an "intangible" or indirect way, which might not readily invite commitment from participants. This sort of commitment is important to the current FOP model. A different curriculum or different expectations might still create value without this commitment, but there are also ways to create buy-in. One interviewee described how the FOP leader community might help create buy-in. There are about 100 students at Harvard who are FOP leaders and who are, as one person put it, "super amped about FOP." They could, as this person described, serve as "evangelists" about the value of a FOP-like trip in other student organizations to which they belong.

The member of DPE that I spoke to said that something that helped them create buy-in from clients was "giving them some voice in the dialogue...[and] choosing topics that we know are really important to people on campus." One FOP leader said "you don't build a perfect community on FOP and it's important for us to be realistic about what sorts of spaces and considerations people have coming into FOP." Contextualizing FOP custom education programs in the unique needs and backgrounds of the participants (similarly to how Beames and Ascencio advocate for grounding outdoor education in the surrounding communities) could help create buy-in. One way that the DPEs give clients voice while maintaining the core of their program is by offering clients a choice among several set curricula. FOP could do something similar to leverage the FOP model while encouraging buy-in by giving agency to participants.

Buy-in encompasses more than just being willing to sing a song or offer your feelings in a group discussion, however. A more fundamental requirement to have buy-in is to have participants believe in the value of a FOP-like experience enough to sign up. One interviewee described how many people "don't see [the outdoors] as something that's valuable or worthwhile or even just like on their radar." Structural inequalities that restrict access to the outdoors make the concept of outdoor education unfamiliar to many people in the Harvard community. This might result in people being unwilling, unenthusiastic, or uncomfortable embarking on a FOP-

like experience. Overcoming this obstacle would require dedicated outreach and a focus on accessible branding. For example, pictures of FOP trips with mostly white or East Asian students do not create an inclusive image of the outdoors. The person I talked to from DPE also emphasized that creating buy-in is sometimes a slow process. They said that, often, their goal is just to “introduce people to the DPEs and our space” and to let them “know that we're a resource for them.” It might not be possible to create buy-in for long, intense programs, but simple outreach might help make a difference. Though this issue with the outdoors as a space poses a significant problem for FOP custom education, it also means that successful outreach for a FOP custom education program could be an important contribution towards making the outdoors and FOP more diverse and inclusive spaces.

Some significant assets that FOP would have in creating a custom education program are the resources it has from the orientation trips. This includes physical resources like backpacking equipment as well as human resources in the form of FOP leaders. FOP leaders are trained over the course of about 40 hours of on-campus training and a nine day backpacking training trip. They have both technical skills for conducting activities safely in the outdoors and interpersonal skills for facilitating FOP curriculum, creating safe and inclusive spaces, and resolving conflicts. Furthermore, FOP has extensive institutional memory about how to effectively facilitate a trip. Part of this is the leader handbook, which one leader highlighted as a collection of “generalizable” techniques for “how to build community within these very specific resource constraints.” This expertise would certainly have to be adapted for a custom education program. One outdoor education professional I talked to emphasized that effective custom education requires highly trained facilitators, even more than orientation trips, because of the adaptability and focus that custom education requires. They said that the facilitators would have to be “comfortable enough to be able to use their skills towards different outcomes.” However, the strong base of equipment, knowledge and skills that are already present in FOP is a promising sign for the potential of growing to add custom education programming to FOP. These resources currently lie unused during the semester. On the physical resources side, this is inefficient, but on the human resources side, this is a gap in FOP’s mission of creating leadership development opportunities. One leader put leadership development front and center and described how they

“felt so empowered with...the leadership skills that [they were] learning.” While experiences like these are a valuable part of FOP today, FOP could be even more impactful if trainings and leadership opportunities continued throughout the semester and in new contexts.

One resource that would need to be addressed for the creation of a FOP custom education program is funding. To maximize accessibility for client organizations, these programs would ideally be low-cost or free. However, to maximize accessibility for the opportunity to lead these programs, FOP custom education would ideally pay the leaders who facilitate programs. Further work needs to be done to close this gap, but creating a sliding scale where organizations are charged according to their resources and leaders and paid according to their needs might help reduce the pressure. Also, this program could potentially solicit funding from donors.

Throughout the research, I also found ideas for organizations that might benefit from custom education. First, retreats for members or boards or student organizations could be made more effective by using outdoor education. One interviewee described how retreats often feel like a “party” and FOP-like programming could make the retreats better at teaching skills and creating team bonding. A custom education program could also focus on community building and facilitating connections in a cultural or identity-based organization. Outdoor education trips based around a shared identity, or “affinity trips,” can be empowering and bonding experiences for participants. See, for example, Mitten (2008), Gray (2008), and Argus (2008) for accounts of trips for female-identifying participants. A FOP custom education program designed for an identity-based organization at Harvard could help participants bond or achieve other goals of the organization. A particularly exciting possibility is to have FOP leaders who are also members of a cultural or identity-based organizations facilitate custom education for this organization. This would allow the programming to come from within the group and give the group more ownership over their experience. Finally, FOP custom education trips could also be tailored to Harvard students at different points in their journeys. In past years, FOP has helped facilitate Senior Outdoor Reflective Trips (SORT), which have been, according to people involved, successful programs that allow seniors to reflect on their experience and bond with other members of their class. SORT has lost some support due to structural changes within FOP, and a

FOP custom education program might be able to take responsibility for it. The SORT model could also be adapted to students at other significant points in their college experiences.

Blueprint for Action

Similarly to how FOP continuously learns and improves through handbook updates, new procedures, and informal knowledge passed down through leaders, a FOP custom education program would need time to develop effective curricula and train skilled facilitators. To get the iterative improvement process started, I hope to conduct a few pilot programs in the 2020-2021 academic year. In order to do this, FOP would need a curriculum developed for the custom education context. This could have large overlap with the FOP curriculum and could be based off the FOP leader handbook. The custom education handbook would have to make changes that are relevant to different populations, time frames, and goals of custom education. We would also need a process for planning with clients. During the summer of 2020, I plan to work on a revised handbook and a set of questions to guide conversations with clients. Finally, in order to conduct pilot programs, we would need leaders and client organizations to participate. I plan on asking interested leaders to volunteer and finding organizations that could use a custom education program through connections with FOP leaders. I hope that these first few programs could be paid for by the client organization before we find a more permanent financial model.

Conclusion

FOP trips are so effective at creating community bonding and self-awareness for the first-years that are able to participate in FOP's orientation trips that it is natural to ask whether these experiences can be extended to others or used in new contexts. During this research, several important themes emerged: the issue of creating buy-in, the need for intentional curricula and highly trained facilitators, and the importance of giving participants a voice. I also realized the importance of being open-minded about how custom education programs might look. I look forward to experimenting with new programming and to addressing further questions. For example, where will the funding for this program come from in the long term? What will the leadership or institutional organization of FOP custom education look like? How much

immersion in the outdoors is required to create the space for effective programs? These are all questions that will require answers in order to make FOP custom education, but I am left excited about exploring the possibility of using FOP to achieve community bonding and self-awareness for more people in the Harvard community.

References

- Stephanie M. Argus. 2018. "LGBTQ Girl Scouts Reflect on Their Outdoor Experience." Pp. 529-544 in *The Palgrave International Handbook of Women and Outdoor Learning*. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Beames, Simon, and Matthew Atencio. 2008. "Building Social Capital Through Outdoor Education." *Journal of Adventure Education & Outdoor Learning* 8(2):99-112.
- Gray, Tonia. 2018. "Thirty Years On, and Has the Gendered Landscape Changed in Outdoor Learning?" Pp. 35-53 in *The Palgrave International Handbook of Women and Outdoor Learning*. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Harvard First-Year Outdoor Program. 2020. "About." Retrieved May 8, 2020 (<https://fop.fas.harvard.edu/about>)
- Johnson, David W., Roger T. Johnson, Mary Beth Stanne, and Antoine Garibaldi. 1990. "Impact of Group Processing on Achievement in Cooperative Groups." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 130(4):507-516.
- Judge, William. 2005. "Adventures In Creating An Outdoor Leadership Challenge Course for an EMBA Program." *Journal of Management Education* 29(2):284-300.
- Mitten, Denise. 2018. "Let's Meet at the Picnic Table at Midnight." Pp. 19-34 in *The Palgrave International Handbook of Women and Outdoor Learning*. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Thayer, Paul B. 2000. "Retention of Students from First Generation and Low Income Backgrounds." Council for Opportunity in Education National TRIO Clearinghouse. Accessed May 8, 2020 (<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED446633>).