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An Investigation Into the Existence of Child Sex Abuse Policies Within Youth Sport Day Camps

Dennis A. Johnson

Abstract
In light of the recent childhood sexual abuse (CSA) stories, this investigation involved semi-structured interviews of the directors of five youth sport day camps (n=5) serving a total of approximately 300 children. The purpose was to determine if camp directors developed camp policy/procedures, oriented the staff with regard to childhood sexual abuse, and if they had a documented plan should allegations of CSA occur. Results indicate that day camp directors in this sample do not have a written policy or procedures to deal with CSA issues, and they do not hold staff orientation to discuss safeguarding campers. Nearly all of the directors struggled to disclose how they would deal with a claim of sex abuse issue should one arise. Implications from this sample indicate a need for further study; meanwhile, sport managers might utilize best practices chronicled as a template for youth sport day camp directors to follow.
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**Introduction**

There have been a large number of childhood sexual abuse cases documented in the past 30 years. Many of those cases having been investigated operated from a paradigm of male perpetrator on a female victim (Hartill, 2009). However, with stories of male sex abuse moving into the mainstream media, there appears to be new light being shed on the male-on-male scenario (i.e., male perpetrator on male victim).

Hartill (2009) moved to highlight how the institution of childhood, masculinity, and sport come together in abuse of males. One such example noted is Sheldon Kennedy, who recently testified he believed that beloved Canadian hockey coach James Graham had molested 75–150 males under his tutelage (Kennedy & Grainger, 2006). In the United Kingdom, Celia Brackenridge has completed extensive research in the sport arena on the characteristics of an abuser, the characteristics of a high-risk child, and the location (e.g., locker room, hotel room) most utilized for abuse (Brackenridge, Bishop, Moussali, & Tapp, 2008). However, the underpinning wellspring that has brought the “male perpetrator-male victim” to light in this country has to be the case against Jerry Sandusky (Johnson, 2011).

The result of the Freeh Report (Freeh, Sporkin, & Sullivan, 2012) and subsequent NCAA sanctions against Penn State University in relation to “the lack of university control” has created a groundswell of activity among sporting institutions. As a result, university administrations are sure to have policy in place to address events of child abuse so they will not go unreported. Policy is being developed and/or revised to protect children who are on campus for academic camps/competitions, athletic camps/competitions, and/or for social events. One example is Wingate University, which instituted a new and revised policy for the operation of its summer youth sport camps in 2012 (Wingate University, 2012).

The overnight stay-on-campus camps where youth could be vulnerable to not only sexual abuse but also other forms of misconduct such as bullying and hazing. All camp directors at Wingate University were directed to purchase supplemental insurance policies, develop written policy on how to complete restroom breaks, monitor campers in the dorm, and to produce an organizational chart of who to notify in case of any misconduct. In addition, all members of the sport camp staff would have to complete a background check, and this included any person over the age of 18 (e.g., university players serving as counselors). Staff orientation would be held prior to every camp explaining all policy and procedures. All instances of misconduct would be documented and forwarded on to the university administration (Wingate University, 2012).

Youth sport day camps are typically held for a few hours a day for a period of three to five days with no overnight stays. The purpose of this investigation is to determine if recent events regarding childhood sexual abuse have motivated local day camp directors to increase their attention to the child sexual abuse issue or simply maintain status quo. Specifically, the purpose was to determine:
• Have directors worked to increase staff awareness regarding safeguarding campers from childhood sexual abuse (CSA)?
• Did camp directors have a written policy and a procedure detailing how to deal with restroom breaks and/or misconduct allegations (including bullying and hazing) by those youth attending day camps?
• Did camp directors have policy and procedure written or not that was detailed and explained in a staff orientation session?
• Could camp directors provide a clear chain of command with regard to reporting an allegation of child sexual abuse?

Review of Literature

Childhood Sexual Abuse (CSA)

Childhood sexual abuse defined. Childhood sexual abuse is a complex phenomenon that involves children abused by people of power for a number of reasons and in a variety of locations. Glaser and Frosh (1993) define childhood sexual abuse as:

Any child below the age of consent is to be deemed to have been sexually abused when a sexually mature person has, by design or by neglect of their usual societal or specific responsibilities in relation to the child, engaged or permitted the engagement of that child in any sexual activity of a sexual nature which is intended to lead to the sexual gratification of the sexually mature person. This definition pertains whether or not it involves genital contact or physical contact, and whether or not there is discernible harmful outcome in the short-term (p. 5).

Saul and Audage (2007) add nonsexual acts such as exposure or voyeurism to the definition of childhood sexual abuse and include any individual between the age of zero and 17 years.

Childhood sexual abuse activities. Bringer, Brackenridge, and Johnston (2002) examined coaches’ perceptions of acceptable and unacceptable behaviors in the coach and athlete interactions. Fried (1996) indicates that there are a wide variety of interactions that might constitute childhood sexual abuse. Such interactions might include “rape, physical assault, sexual battery, unwanted physical contact, unwelcomed sexually explicit or offensive verbal communication, coercive or exploitive sexual contact, verbal sexual harassment, and/or sexualized attention or contact with a minor by a person in a position of authority” (p. 155).

Grooming methods. Childhood sexual abuse might include a variety of components that are especially highlighted in the sporting context. There exists an environment where “nurturing” is the norm and a coach is often respected much like a parent. The power structure is also very clear in that the coach is the boss and the athlete is expected to submit to his/her wishes. Toftegaard-Nielsen (2001)
found that a precursor to abuse involved a three-step process beginning with deliberate planning followed by extensive grooming and concluding with the actual execution.

The “grooming” concept, sometimes known as subjection (Spiegel, 2003) or entrapment (Gallagher, 1999), has been identified and discussed in recent research studies. Regardless of the terminology, it is an applied strategy to convince or coerce a child to engage in sexual behavior. Strategies might range from any “quid pro quo” arrangement such as financial inducements, gifts, or to increased playing time to verbal/physical intimidation and/or emotional blackmail (Pryor, 1996). Almost any strategy that can be used to gain the trust and compliance of a child/youth athlete can be considered in the grooming context.

**Childhood sexual abuse: When and where?** Recent research studies have identified findings that shed light on characteristics of the abused child/youth, the abuser, and situation factors leading to abuse (Brackenridge et al., 2008; Cense & Brackenridge, 2001). Fasting, Brackenridge, and Sundgot-Borgen (2004) found that sexual harassment/abuse was unrelated to sport type (individual versus team), gender structure (male versus female), or the amount of clothing cover. Myers and Barrett (2002) indicate most abusers were male authority figures who abused their charges in the locker room, in a car (driving home), at parks, or in a hotel.

**Meeting the Challenge and Protecting Young Athletes**

**England.** England has been out in front on the child sexual abuse issue for the past decade. Since 2001, the governing bodies of sport in England required their sport teams to have a child protection action plan in place in order to be funded (Brackenridge, 2003). The establishment of the Child Protection in Sport Unit (CPSU) was cofounded by the National Society for the Prevention to Cruelty to Children (NSPCC), and Sport England and serves as a clearinghouse for advice and referrals in sport. Celia Brackenridge indicates there are four dimensions that sport professionals must attend to in relation to sexual abuse. First, protect athletes from others—inside or outside of sport. Second, protect the athlete from oneself—observing and encouraging good practice when working with athletes in order to avoid perpetrating abuse. Third, protecting oneself from the athletes or others by taking precautions to avoid false allegations. And finally, protecting one's profession and safeguarding the good name of sport, coaching, and sport science (Brackenridge, 2003). Still, even with a national plan, sport organizations find managing data of cases of abuse an overwhelming challenge due to the volume of sport teams and participants (Brackenridge, Bringer, & Bishopp, 2005).

**Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.** Saul and Audage (2007) authored a position paper for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) that discussed the prevention of child sexual abuse within youth-serving organizations. The document contained topics to implement as policies and procedures for youth-serving organizations. Their recommendations included appropriate
screening and selection of employees and volunteers, instituting guidelines on interactions between individuals (i.e., employee/volunteer and youths), monitoring behaviors, and ensuring a safe environment. Finally they emphasized staff development training for all employees and volunteers emphasizing how to respond to inappropriate behavior, breaches in policy, and all allegations/suspicions of childhood sexual abuse.

United States Olympic Committee. The United States Olympic Committee (USOC) gathered professionals that contributed to the SafeSport Initiative which was dedicated to promoting a safe training environment for athletes (USOC, 2012). The result of their efforts is the booklet entitled Recognizing, Reducing, and Responding to Misconduct in Sport: Creating Your Strategy. The initiative involves six strategies designed to safeguard athletes. The strategies include training and education of coaches, volunteers, and staff, along with extensive background checks. They discuss at length the importance of establishing boundaries to be implemented for coaches and athletes both in and out of the athletic arena.

The highlight of the document in relation to misconduct can be found in part one of the document under strategy numbers four (Managing Training and Competition) and five (Responding to Abuse, Misconduct, and Policy Violations). There is discussion regarding the supervision of athletes, physical contact during practice, and how to deal with electronic media, and appropriate procedures for the locker room. There is also increased emphasis on how to respond to abuse, misconduct, and other policy violations.

USA Swimming. USA Swimming was rocked with a sex abuse in 2010. Some observers compared the scandal to that which took place earlier in the Catholic Church. There were at least 36 swimming coaches who were banned for life by the organization in the previous 10 years because of sexual misconduct (Chuchmach & Patel, 2010). These episodes also forced a national team coach to be fired. In response, USA Swimming developed a policy/procedure manual to aid in the protection their athletes from abuse.

In May of 2010, the USA Swimming Board of Directors created an Athlete Protection Committee as well as new staff positions to support the organizations efforts to “provide a safe, healthy, and positive environment as possible for its member swimmers” (USA Swimming, 2010, p. 4). USA Swimming’s document focuses on preventing child sexual abuse through training, background checks, implementing best practices in locker rooms and during travel, and a mandated report system for any sexual misconduct. A number of other governing bodies (e.g., USA Wrestling, USA Figure Skating) have followed and have created best practice documents designed to safeguard athletes from the sexual abuse.

Young Men’s Christian Association (The Y). The Y, like most youth-serving organizations, has extensive child protection policies. However, the Y also includes training for front-line staff for best-practices for in the supervision of the locker room and restroom. The Y implements policies and practices on restroom
supervision and hold orientation sessions to assure employees are in compliance (YMCA, 2012).

**Literature Summary**

Child sexual abuse has become a mainstream topic in the youth sport world due to the scandals at USA Swimming, with Canadian youth hockey, and more recently at Penn State University. The literature is clear about what constitutes childhood sexual abuse and how it takes place. In response to the problem of childhood sexual abuse, many organizations have developed policy and implemented training to eliminate the problem. However, the question remains; when the rubber meets the road, are youth sport leaders implementing the best practices to assure young athletes safety from adult predators in the youth sport day camp setting?

**Method**

Data for this investigation came from semi-structured interviews with five directors of youth sport day camps located in a one county of a northeastern state. Questions utilized for the interviews centered on goals of the camp, safety issues, insurance issues, and general questions regarding the safeguarding of campers (see Appendix A). Interviews were recorded in the subject's office and typically lasted from 20–60 minutes.

Institutional permission was granted for all human subject interviews used in this project. All subjects signed written informed consent forms and were notified that they may withdraw from the study at any time. They also consented to be recorded. The consent forms and recordings are on file with the investigator.

The subjects were all experienced coaches and had directed their camp for a minimum of three years. There were three football camps (male campers only), one volleyball camp (female campers only), and one track and field camp (both male and female campers) utilized for this study. The demographics of the subjects (pseudonyms are used) are as follows:

**Dan**—45-year-old junior high football coach with 20 years of coaching experience runs a football camp with approximately 100 campers and a 10–1 camper/staff ratio  
**Sam**—33-year-old varsity head football coach with 10 years of coaching experience runs a football camp with approximately 60 campers and a 5–1 camper/staff ratio  
**Ron**—37-year-old male varsity head football coach with 14 years coaching experience runs a football camp with approximately 60 campers and a 3–10 camper/staff ratio  
**James**—36-year-old male who is head coach of female volleyball and runs a volleyball camp with approximately 24 campers and 3–6 camper/staff ratio
Sue—26-year-old female who is varsity women’s track & field coach with three years coaching experience and runs a T & F camp with 50 campers and a 5–1 camper/staff ratio

All recorded data was transcribed and summarized by the investigator.

Results

General Camp Information

Camp goals and cost. The camp directors who were interviewed for this investigation indicated that in general their camps were designed to enhance tactical/technical preparation for the sport at their particular school. There was no specific design utilized to enhance the camper as a whole person from an affective, cognitive, or physical perspective. Although most camp directors related that the camps were not designed to identify future starters, there was an undertone that in fact camps were designed in part for at least some talent identification.

All of the campers in this study were required to pay a nominal fee (e.g., $10–$40) to attend the camp. All directors said that they had free or reduced rates for individuals experiencing financial hardship. The only qualifier to attend the camps was the camper’s age and grade. All of the directors indicated that participants did not need to reside in any particular attendance area or attend any specific school to attend the camp.

Insurance issues. The camps all took place at local school district facilities. Two of the five camp directors indicated they had to pay rent for use of the facilities. All directors indicated they assumed the school district insurance policy would cover any liability occurring during camp operations, though none could verbalize what was covered in that policy. One director (Sam) indicated that the local grid club had an insurance policy that would cover the camp, but again he had no idea of the coverage.

Participants did not need proof of a physical exam to take part in the camp and all were expected to sign some sort of a waiver rather than a participation agreement. The waiver forms utilized were generally a template from another camp. Camp directors did not know if the waivers would hold up in a court of law. Campers also did not need proof of any type of medical insurance coverage.

Staffing issues. Staffing for the camps consisted of a mixture of college coaches, high school coaches and staff, parents, college athletes, and high school athletes. The adults (i.e., teachers, parents, and coaches) who were employed as school or university staff had undergone background checks, while some parents, high school athletes, and college athletes, had not. It was noted that many of the background checks of those employed by the school district were conducted at the time of their initial hire. There had been no attempt to update the background checks of those individuals. In some instances, background checks had not been updated in the past 20 years. Staff-to-camper ratios ranged from 1–10 to 3–10 at
the camps. In most instances, the documentation of background checks was indicated to be housed in the school district main administrative office.

Ron related that copies of his staff’s background check information were housed in his office, the principal’s office, the athletic director’s office, as well as in the central administration office. He also indicated that in future years, his grid club was going to pay for all of the football coaches to have background checks completed. All other camp directors reported that staff members had previously paid for their own background checks.

Procedures and Orientation for Sexual Abuse/Misconduct

All of the camp directors were aware of the childhood sex abuse issues involving Jerry Sandusky at Penn State University. However, the general results of this investigation indicate that youth sport day camp directors are operating “status quo” without regard to the recent childhood sexual abuse incidents. All camp directors indicated that they planned to operate their camps in a similar fashion as they had done the previous year. They had given no additional thought to addressing the sexual abuse issues in terms of writing operating procedures for the staff or for holding an orientation with the staff.

Orientation and policy/procedure. Camp directors in this study have not altered operating procedures in terms of raising awareness of childhood sexual abuse in their camps according to their responses to question two (i.e., Is there an orientation session for employees/workers/counselors/clinicians to review appropriate behaviors when working with youth? and Is there a written document detailing how staff is to deal with hazing/bulling/sexual abuse?). None of the camp directors indicated that they possessed a written camp procedure detailing how to deal with an allegation of sexual abuse. However, some directors when probed mentioned that they would refer to the school district handbook in terms of bullying or hazing incidents. In terms of staff orientation, there was no intention to institute such an event. Most indicated that they typically would meet with the staff for a five-minute meeting to explain staff duties in terms of technique and tactic practice for a particular session. Sam indicated that his staff knew the expectations and Ron reported that he told his high school staff members to be positive and not to be physical.

Abuse allegations and restroom procedures. Question four (i.e., If a camper approached you as camp director with allegations of abuse by an adult working the camp, what would you do?) and question five (i.e., What is the procedure for kids going to the bathroom during camp?) provided the greatest insight into the possible lack of preparation for camp directors to deal with childhood sexual abuse. James and Sam said that both questions were “pretty hypothetical.” They had operated camps for years and never really given the questions any thought.

In terms of what to do about an allegation by a camper of sexual abuse, reactions varied. Dan struggled, and said he “would bring ’em together (i.e., staff mem-
and I thought it was serious, I might call the police or might bring in the parents...worst case, I'd call police.” Sam said, “I would inform parents and remove child and staff member from the camp environment.” James indicated he would “talk to staff member accused while another staff member runs camp.” Then he would (i.e., James) “call the athletic director and let athletic director handle it...maybe call parents.” Sue indicated she would just keep the accused and accuser in her sight line and would call the athletic director and let him handle things.

Ron seemed to be the most prepared in terms of what to do with a childhood sexual abuse allegation, stating that:

- the staff member must leave field immediately...kid (accuser) must explain to me and another coach or parent (prefer parent) what happened, I’d contact my administrator (AD), document incident...must contact child protective services, my hope would be that we can find out what happened...It is a tough situation—must remove from the field and get the facts. Maybe even call school administrator to come to school. Assign someone else to run camp till get it figured out...We are mandated reporters-have to call child protective services.

Ron also seemed to have a well-planned routine for bathroom breaks as did Sue. Both indicated that adults would accompany campers to the bathroom. Ron’s campers had used portable toilets in the past but needed to use the school this summer. Sue’s campers used a concession stand bathroom and campers were always accompanied by an adult. James indicated the volleyball girls went to the restroom unattended as it was located adjacent to the gym floor.

Dan had changed camp location from the previous year and was caught totally unprepared in terms of where his campers would even be able to use a restroom. There were no portable toilets, and the school was 800 meters away and well beyond any sight lines. Asked if he would use the weeds and woods beside the creek; he said he was going to give it thought; however, he indicated he would not rent portable toilets. Sam indicated that campers could use the locker room at the football facility, but no procedures were in place for using them. Also, it was interesting to note that Sam did not know who was in attendance at the camp on the second and final night of the camp. Neither he nor any of his staff took any kind of attendance. When asked about it, he indicated that they just counted the number of boys in attendance each night and he knew that there were fewer in attendance on the second night.

Sexual abuse safeguards. The final question of each interview dealt with the camp directors’ opinions of what could be done to ensure that children and youth were safeguarded from sexual abuse at the day camps (What safeguards do you think should be in place to protect children?). All of the directors mentioned that staff members should undergo background checks. There was also mention of an awareness of bullying and/or hazing incidents and how staff members should be
on the lookout for such instances at the camp. However, even at the conclusion of
the interviews, none of the directors mentioned that a written policy/procedure
manual and/or a staff orientation might be included as a means to safeguard chil-
dren.

Conclusions

Results from this limited sample of youth sport day camp directors indicate
that camp directors are operating much as they have in the past. There has been
no effort to develop a written policy in terms of childhood sexual abuse. Nor has
there been any effort to conduct a staff orientation to prepare the staff or raise
awareness of the issue. Finally, there has been very little thought given as to how
to handle an incident of childhood sexual abuse should it occur.

Some of these responses from camp directors who indicated they would at-
tempt to question an accuser were a bit alarming in light of the USOC’s document
entitled, Recognizing, Reducing, and Responding to Misconduct in Sport: Creating
Your Strategy (2012). Their document is very clear on the issue of questioning
sexual abuse allegations. They indicate that all stakeholders must know how to
respond in an allegation instance. “It is critical that staff members and/or volun-
teers should not attempt to evaluate the credibility or validity of child physical or
sexual abuse allegations as a condition for reporting to the sport organization or
to appropriate law enforcement authorities” (p. 46).

Limitations and Future Research

There are two major limitations regarding this study. First, the sample size is
extremely limited in scope and may not give a true picture of what is happening in
other day camps. Second, the location of the day camps utilized in this study was
limited to one county school district that consisted of six high schools (including
public, private, and charter schools) in the northeast United States. Thus, one can-
not generalize the information garnered in this investigation.

Future studies might include day camp operations from other sections of the
country. Investigations might also differentiate behaviors between directors of
different sport types. For instance, are those directing cheerleading, gymnastic,
or wrestling camps more cognizant of the sexual abuse issues since their sports
involve hands-on action in terms of technical instruction? Another study might
look at precautions that male coaches might institute if they are directing an all-
female camp.

The take-away of this investigation is that youth sport day camp directors are
aware of the childhood sex abuse issue. However, from the responses obtained in
this snapshot sample, there appears to be a need for camp directors to become
more proactive in addressing the issue. Camp directors might need to be edu-
cated in the importance of policy and procedure development as means to pro-
tect campers and staff. Best practices would dictate they need to develop written
policy, complete staff orientation, develop participation agreements, and purchase insurance to ensure that children and staff are protected during camp.

Recommendations and Best Practices

Youth sport day camp directors might be well served to implement best practices recommended by professionals specializing in child abuse throughout sport (e.g., Saul & Audage, 2007) to further safeguard children and to help protect camp staff and sponsoring organizations from possible litigation. The Centers for Disease Control (Saul & Audage, 2007) and the United States Olympic Committee (2012) have also responded to the recent childhood sexual abuse crisis and developed best practices for youth sport professional to implement. Many of the national sport bodies in the United States have developed policy and procedures for their teams to implement. Ideally, staff members at all youth sport day camps would possess some type of training in the form of coaching certification (e.g., American Sport Education Program) that included appropriate behaviors in dealing with athletes. However, since many youth sport camps are staffed by non-coaches, other best practices to be implemented for the operation of a youth sport day camp might include the following:

**Background checks.** All staff members over the age of 18 should have a background check on file with the sponsoring organization. Wingate University recommends that all staff members have a background check completed within the past three years. Saul and Audage (2007) suggest camp directors conduct interview screening and reference checks for all of those staff members under the age of 18 (e.g., high school athletes).

**Policy and procedures.** All youth sport processionals specializing in the prevention of childhood sexual abuse suggest the use of a policy/procedure manual (Saul & Audage, 2007; USA Swimming, 2010, USOC, 2012). Youth sport day camp administrators should develop a written policy and procedure document that covers safety procedures and daily operation of the camp. All counselors and clinicians should be presented with a written copy. In relation to this topic, the definition of childhood sexual abuse and behaviors that are acceptable throughout the camp should be documented. The following behaviors are to be avoided in the camp setting at all times:

- sexually oriented comments, jokes, or sexual innuendos made to or about an athlete/camper, or other sexually harassing behaviors
- a coach/staff member discussing his or her sex life with an athlete/camper
- a coach/staff member asking an athlete/camper about his or her sex life
- coach/staff member requesting or sending a nude or partial-dress photo to athlete/camper
- exposing athletes/campers to pornographic material
- sending athletes/campers sexually explicit or suggestive electronic or written messages or photos (e.g., “sexting”)
deliberately exposing an athlete/camper to nudity (except in situations where locker rooms and changing areas are shared) (USOC, 2012, p. 20).

The policy manual should also outline a clear reporting structure should anyone on the staff be accused of abnormal behavior. The structure should include the chain of command as to who will be notified (e.g., family, athletic director, police, family services, etc.) if an allegation should occur (USA Swimming, 2010; USOC, 2012). All alleged incidents should be documented regardless of the scope of the claim.

**Orientation.** Camp directors should hold a brief staff orientation to discuss camp policy with all staff members. The staff should be presented a copy of the camp policy at that time (USOC, 2012). The camp director should maintain proof that each member was in attendance by having them sign and date a staff log.

**Participation agreements.** Although not directly related to childhood sexual abuse, camp directors might consider developing participation agreements for campers and their parents to sign. These types of documents seem to hold more weight in a court of law than do typical waivers (Martins, 2010). Rainer Martens (2010) notes four main points when crafting participation agreements to aid the staff and sponsoring organization should litigation occur. Make sure that the signed document indicates the campers

- understand the dangers inherent in the sport;
- appreciate the consequences of the risks involved, including possibly injury and death;
- know the rules and procedures of the sport and the importance of following them; and
- knowing all of this, request to participate in the sport (p. 493).

**Insurance.** Camp directors should purchase insurance to cover all phases of the camp operations. Many professional coaching organizations, youth sport organizations, and/or governing sport bodies offer insurance coverage at a reduced rate for their members. For instance, a coach who is a member of the National High School Coaches Association (NHSCA) can obtain camp, clinic, and tournament insurance. The rates per participant run from $2 for a one-day camp to $5.80 per participant for a five-day camp and coverage includes the following: General aggregate limit–unlimited, Each occurrence limit–$1,000,000, Personal injury–$1 million, Damage to premises–$300,000, Medical premises expenses–$5,000, Medical coach's expenses–$25,000, Sexual abuse and molestation–$1 million (aggregate–$2 million), Legal liability to participants–$1 million, and additionally, the owners and lessors of premises, sponsors, and copromoters, coaches, officials, and volunteers at the event are additionally insured for no additional fees (National High School Coaches Association, 2013).
Finally, the chances that childhood sexual abuse will occur at a youth sport day camp are minimal; however, camp directors are encouraged to take these small steps to assure the safety of the campers while simultaneously protecting the reputation of the coaches, clinicians, and counselors. The results of this research have implications for sport managers who are involved organizing and operating youth sport day camps. There are many legal, ethical, and financial issues facing camp directors in today's society. Coaches and/or others who operate day camps for their athletes should pay particular attention to the best practices listed in the text.
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Appendix A

Summer Camp Interview Survey

Name____________________________________________
Position (director, clinician, etc.) _____________________
Age ___ Sex ___ Sport___________________________
Camper Age Range________________________________
Camp Times______________________________________

Camp Goals
• What is the main purpose of the summer camp?
• What is the cost of participation? Are any participants admitted free or on a need-based tuition?
• Do you see this as a developmental camp or do you see it as a part of the technique/conditioning portion of a specific scholastic athletic program?
• Are there any intentionally designed attempts to develop the camp participant as a whole person from an affective, cognitive, and physical perspective?
• Is camp used to identify future starters/contributors?
• Is the camp open to youths from any area or is it restricted to youth in a specific school attendance area?

Safety Issues
• Is a background check on file for all adults working with campers?
• If so, who paid for the background check?
• Where is documentation for the background check being housed?
• Is there an orientation session for employees/workers/counselors/clinicians to review appropriate behaviors when working with youth?
• Is there a written document detailing how staff is to deal with hazing/bullying (campers making fun of campers)? If not how is the staff to deal with such issues?
• Are campers required to provide evidence of a physical examination within the past six months?
• Is there athletic training staff available at camp sessions?
• If not, is the staff trained in basic CPR/First Aid? How many on staff are trained?
• What is the adult-/staffer-to-camper ratio?

Insurance Issues
• Who provides insurance for the camp?
• What does the policy cost?
• What does the policy cover in terms of liability and medical coverage of the campers?
• Are campers required to provide proof of individual medical insurance?
- Do campers and their parents sign a waiver form; if so, who drafted the document and would said waiver hold up in a court of law?

**General Questions Regarding Sex Abuse**

- Has there been an increase in education/training on sexual abuse for this camp?
- Has an emphasis been placed on appropriate interactions with children? If so, what has the message been?
- Is staff more concerned with protecting themselves from liability and staying out of situations that might put them at-risk or is the priority on a legitimate, conscious attempt to protect the kids?
- In your role working with youth, are you concerned with being wrongfully alleged of abuse? Why or why not?
- If a camper approached you with allegations of abuse by an adult working the camp what would you do? (Follow-up question: Who and when would you notify as a result of such and allegation?)
- What is your policy and procedure for allowing campers to go to the restroom?
- What safeguards do you think should be in place to protect children?