

american **CAMP** association™
Committee Meeting Minutes

1. **Committee Name:** Public Policy Committee
2. **Committee Chair:** Sharon Kosch
3. **Meeting Dates:** October 17, 2005
4. **Meeting Location:** Via Teleconference
5. **Role Call:**

Committee Members Present: Sharon Kosch, Chair; Scott Brody, Don Cheley, Vance Gilmore, Darrow Milgrim, Jane Sanborn, and Ann Sheets.

Committee Members Absent: Steve Sudduth

Staff Present: Susan E. Yoder

6. **Discussion and Actions:**

A. Staffer Index: The committee reviewed the background pieces created by Kosch and Brody; and the explanation piece distributed by AMSkier. The committee discussed the need to establish the facts about what the program is and is not:

- The staffer index is not a criminal background check.
- The Staffer Index is a database that lists the names of those who worked at participating camps as well as the names of the camps and camp directors for whom they have worked. There are over 100,000 (although we have heard numbers between 40,000 and 100,000 – we cannot confirm) names on the index.

The committee discussed at length the confusion about criminal background checks and the fact that the materials from AMSkier indeed imply that the program was established because of the challenges with criminal background checks.

The topic of the potential for “hiring discrimination” issues was discussed at length. Milgrim expressed concern that especially in states like California, this type of index would potentially be illegal – especially if individuals were required to allow their names to be on the list. Brody explained that if ACA were to adopt this index, we could reject that notion and make clear that it could be optional. Discussion followed. No consensus was gained – but it was noted that it would be imperative to clarify this issue if ACA were to decide to take this over.

The committee discussed the perceived benefits to a camp to participate in the index:

- It allows a director to cross reference an applicant with the listing thus confirming or setting off red flags if the name doesn't appear in both places. Directors can call previous directors who employed the individual to get more information.
- Participation by a camp could provide evidence that it goes "above and beyond" in its staff screening process.

The committee also discussed challenges with the index:

- It is simply a list of names. There could be countless "John Smith's" in the list.
- The database is not complete. It only contains names of camps that have chosen to participate.
- In some states, there are questions about discrimination and liability that are unanswered.

Cheley noted that the organization would also have to consider an exit strategy – that is, if we did decide to do it, and after a year – determine that we don't want to continue – how would we get out?

Additional unknowns were discussed. This questions would have to be answered before we even considered taking over the program:

- Information on current costs has yet to be received. ACA would not be able to run the Index in the same manner as AMSkier. What would be the costs and human resources needed?
- Do ACA camps want this service?
- Answers to liability and privacy questions have not been answered.
 - Is it ok to require all staff that work at a camp to allow their names to be entered into the database?
 - If they chose not to work at the camp because of this, does that indicate any potentially harmful behavior on their part?
 - Is there liability to the host of the database in disputed information?
 - Does the host of the database have a legal responsibility to educate the camp in the use of the data?
 - Does the recommended use of the database fall under any state discrimination laws?
- We have no information on any past challenges.
- What is the view of other insurance companies?

B. Recommendations: The committee discussed the recommendations it wants to make to the Board:

- This is not a criminal background check issue. Therefore it is not directly public policy.
- There are issues that would need to be considered before we even decided to do.

- We need to find out if members are interested.
- We need to consider what this project would cost and whether it would be worth it.
- The ACA, NY pilot needs to be analyzed when it is completed.

C. Next Steps: Kosch and Yoder will draft a report to the Board for the committee to review. The Board meeting is this weekend.

D. Adjourn: Kosch adjourned the meeting at 12:15 pm.

7. Summary of Items Requiring Action By Staff:

- A. **Yoder** will create and distribute meeting minutes.
- B. **Yoder** will assist Kosch in developing a draft Board report.

8. Summary of Assignments to Committee Members:

- A. **Kosch** will work with Yoder to draft a report to the Board
- B. **All** will respond back to Kosch after receiving the draft Board report.

9. Summary of Motions:

None

10. Next Meeting:

November 17-19, 2005; Indianapolis

11. Minutes Submitted by:

Susan E. Yoder
October 19, 2005