

Evaluation of Camp Shriver in Six U.S. Sites

Gary N. Siperstein, Ph.D.
Gary C. Glick
Coreen M. Harada
Jennifer Norins Bardon

University of Massachusetts Boston
December 2006

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to extend our thanks to the following individuals for their assistance with data collection at the following Camp Shriver sites:

Camp Shriver Oregon

Dean Hatfield, Co-Camp Director, Camp Shriver Oregon
Ted Martch, Co-Camp Director, Camp Shriver Oregon

Camp Shriver Florida

Mark Thompson, Executive Director, Special Olympics Miami/Dade County
Evelys Ubiera, Camp Director, Camp Shriver Florida

Camp Shriver Louisiana

Pat Carpenter, CEO, Special Olympics Louisiana
Charlie Courville, Sports & Competition Director, Special Olympics Louisiana

Camp Shriver Maryland

Tom Songster, Senior Vice President of Special Projects, Special Olympics Inc.

Camp Shriver Missouri

Mark Musso, President/CEO, Special Olympics Missouri
Susan Shaffer, Competition Coordinator, Special Olympics Missouri

Camp Shriver Boston

Kari Russ, Program Coordinator, Camp Shriver Boston
Dan Needham, Camp Director, Camp Shriver Boston
Danna DiGesse Bille, Assistant Director, Camp Shriver Boston

University of Massachusetts Boston Evaluation Staff

Mariusz Bojarczuk
Kaitlin Bountress
Robin Parker, M.S.
Tari J. Selig

We would also like to extend our thanks to Anthony Roman and Carol Cosenza at the Center for Survey Research at the University of Massachusetts Boston for their assistance with questionnaire development.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	4
II.	Methods	6
III.	Results	8
IV.	Summary & Conclusions	24

I. INTRODUCTION

In today's society, summer camps are a normative life experience for children, youth, and even adults. The relatively unique nature of the summer camp experience, when compared to more structured settings that one might find in school, lends itself to providing a range of recreational and competitive experiences mixing fun and instruction. More specifically, summer camps have long been a setting for children to learn new skills, build friendships, and experience personal growth in unique ways that only an informal recreational setting such as camp can provide.

This is especially true for children and adolescents with disabilities, particularly those with intellectual disabilities (ID). A wide variety of positive outcomes are associated with participating in a camp experience for children and adolescents with ID. Research has shown improvements in the self-esteem, communication skills, and social interactions of those individuals with ID who attend camp (Brannan, Arick, & Fullerton, 1996; Marsh, 1999). Further, camps have the potential to promote friendships and improve peer relations among participants with ID who may not have this opportunity on a daily basis (Henderson, 2005). Interestingly, it has been found that even brief camps (those lasting only a few days or a week) have the potential to provide such benefits for individuals with disabilities (Brannan, Arick, Fullerton, & Harris, 2000).

Throughout the past several decades, the camp experience has expanded and diversified to include populations that historically have had limited access to such an experience. Recently there has been a growing trend in the implementation of camps to include individuals both with and without disabilities (Brannan, Arick, Fullerton, & Harris, 1997). Such camps stress the importance of recognizing similarities among all children who participate (Rothman, 2001). A number of benefits that may be uniquely attributable to this inclusive structure have been found for participants with ID. For example, inclusive camp experiences have been shown to increase independence and resourcefulness of children and adolescents with ID (Brannan & Fullerton, 1999). Further, because such experiences provide opportunities for a broader range of social interactions, improvements in social skills have also been noted (Mulvihill, Cotton, & Gyaben, 2004). Inclusive camps also provide participants without ID (i.e., partners, staff) the opportunity to develop a more realistic understanding of, and more positive attitudes towards, individuals with ID (Mulvihill et al., 2004).

One of the oldest examples of a camp for individuals with ID dates back to the summer of 1962 when Eunice Kennedy Shriver invited 35 boys and girls with ID to her home in Rockville, Maryland to participate in a camp. Camp Shriver, as it is known today, became an annual event through the 1960s. This groundbreaking camp served as the impetus for the Special Olympics movement, which has since grown to reach more than 2 million athletes worldwide.

Camp Shriver, as described in an original Special Olympics concept paper is, "a place for people with intellectual disabilities to learn new sports skills, participate in individual and team sports, and build friendships..." (see Appendix A). The goals of the camp are as follows:

- To provide new sports and other opportunities for all participants as well as to strengthen existing sports camp experiences for people with intellectual disabilities.

- To create an atmosphere of understanding, learning, and sharing so that new friendships between athletes and their partners are created and continue to thrive once camp is over.

In the summer of 2006, five new Camp Shriver sports camps were implemented throughout the United States, in addition to the camp run at Mrs. Shriver's home in Maryland. These sites included camps in Florida, Oregon, Louisiana, Missouri, and Massachusetts. In partnership with Special Olympics, Inc., the Special Olympics Global Collaborating Center at the University of Massachusetts Boston conducted an evaluation of the six Camp Shriver sports camps that were implemented during the Summer of 2006. The goals of the evaluation were:

1. To document the implementation of the six Camp Shriver sites;
2. To document the impact of the camp experience on campers with intellectual disabilities and, unique to the Boston site, on the participating campers without intellectual disabilities; and,
3. To document the impact of the camp experience on volunteers, counselors, and partners.

II. METHODS

The Camp Shriver evaluation focused on the following sites: Coral Gables, Florida; Roseburg, Oregon; Baton Rouge, Louisiana; Potomac, Maryland; St. Peters, Missouri; and Boston, Massachusetts. The objectives of the evaluation included documenting the implementation of Camp Shriver, assessing change in camper sport skills at each site, and assessing the impact of the experience on volunteers, staff, and partners. To evaluate the implementation of each camp, we designed a series of survey instruments and forms to obtain information about each camp from camp directors, volunteers/counselors, coaches, and campers. Below is a brief description of the evaluation activities.

A. Instruments to Document Camp Operations

A pre-camp survey for camp directors was developed to assess the structure and implementation of each camp (see Appendix B). The survey focused on the proposed duration and scope of camp sessions, activities, facilities, resources, and overall goals. This survey was distributed to camp directors by electronic mail prior to the start of each camp. In addition to the survey, directors were personally interviewed via telephone at the conclusion of each camp. This interview focused on how the camp was actually implemented and how the implementation of each camp differed from the outline in the pre-camp survey (see Appendix C). The post interview also addressed the successes and challenges that each site faced. Collectively, the pre-camp survey and post-camp interview provided a rich amount of information about each camp.

Logs were developed for camp staff to note daily activities (both sport and non-sport), interactions between campers and partners, and interactions among campers themselves. The counselor logs (see Appendix D) were intended to be filled out by counselors (i.e., team leaders) once per day. The logs included spaces for counselors to indicate whether or not a given sport was played during the morning or afternoon session, the length of the session, and what activities were included during the sport lesson (e.g., drills, scrimmage). Counselors also were asked to describe what non-sport activities were conducted each day. Following each description, counselors were asked to note the level of camper participation in each activity, the level of interaction (both positive and negative) among and between campers, and the level of interaction (both positive and negative) among and between campers and partners. This was done for both sport and non-sport activities.

B. Instruments to Assess Impact on Campers

Skill assessment forms (adapted from SO) were used to assess basketball, soccer, kickball, and swimming (see Appendix E). The forms were designed to assess each camper individually. Assessments were intended to be given once at the beginning and once at the end of camp. In each sport, coaches and/or counselors were given the opportunity to rate campers on specific skill components, pertinent to each sport, on a scale from 0 to 5. The following table indicates the value to which each skill level corresponds.

Table 1. Sport skill component ratings.

Rating	Level of Skill Demonstration
0	No opportunity to perform skill
1	Could not perform skill at all
2	Performed skill with assistance (verbal & demonstration)
3	Performed skill with verbal assistance only
4	Performed skill proficiently, needs practice
5	Mastered skill

Depending on the sport, each assessment form contained 4 or 5 skill components on which campers could be rated. Basketball was composed of four skill components: dribbling, passing, shooting, and team play. Soccer was composed of five skill components: control/receiving, dribbling, passing, shooting, and tackling. Kickball was composed of five skill components: kicking, running, fielding, throwing, and team play. Swimming was composed of five skill components: learning to swim, freestyle, backstroke, breaststroke, and butterfly. In addition to these formal assessments, counselors were given the opportunity to indicate whether they saw “a lot,” “a little,” or “no change” in the sports skills of campers in a post-camp survey.

A brief survey was developed to administer to campers at the conclusion of the camp (see Appendix F). This survey included items that assessed camper perceptions of their improvement in sport skills and their perceptions of the camp in general. Prior involvement in sports and SO programming were assessed as well. In addition, campers were asked at the end of the survey if they wanted to come back to Camp Shriver next year.

For Camp Shriver Boston, a sociometric interview guide was developed for individual interviews conducted with each camper during the last two days of camp (see Appendix G). [Note: Camp Shriver Boston included campers both with and without intellectual disabilities.] During the interview, campers were asked 2 questions to assess their social relationships at camp: “Who do you like to play with at camp?” and “Did you make any new friends at camp?” Two additional questions (i.e., “What was your favorite sport at camp?” and “What was your favorite thing at camp?”) were also asked during each interview. All questions were asked in an open-ended manner, which allowed campers to provide multiple responses to each question. This was done to ensure that each camper had the opportunity to give as complete a response as possible. In addition to camper interviews, counselors at Camp Shriver Boston were asked in a post-camp assessment whether they saw “a lot,” “a little,” or “no change” in the following aspects of camper behavior: self-esteem/self-confidence, social skills, and ability/ease in making friends.

C. Instruments to Assess Impact on Volunteers, Counselors and Coaches

Two survey instruments were developed for volunteers, counselors, and coaches (see Appendix H). The first (pre-camp) survey assessed demographic information, experience and perceptions of individuals with ID, and past experience with SO. The second (post-camp) survey also assessed perceptions of individuals with ID in an attempt to determine whether or not such perceptions changed after participating in the camp. In addition, the post-camp survey included items on training and orientation sessions, team and camp dynamics, improvement among

campers, and perceptions of camp programming. Staff were also asked open-ended questions pertaining to the challenges they faced during the camp experience, as well as their interest in future participation in Camp Shriver.

The post-camp survey also included items for coaches that assessed the coaches' roles and the structure of their sport lessons, as well as the involvement of counselors in sport lessons. Coaches were also asked how they assessed camper sport participation and how useful they found such assessments to be. As with volunteers and counselors, coaches were asked to indicate and elaborate upon the challenges they faced during the camp experience and to indicate their interest in returning to coach at Camp Shriver next year.

III. RESULTS

A. Implementation of Camp Shriver

1. Implementation: *Camp Shriver Florida*

Camp Shriver Florida was carried out in one ten-day session from July 24 to July 28 and July 31 to August 4, 2006. All activities were held at the Merrick Education Center and the adjacent, city-owned Phillips Park in Coral Gables, Florida. Twenty-nine campers ranging in age from 14 to 22 participated in the camp. Of these 29 campers, 10 were female and 19 were male. Most of the athletes in the camp were characterized as high functioning, however, approximately 6 of the campers could be characterized as more severely impaired. Several campers who attended had been previously diagnosed with autism or Down Syndrome, yet these campers ranged considerably in terms of their level of functioning. Campers were recruited from the greater Miami-Dade County area, and all had previous experience in SO.

Thirty-two volunteers served as partners. These partners ranged in age from 15 to 19 and were recruited from local high schools throughout the Miami-Dade County area. Special attention was given to recruiting partners who had prior experience with SO and in working with individuals with ID. Partners were given a 90-minute orientation session on the first day of camp. Only the more impaired campers were matched with partners in one-on-one pairings. All campers were assigned to one of 4 teams based on age and sports skills. Each team included 6 to 9 campers and a similar number of partners. The focus in this camp was on creating teams that worked well with each other in sports and other activities as opposed to a series of camper-partner dyads.

Staff at Camp Shriver Florida included a camp director and 4 coaches who were current Special Olympic coaches recruited from area schools. Coaches were given a two-hour orientation regarding the skills they would be teaching to campers, the schedule of the camp, and how to fill out sport assessments. Each of the 4 coaches was responsible for the supervision and assessment of a team of campers and partners. Coaches followed their teams from sport to sport and were not responsible for one specific sport. Partners with a significant background in a sport offered at camp stayed at the same sport throughout the entire day.

Campers received daily sports instruction in basketball, softball, and soccer. Swimming lessons were carried out several times throughout the duration of the camp at an off-site facility. Lessons in all sports were carried out in the teams outlined previously. Campers and volunteers were also provided lunches donated by camp sponsors. In addition, camp programming included field trips, arts and crafts, tennis, and opening and closing ceremonies. Campers were responsible for their own transportation to and from camp. This posed a challenge for several families, as many campers lived up to 40 miles from the camp site.

2. Implementation: *Camp Shriver Oregon*

Camp Shriver Oregon was carried out in one eight-day session from July 10 to July 13 and July 17 to July 20, 2006. All activities were held at the Central Douglas County YMCA in Roseburg, Oregon. Twenty-eight campers ranging in age from 8 to 21 participated in the camp. Of the 28 campers, 15 were male and 13 were female. Impairment levels of campers ranged from mild ID to more severe impairments (i.e., Noonan's syndrome, Fragile X syndrome, lower-functioning autism). Campers were recruited from schools and local Special Olympic programs with 50% of campers having previous experience in SO. Campers were assigned to two teams (i.e., Team A and Team B) for sport lessons based on age. Team A was comprised of 15 campers ranging in age from 14 to 21 while Team B had 13 campers ranging in age from 8 to 14.

Thirty-nine partners also participated in the camp. Partners were recruited from preexisting "Partner Clubs" within local schools¹ and ranged in age from 10 to 18. Partners were matched with campers based on age and school, so that partners and athletes might have the potential to extend their relationship beyond the two-week camp. More severely impaired campers were paired with 2 partners, thus accounting for a high partner to camper ratio. Prior to the first week of camp, partners participated in a full day of orientation, which focused on background information regarding SO and intellectual disabilities, as well as how to interact and play sports with people with ID. Training was based loosely on the *So Get into It*TM curriculum.

Staff at Camp Shriver Oregon included 2 camp directors, 2 counselors, and 4 coaches. Camp directors programmed and implemented daily activities as well as supervised the overall operation of the camp. Each counselor was responsible for the general supervision of his/her team. The coaches directed the various sport lessons. All staff were recruited from schools, community centers, and local SO programs. Roughly 75 volunteers also assisted throughout the duration of the camp with various aspects of camp programming as needed. However, only some of these volunteers (approximately 15 to 20) were present for the majority of the camp, while most assisted on a day-to-day basis.

Campers received daily sports instruction in basketball, soccer, and kickball. Swimming lessons were held less frequently as facilities were off-site and not as readily available. Camp programming also included special events such as, fishing, hiking, a game day, and introductory lessons in tennis, golf, and bocce. Campers also received a Healthy Athletes screening. SO Oregon scheduled camp to coincide with its extended school-year plan, which allowed students

¹ "Partner Clubs" are school-based organizations for students without ID to program special events and fundraisers for students with ID in conjunction with the local SO program. Such schools may also have Sport Partnership Programs where physical Education is conducted in an inclusive setting, similar to Unified Sports.

to be transported directly to the camp from schools. This also provided for district-funded personal assistants to follow more severely impaired children from classrooms to camp. In addition, a partnership with the local YMCA allowed Camp Shriver Oregon access to high-quality sports facilities and increased community exposure.

3. Implementation: *Camp Shriver Louisiana*

Camp Shriver Louisiana was carried out in two separate five-day sessions from July 31 to August 4 and August 7 to August 11, 2006. All activities were held at the Paul G. Manship YMCA in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. During the first week, 44 campers (29 males and 15 females) participated in the camp. During the second week, 21 campers (12 males and 8 females) participated in the camp. Campers had the option to sign up for both weeks, ten of which did. In both camps, campers ranged in age from 12 to 35, while most of the campers were 18 or older. Impairment levels of campers ranged from mild to moderate intellectual disabilities, while approximately 5 campers had more severe impairments. Campers were recruited from schools, group homes, and local SO programs. All campers had previous experience in SO.

Twenty-seven partners participated in camp. Partners were recruited from the special education department at Louisiana State University (LSU), most of which were present for both weeks of camp. These partners received course credit in special education for their participation in the camp. Partners were given a two-hour orientation prior to camp to discuss the history and goals behind Camp Shriver, the agenda and expectations for the upcoming weeks of camp, and how to deal with risk management issues. In the first week, most partners were not individually matched with campers in one-on-one relationships, and only in the case of more impaired campers did this occur. Instead, partners and campers were assigned to teams based on their personality types, as determined by camp staff. In the second week, when there was roughly a one-to-one ratio of campers to partners, one-on-one matches were easier to facilitate within the context of such teams.

Staff at Camp Shriver Louisiana included 5 sports clinicians (i.e., coaches), 5 group leaders, and a camp director. All staff were present at the orientation for partners and each sport clinician was responsible for the supervision of one of the camp's five sports. These clinicians were recruited from the Department of Special Education at LSU, just as partners were. Five of the 27 partners were recommended by LSU staff to serve as group leaders (i.e., counselors). These individuals were each responsible for the supervision of one of the five teams as they rotated through different sport lessons and activities throughout the day. Additional volunteers, many of which were family members of campers and partners, came in to assist with general aspects of camp (i.e., registration, serving food) on a day-to-day basis.

Campers received daily sport lessons in swimming, softball, soccer, bocce, and tennis. These lessons were all carried out in team settings. Each team rotated from sport to sport throughout the day and campers stayed with their team for all sport lessons. Camp programming also included opening and closing ceremonies, a family picnic, and a Healthy Athletes screening. Campers were responsible for their own transportation to and from camp, which posed a problem for several campers who lived outside the Baton Rouge area.

4. Implementation: *Camp Shriver Maryland*

Camp Shriver Maryland was carried out in three five-day sessions from July 10 to July 14, July 17 to July 21, and July 24 to July 28, 2006. All sessions were held at the residence of Mrs. Eunice Kennedy Shriver in Potomac, Maryland. Approximately 50 campers attended the first two weeks, while approximately 40 attended the third week. One unique aspect of Camp Shriver Maryland was that it did not have a closed enrollment policy; campers could join at any time throughout the three weeks. This allowed for some campers to attend one week and others to attend multiple weeks of camp based on their individual schedules.

Campers ranged in age from 8 to 35 and most were between the ages of 10 and 20. Most campers had mild to moderate intellectual disabilities, while several of the campers had more severe impairments (i.e., autism). In addition, several campers had vision and hearing impairments. All campers were recruited from local schools, community centers, and SO programs in Maryland, Virginia, and Washington, D.C. Almost all (78%) of campers had previous experience in SO. To facilitate sport lessons, campers were initially grouped into 4 teams based primarily on age. As camp progressed, these teams were altered by level of sport skill so that campers could participate in groups at a level most suitable to them. Teams were also rearranged as the weeks went on due to variation in attendance from week to week.

Campers were paired with partners based on age. The age range of partners was similar to that of campers. Throughout camp, the ratio of campers to volunteers was roughly one partner to every camper. In the case of more severely impaired campers, two partners might be matched with a camper. Partners were sometimes alternated to provide a better match with campers, and in the case where a partner might not be available to volunteer for the entire length of camp.

Staff at Camp Shriver Maryland included a camp director, 2 assistant camp managers, 4 sport directors, and 4 team leaders. The camp director and assistant camp managers organized and supervised the overall operation of the camp. Sport directors each supervised lessons in a given sport with the help of at least two assistant sport directors. Team leaders were each responsible for supervising one of the four teams, while 2 or 3 counselors-in training (usually younger and less experienced volunteers) were available to each team for assistance.

A number of general volunteers were also present at the camp to assist as needed. These volunteers often were present on a day-to-day basis, with most present for at least 3 or 4 camp days, to assist with specific camp operations as needed. Camp Shriver Maryland has a strong volunteer base from which it is able to draw support from annually. Volunteer staff and prior camp volunteers are recruited mostly from Montgomery County, Maryland-area SO programs, local schools, and community organizations (i.e., Archdiocese of Washington). Many youth volunteers were able to fulfill a community service requirement through participation in the camp and, as was the case with several other Camp Shriver sites, many expressed interest in returning to volunteer next year.

Staff were provided with intensive training prior to the start of camp. The camp director, assistant camp managers, and sports staff all participated in roughly 20 hours of on-site training, which covered the Camp Shriver curriculum. Volunteers, team leaders, and counselors-in-

training participated in two 4-hour training sessions prior to the start of camp, which covered much of the camp curriculum. Staff also had the opportunity to meet several of the campers already involved with SO at these training sessions. A two-hour training session was conducted on-site at the start of each week of camp for general volunteers.

Campers received daily sports instruction in swimming, basketball, soccer, and kickball. All sports lessons were carried out in team settings and campers rotated from sport to sport in one hour increments throughout the day. Campers, along with their partners, also had the opportunity to participate in less structured activities such as bocce ball, capture the flag, softball, and volleyball. Simple games, such as “Duck-duck-goose,” were also common and gave the campers and partners an opportunity to interact in a more informal social setting. Campers and their families were responsible for their own transportation to and from camp activities.

5. Implementation: *Camp Shriver Missouri*

Camp Shriver Missouri was carried out from July 24 to July 28 and July 30 to August 3, 2006 in St. Peters, MO. The director of the camp provided information about the camp’s implementation in the director survey given prior to camp. However, no additional information from the director, volunteers, counselors, or coaches was received. Therefore, because of the lack of data on the actual implementation of the camp and the lack of information about the camp’s impact on campers and staff, the Camp Shriver Missouri pilot site was not included in any of the subsequent data analyses.

6. Implementation: *Camp Shriver Boston*

Camp Shriver Boston was carried out in one ten-day session from July 17 to July 21 and July 24 to July 28, 2006. All activities were held at University of Massachusetts Boston facilities. Fifty-two campers ranging in age from 8 to 12 participated in the camp. Half of the campers were children with ID and the other half were children without ID. Rather than utilizing the “partner” concept, every child was considered an equal-status camper, regardless of whether they had an intellectual disability. It is important to note that none of the children with ID had previous experience in SO.

Staff at Camp Shriver Boston consisted of a camp director, an assistant director, a program coordinator, 4 sports coaches, 12 counselors, 5 counselors-in-training, and one lifeguard. In addition, 7 volunteers were recruited to assist in various aspects of the camp as needed. Staff were recruited from universities, local public school systems, and via the Internet. Two counselors and 1 counselor-in-training were responsible for supervising a team of approximately 9 campers. All staff members participated in two days of intensive orientation and training where they engaged in team-building activities, received an orientation on the history of Camp Shriver, toured camp facilities, and learned about intellectual disabilities.

Campers were grouped into 6 teams of approximately 9 campers. Teams were selected to have an equal balance between males and females, as well as campers with and without ID. This team structure is considered a best practice of inclusive programming. Both children with and without ID were identified, screened, and selected from the same schools and neighborhoods (i.e.,

Boston, Brockton, and Cambridge). The camp director reviewed the individual education plans (IEP) of the campers with ID to identify any unique challenges the child might have in adjusting to camp and participating in camp activities. When the teams of counselors were given their list of campers, they were not informed which campers had ID and which campers did not. In fact, only one of the camp administrators knew the disability status of all 52 campers. One week prior to camp, counselors called the parents of each camper to introduce themselves and to give parents the opportunity to talk about their child.

Campers received daily sports instruction in basketball, soccer, and swimming every morning of camp. Lessons in each of the three sports were administered by one coach, with the exception of swimming, which was administered by two coaches. Afternoon programming included less structured activities (i.e., recess-style play, free swim, yoga, arts and crafts). Camp programming also included two field trips and opening and closing ceremonies. Campers were transported to and from camp in buses provided by the camp. Campers were also given breakfast, lunch, and a snack each day of camp.

B. Camp Shriver’s Impact on Sports Skills

For each sport, skill component scores were summed to compute total scores. In basketball, team play was removed from analysis due to the high number of missing assessments. In soccer, tackling was removed from analysis for the same reason. One of the camps (Florida) modified the assessment designated to assess kickball for assessment in softball. The only difference between the two assessments was that the skill component “kicking” replaced “hitting.” Also, team play was removed from analysis in softball due to the high number of assessments in which it was left blank. An alternate swimming assessment was given at Camp Shriver Boston due to the need to expand the assessment to the lower end of the skill continuum. The alternate swimming assessment was composed of the following components: getting in the water, floating, gliding, paddling, deep end, and freestyle.

The total scores for each sport were used to create ability level groupings, which are displayed in Table 2. The use of such ability groups provides a useful way to sort campers based on initial sport ability, allowing us to further depict the extent to which campers improved in sport skills, particularly those campers at lower ability levels.

Table 2. Sport ability groupings for each sport.

Sport Ability Level	Basketball	Soccer	Softball	Kickball
Beginner	0 to 3	0 to 4	0 to 4	0 to 5
Rookie	4 to 7	5 to 9	5 to 9	6 to 11
Winner	8 to 11	10 to 14	10 to 14	12 to 18
Superstar	12 to 15	15 to 20	15 to 20	19 to 25

The following is a description of the results of the sport assessments for each of the sports in which sites chose to program lessons. At Camp Shriver Florida and Camp Shriver Oregon, sport assessments were made once at the beginning of camp (pre) and once at the end (post). At Camp Shriver Boston, basketball assessments were administered four times while soccer and

swimming assessments were administered three times. The final assessment was used as the post assessment in all sports. Difference scores were computed by subtracting pre from post scores on both total raw scores and ability levels. Camp Shriver Louisiana and Camp Shriver Maryland used alternate sport assessment forms that were not viable to detect change in camper ability levels, thus they were dropped from the analysis.

1. Sports Skills: *Camp Shriver Florida*

Camp Shriver Florida held sport lessons in basketball, soccer, softball, and swimming. Data was obtained on the camper’s initial sport ability during the first two days of camp. These ratings are presented in Table 3. Swimming lessons were infrequent due to a lack of consistently available facilities, thus swimming was dropped from subsequent analyses.

Table 3. Mean pre sport skill ability: Camp Shriver Florida.

	N	Mean (SD)
Basketball	24	10.00 (2.52)
Soccer	28	11.96 (3.95)
Softball	28	9.82 (2.34)

To assess the impact of sport lessons on sport ability, pre and post means were compared on the total scores in each of the three sports. Of the 29 campers, pre and post assessment data was available for 19 campers in basketball, 27 campers in soccer, and 28 campers in softball. Campers exhibited significant improvement in soccer ($t = -3.07, p < .01$) and softball ($t = -9.69, p < .001$) over the course of the two week camp. Cohen’s d indicates a small to moderate effect size in soccer ($d = -.37, r = -.18$) and a large effect size in softball ($d = -.98, r = -.44$).² Basketball scores did not change significantly from pre to post assessments ($t = -.58, n.s.$). Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 4. These results are further supported by post-camp surveys completed by volunteers, 91% of which indicated that they saw improvement in the sports skills of campers over the course of camp.

Table 4. Mean pre and post sport skill ability ratings: * Camp Shriver Florida

	N	Mean (SD)
Basketball		
Pre	19	9.95 (2.61)
Post	19	10.26 (2.98)
Soccer		
Pre	27	11.96 (4.02)
Post	27	13.33 (3.26)
Softball		
Pre	28	9.82 (2.34)

² Cohen’s d is calculated as the difference between means for two groups divided by the pooled within-group standard deviation. Therefore, Cohen’s d indicates how many D units the means differ; Cohen (1988) identified d values of 0.2, 0.5, and 0.8 as small, medium, and large effect sizes, respectively.

Post 28 12.43 (2.94)

*This data is only provided on campers who had both a pre and post assessment.

Another way to depict improvement among campers is through the use of ability level groupings. These ability levels were computed by calculating four ranges for the total scores of individual skill components, as outlined previously in Table 1 and Table 2. The percentage of campers at each skill level at the pre and post assessments is displayed in Table 5.

Table 5. Pre and Post sport skill ability level groupings: * Camp Shriver Florida.

N	Pre Assessment	Post Assessment
Basketball Ability Level		
Beginner	0%	0%
Rookie	21%	22%
Winner	46%	30%
Superstar	33%	48%
Soccer Ability Level		
Beginner	4%	4%
Rookie	25%	7%
Winner	32%	33%
Superstar	39%	56%
Softball Ability Level		
Beginner	4%	4%
Rookie	39%	7%
Winner	54%	64%
Superstar	4%	25%

*This data is only provided on campers who had both a pre and post assessment.

Of particular interest was the percentage of campers who improved enough in a particular sport to move up to a higher ability level. In the sports where the total score increase was significant (e.g., soccer and softball), the percentage of campers who improved an entire ability level was much greater (37% and 57%, respectively) than it was in basketball, where the total score increase was not significant (16%). Also, in soccer and softball, the percentage of campers at the “Rookie” level dramatically decreased from pre to post assessment while the percentage at the “Superstar” level dramatically increased.

2. Sports Skills: *Camp Shriver Oregon*

Camp Shriver Oregon held sport lessons in basketball, soccer, kickball, and swimming. Data from swimming assessments were not included in subsequent analyses due to frequent instances where skill components were not able to be assessed. Initial sport skill assessments were obtained from campers during the first two days of camp and are displayed in Table 6.

Table 6. Mean pre sport skill ability: Camp Shriver Oregon.

	N	Mean (SD)
Basketball	26	7.38 (2.48)
Soccer	20	9.65 (3.41)
Kickball	25	16.08 (3.64)

Sport skill assessments were conducted again during the last two days of camp. Of the 28 campers, pre and post assessment data was obtained from 24 campers in basketball, 18 campers in soccer, and 25 campers in kickball. Results show that campers exhibited significant improvements in basketball ($t = -4.371$, $p < .001$), soccer ($t = -6.01$, $p < .001$), and kickball ($t = -5.43$, $p < .001$). Means and standard deviations are displayed in Table 7. Cohen's d indicates a moderate effect size for basketball ($d = -.51$, $r = -.25$), a moderate to large effect size for soccer ($d = -.75$, $r = -.35$) and a small to moderate effect size for kickball ($d = -.36$, $r = -.18$).

Table 7. Mean pre and post sport skill ability ratings: * Camp Shriver Oregon

	N	Mean (SD)
Basketball		
Pre	24	7.67 (2.35)
Post	24	8.83 (2.20)
Soccer		
Pre	18	10.11 (3.23)
Post	18	12.22 (2.29)
Kickball		
Pre	25	16.08 (3.64)
Post	25	17.40 (3.69)

*This data is only provided on campers for which we have both a pre and post assessment.

As with Camp Shriver Florida, ability levels were used to illustrate the extent to which individual campers improved from the beginning to the end of camp. The percentage of campers at each ability level at the pre and post assessments is displayed in Table 8.

Of particular interest was the percentage of campers who improved enough in a particular sport to move up an entire ability level. In basketball, 42% of campers improved an entire ability level from the pre to post assessment. In soccer, 39% of campers improved an entire ability level while in kickball, 36% of campers exhibited this level of improvement. It is also interesting to note that the percentage of campers at the "Beginner" and "Rookie" levels of achievement decreased in all three sports (with the exception of one "Beginner" camper in kickball) from pre to post and that the percentage of campers at the "Superstar" level increased in all three sports. This is encouraging because it provides support for marked improvement among campers who entered camp with relatively low sports ability.

Table 8. Pre and post sport skill ability level groupings: Camp Shriver Oregon.

N	Pre Assessment	Post Assessment
Basketball Ability Level*		
Beginner	8%	4%
Rookie	46%	17%
Winner	42%	67%
Superstar	4%	12%
Soccer Ability Level*		
Beginner	10%	0%
Rookie	30%	8%
Winner	50%	56%
Superstar	10%	36%
Kickball Ability Level*		
Beginner	4%	4%
Rookie	12%	4%
Winner	60%	38%
Superstar	24%	54%

*This data is only provided on campers who had both a pre and post assessment.

Another interesting finding with respect to sports skills is that the campers themselves felt as if they improved through participation in the camp. In basketball, 67% of campers indicated some improvement over the course of camp. In soccer this figure was 89% and in kickball 85% of campers indicated some improvement. Also, 82% of campers felt that they improved in swimming even though swimming lessons were only held a few times throughout camp. Finally, roughly three-fourths of all campers (74%) indicated that they learned how to play a new sport while at Camp Shriver.

3. Sports Skills: *Camp Shriver Louisiana*

While Camp Shriver Louisiana held regular sport lessons in swimming, soccer, softball, bocce, and tennis, an alternate sport skill assessment form was used that did not allow for the depiction of change in the campers' sports skills over time. However, evidence from both campers and counselors in post-camp surveys indicate that campers improved significantly in multiple sports. Strikingly, 95% of campers indicated improvement in swimming while 90% indicated improvement in soccer. In addition, 79% of campers indicated that they learned a new sport while at camp.

4. Sports Skills: *Camp Shriver Maryland*

Camp Shriver Maryland held sport lessons in swimming, basketball, soccer, and kickball yet the camp chose not to use the sport skill assessment forms provided by the evaluation team. The assessments used by the camp often only listed the first names of campers and were not dated, thus making it difficult to assess change in camper sport skills over time. However, based on

post-camp data received from campers and counselors there is much evidence to support the notion that the camp had a positive impact on the sport skills of its participants. In a post-camp survey, 78% of campers indicated some improvement in swimming, 87% indicated some improvement in basketball, 78% indicated some improvement in soccer, and 96% indicated some improvement in kickball. In addition, 52% of campers learned a new sport while at camp.

5. Sports Skills: *Camp Shriver Boston*

Camp Shriver Boston held sport lessons in basketball, soccer, and swimming. However, swimming assessments were not filled out completely by coaches, thus they were not used in subsequent analysis. Initial sport skill ratings are provided in Table 9.

Table 9. Mean pre sport skill ability: Camp Shriver Boston.

	N	Mean (SD)
Basketball	24	9.71 (2.07)
Soccer	22	11.48 (1.88)

Sport assessments were completed 4 times throughout the camp for basketball and 3 times throughout the camp for soccer. To illustrate whether campers improved from the beginning of camp, initial and final assessments in each sport were used as pre and post tests, respectively. In basketball, there was significant improvement between pre and post ability scores for campers with ID ($t = -4.24$, $p < .001$). Cohen’s d indicates a moderate to large effect size ($d = -.75$, $r = -.35$). In soccer, there was also significant improvement among campers with ID ($t = -4.51$, $p < .001$). Cohen’s d indicates a large effect size ($d = -.98$, $r = -.44$). Means and standard deviations for pre and post skill ratings in both sports are presented in Table 10. These results are further supported by post-camp surveys completed by counselors, all of which (100%) indicated that they saw improvement in the sports skills of campers over the course of camp.

Table 10. Mean pre and post sport skill ability ratings for campers with ID: Camp Shriver Boston.

	N	Mean (SD)
Basketball		
Pre	23	9.61 (2.06)
Post	23	10.96 (1.49)
Soccer		
Pre	22	11.27 (1.64)
Post	22	13.23 (2.31)

As with the other camps, the percentage of campers who improved enough in a particular sport to move up an entire ability level was of particular importance. The percentage of campers in each skill level at the pre and post assessments is displayed in Table 11. In basketball, 35% of campers moved up an entire ability level from initial to final assessment. It is interesting to note that all campers in the “Rookie” ability level at the pre assessment moved up to the subsequent

“Winner” level when assessed again at the conclusion of the camp. Similar to basketball, 41% of campers moved up an entire ability level from pre to post assessment in soccer.

Table 11. Pre and post sport skill ability level groupings: * Camp Shriver Boston.

N	Initial Assessment	Final Assessment
Basketball Ability Level		
Beginner	0%	0%
Rookie	17%	0%
Winner	58%	65%
Superstar	25%	35%
Soccer Ability Level		
Beginner	0%	0%
Rookie	13%	9%
Winner	83%	61%
Superstar	4%	30%

*This data is only provided on campers who had both a pre and post assessment.

Because Camp Shriver Boston was a totally inclusive camp, we had the unique opportunity to explore the differences between campers with and without ID in sports skills. Surprisingly, we found no differences in basketball ability between the two groups of campers at the pre assessment ($t = 1.53, n.s.$). However, in soccer there was a significant difference in skill ability at the pre assessment, with campers without ID performing higher than campers with ID ($t = 2.75, p < .01$). Of greater importance is the finding that campers with ID improved in their soccer skill level and reached the initial skill level of campers without ID. That is, after the two weeks of camp, campers with ID “caught up” to campers without ID in soccer skills.

Another benefit of the inclusive model is that it provides opportunities for campers without ID to benefit in ways similar to campers with ID. Like campers with ID, campers without ID displayed significant improvement in soccer ability over the course of camp ($t = -3.80, p < .001$). The finding that both campers with and without ID can improve at similar rates in a recreational sports program, as was the case in soccer, demonstrates the value and strength of the inclusionary model in improving sports skills for all campers.

C. Camp Shriver’s Impact on Social Relationships

To assess whether the camp met its goal of providing an inclusive atmosphere for children with and without ID, campers were asked to nominate the other campers who they liked to play with and those who are they made new friends with while at camp. These nominations were made in response to the questions “Who do you like to play with at camp?” and “Did you make any new friends at camp?” The results from the camper’s responses to the two questions showed that campers with ID received the same number of nominations to “play with” ($t = .75, n.s.$) and the same number of nomination as “new friends” as campers without ID ($t = .53, n.s.$). In fact, 62% of the campers with ID and 79% of campers without ID received 3 or more nominations for

“new friend.” Overall, campers with ID and campers without ID were equally accepted by their peers. Mean nominations for both groups are presented in Table 12.

In assessing the presence of social inclusion at Camp Shriver Boston we also looked at the types of nominations given by campers with and without ID. Campers with and without ID nominated their fellow campers at equal rates, to both “play with” and as “new friends,” irrespective of whether or not they had ID ($t = 1.39, n.s$; $t = 1.40, n.s$, respectively). For example, campers without ID were just as likely to nominate campers with ID and campers with ID were just as likely to nominate campers without ID. In addition, 24 of the 28 campers without ID nominated at least one camper with ID.

Table 12. Mean nominations received by campers with and without ID.

	Campers With ID M (SD)	Campers Without ID M (SD)
N	24	28
“Who do you like to play with at camp?”	2.63 (1.79)	2.96 (1.48)
“Did you make any new friends at camp?”	1.75 (1.11)	1.93 (1.30)

While camper nominations were not affected by disability status, as expected, they were affected by gender. Boys mostly nominated boys while girls mostly nominated girls. When asked to indicate who they like to play with at camp, the number of nominations given within gender was significantly higher than camper nominations given between genders ($t = 5.93, p < .001$). This trend also appeared when campers were asked to indicate who their new friends were at camp ($t = 3.70, p < .001$). Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 13.

Table 13. Mean nominations given within and outside of campers’ gender: All campers.

	Within Gender M (SD)	Across Gender M (SD)
N	52	52
“Who do you like to play with at camp?”	2.04 (1.19)	.79 (1.02)
“Did you make any new friends at camp?”	1.33 (1.28)	.52 (.83)

D. Camp Shriver’s Impact on Staff and Volunteers

Pre-camp and post-camp surveys were given to volunteers to assess the impact of the camp on their perceptions and understandings of individuals with ID. Results from two of the camps (Camp Shriver Louisiana and Camp Shriver Oregon), are not presented here due to a lack of sufficient information needed to present an accurate representation of camp volunteers.

Of the 32 volunteers from Camp Shriver Florida, we received 24 pre-camp surveys and 22 post-camp surveys. In general, staff/volunteers had very positive perceptions of individuals with ID. At the pre-camp assessment, an overwhelming majority of counselors (over 80%) indicated that

they thought individuals with ID were capable of playing on a sports team with non-ID teammates, understanding the rules of a competitive sports game, and making friends with campers without ID. These perceptions remained positive at the conclusion of the camp. In addition, 77% of volunteers indicated that they had learned something new about individuals with ID. Of those, almost all made some reference to either recognizing the similarities between those with ID and without ID, or gaining a new appreciation of the capabilities of those with ID. Responses included comments such as, “I learned that kids with intellectual disabilities are not so different from us,” “people really underestimate their abilities, both physical and intellectual,” and “they are just like me or any other person.”

Like Camp Shriver Florida, Camp Shriver Maryland found the camp to have a similar impact on its volunteers and staff. Of the approximately 100 volunteers at Camp Shriver Maryland, we received pre-camp surveys from 59. As expected due to their high level of SO experience, we found that the vast majority of volunteers at Camp Shriver Maryland viewed individuals with ID as highly capable. Twenty post-camp surveys were also received from Camp Shriver Maryland, several of which we were unable to match with pre-camp surveys. We feel that this relatively low response does not adequately represent Camp Shriver Maryland’s large volunteer base. However, it is interesting to note that of the 20 volunteers who did submit post-camp surveys, 18 indicated that they had learned something new about individuals with ID through participating in the camp. Responses included comments such as, “these kids are just as smart, fun, intelligent, and outgoing as me” and “they [campers] were much more capable than they believed.” A common theme cited by volunteers in the responses was an increase in patience and understanding through participating in the camp.

At Camp Shriver Boston, all 12 counselors and 5 counselors-in-training (CITs) completed the pre-camp questionnaire. While slightly less than half of the counselors had prior experience with intellectual disabilities, almost all staff held very positive perceptions of the capabilities of individuals with ID. Of the 15 staff who completed post-camp surveys, 73% percent of counselors indicated that they had learned something new about individuals with intellectual disabilities. Many of these responses made specific references to the similarities witnessed between children with and without ID. Responses included comments such as, “It was easy to forget disabilities when all were treated equal,” and “Kids with and without disabilities blend right together.”

E. Successes and Challenges of Camp Shriver

As part of the post-camp interviews, directors were asked about the successes that their camp achieved as well as challenges they had to overcome. One of the greatest successes they noted was the development of relationships between their camp and the surrounding community. These partnerships greatly enhanced the daily operations of the camps, particularly in terms of providing staff, facilities, and even transportation to and from camp. In forming a partnership with Louisiana State University, Camp Shriver Louisiana was able to directly recruit staff who were pursuing special education degrees. This partnership provided a camp staff with both experience working with individuals with intellectual disabilities and a genuine interest in obtaining more experience. Similarly, Camp Shriver Boston was hosted by the University of Massachusetts Boston. This partnership gave the camp access to the rich resources afforded by

the university setting (i.e., college-level facilities, assistance with food and transportation, staff recruitment). Camp Shriver Oregon attributed much of its success to a strong partnership with the surrounding public school system. One unique aspect of this partnership was structuring the camp around an extended-school year plan. This was found to be extremely beneficial, as it provided direct transportation of campers from school to camp and paid personal aides to assist more severely impaired campers.

Perhaps the most significant success of these camp-community partnerships was their potential to promote social relationships between campers and partners after the conclusion of camp. The affiliation Camp Shriver Oregon made with existing SO “Partner Clubs” in local schools (groups that program inclusive events for students with and without ID in schools) appears to be a way for the social relationships formed at camp to continue into the school year. In fact, several camps reported that recruiting volunteers from the same local schools as campers allowed for these relationships to persist throughout the school year and into next year’s camp. Further, directors at Camp Shriver Florida reported that they consistently receive calls from volunteers who ask details about next year’s camp and if interim programming (i.e., a camp reunion) would be possible. In fact, Camp Shriver Boston is taking an active role in promoting continued relationships among campers by hosting a reunion for campers in conjunction with a university basketball game.

Another success that camp directors reported was the building of a solid volunteer base. Camp Shriver Oregon reported that volunteers would often recruit their friends to participate, which resulted in a steadily increasing volunteer base as camp went on. This open recruitment of volunteers, a tool used by several camps, is a great strength because it recruits individuals that may be new to SO programming. It should also be stressed that several of the camps were able to incorporate existing SO programming into camp operations. A good example of this is Camp Shriver Oregon and Camp Shriver Louisiana’s efforts to provide Healthy Athletes screenings to all of their campers. Camp Shriver Oregon also incorporated elements of the *SO Get into It*TM curriculum into staff and volunteer training.

Above all, Camp Shriver succeeded in its ability to provide both a fun and enriching experience to all participants. This success is defined by the overwhelming majority of both campers and volunteers who expressed a genuine interest in maintaining their involvement with the camp in future years. Eighty-two percent of campers at Camp Shriver Oregon and 85% of campers at Camp Shriver Louisiana indicated that they would definitely like to come back to camp next year. In addition, the percentage of campers who indicated they had “a lot” of fun at camp ranged from 80% to 95% across camp sites. Most remarkably, at Camp Shriver Florida, 100% of the volunteers surveyed indicated that they would like to participate in the camp next year. This collectively supports the notion that camp provides a truly fun and enjoyable experience to all its participants, in addition to the promotion of sport skills and social relationships.

While Camp Shriver has clearly accomplished much, camp directors outlined several challenges to implementing the camp. Several camps faced logistical issues surrounding facilities, food, and transportation for campers. Several of the camps did not have an alternate indoor facility in the event of inclement weather or extreme heat, and several camps had limited access to pools. The challenges camps faced in acquiring access to suitable facilities often determined what

sports programming was feasible. Providing meals and snacks for campers proved to be an additional challenge for some camps. Transportation to and from camp also appeared to be a major challenge for camps, particularly those serving large and diverse areas. This was perhaps one of the most difficult logistical issues for camps to deal with, as providing transportation for campers is expensive and often difficult to coordinate. The issue of transportation to and from camp often made it hard for campers to attend camp every day. To alleviate these logistical issues, some camps were able to rely on in-kind donations through their local community partnerships, while other camps sought out external funding.

In addition to the availability of facilities and transportation, the training of staff and volunteers was a challenge often cited by camp directors. Because staff and volunteers had such varied backgrounds and experience with individuals with ID, it proved difficult to provide a training curriculum that would serve the full range of volunteers. Several camp directors also indicated that it was especially difficult to find a time to provide training for volunteers who assisted with only a portion of camp. Similarly, several camps had an issue defining roles for their volunteers, a problem exacerbated by the inconsistencies in volunteer attendance. Some camps also reported that several of the coaches, while possessing a strong background in their respective sports, did not have enough experience working with individuals with ID in that sport.

Finally, recruiting campers proved to be somewhat difficult in several of the camps. Almost all of the camps had more volunteers and staff than campers at any given time. The challenge of recruiting campers was driven largely by the limited time made available to camps for implementation and start-up. However, several camps were able to overcome this challenge by turning to existing community ties (i.e., schools, YMCAs) and local SO programs to recruit participants.

IV. SUMMARY & CONCLUSIONS

The present evaluation, based on pilot data from four of the five new Camp Shriver sites and Camp Shriver Maryland, provided strong evidence that Camp Shriver can provide an array of benefits to participants. Overall, the camp experience improved the sport skills of participants, promoted social relationships among and between campers and staff, and enhanced positive perceptions of individuals with ID. The camp also provided those involved with a positive, memorable summer camp experience, an experience that may not otherwise have been accessible. Campers, volunteers, and staff indicated overwhelmingly positive attitudes towards the experience and expressed their desire to remain involved with Camp Shriver in the future.

The evaluation also provided valuable insight into the different ways Camp Shriver can be effectively implemented. While each camp varied with respect to its implementation and the constituency it served, almost all of the camps can be regarded as a success. Much of this success can be attributed to a few essential parameters that both represent and unite this diverse collection of camps. These parameters may be more accurately described as underlying principles that embody the mission and spirit of Camp Shriver and serve as a model for its future implementation:

- In the spirit of camping, Camp Shriver is committed to recreational programming that provides a fun and enjoyable experience for all participants.
- In the spirit of Special Olympics, Camp Shriver is committed to enhancing the sports skills of children, adolescents, and adults with intellectual disabilities.
- In the spirit of Unified Sports, Camp Shriver is committed to inclusive programming that involves people without intellectual disabilities.

In addition to these unifying parameters, each site demonstrated that the general model of Camp Shriver can be successful in a variety of locations and settings. The following are the major findings of the evaluation:

- The Camp Shriver experience significantly improved the sports skills of participants. Within a short period of time, and in an atmosphere that was recreational rather than competitive, improvement in skills was found in multiple sports. This improvement was observed by coaches in objective evaluations and perceived personally by campers, staff, and volunteers.
- The Camp Shriver experience benefited individuals without ID who participated in Camp Shriver as campers (not as volunteers). Those without ID who attended camp benefited not only through their exposure to campers with ID, but also in the improvement of their own sports skills.
- The Camp Shriver experience provided volunteers and staff with the opportunity to witness firsthand the similarities between those with and without ID. Staff and

volunteers who worked at the camps gained a new appreciation of the capabilities of individuals with ID.

- The Camp Shriver experience fostered positive social relationships between individuals with ID and partners and staff. Camp Shriver Boston in particular, which implemented a fully inclusive model, fostered friendships between campers with and without ID. In fact, all campers attending Camp Shriver Boston were equally accepted by their peers, regardless of whether or not they had an intellectual disability. While several camps made genuine efforts to see these relationships continue, this evaluation was not designed to assess the long-term impact of Camp Shriver.
- The Camp Shriver experience served as an exciting first experience for many staff and volunteers who had no prior experience with this population or with the larger SO organization. Staff and volunteers expressed an interest in continuing their involvement with Camp Shriver; they did not see the camp as a one-time experience, but rather as a first step in the development of a long relationship with the camp.
- Most of the Camp Shriver sites were implemented remarkably well considering the short period of time available to recruit campers and staff, find appropriate facilities, and develop camp programming. Camps were able to quickly assemble and adapt the resources of the surrounding community to serve the needs of their respective constituencies. This resulted in the formation of valuable camp-community partnerships that will no doubt serve as a strong resource for each camp's implementation in future years.

In closing, the continued success of Camp Shriver in future years requires that a number of issues are addressed. First, given that Special Olympics, (of which Camp Shriver was a direct precursor and inspiration) was at the forefront in bringing the concept of sport to individuals with intellectual disabilities in the 1960s, how Camp Shriver can best complement the SO movement as it moves into the twenty-first century should be considered.. As Camp Shriver is “scaled-up” in future years, a great deal of thought and planning should be given as to where it fits within the larger SO movement. Given that Camp Shriver is focused on recreation and instruction, as opposed to competition and training, careful consideration should be given as to whether it is more suited as an extension of Unified Sports, or as a free-standing element in the larger SO movement.

Second, the six Camp Shriver sites varied considerably in the age of campers they served, the level and range of impairments among campers, and the nature of the relationship between campers and partners. With future implementations, careful consideration must be given as to what model or models best recognize the individual needs of each constituency. For example, camps that serve a broad age range of campers, and specifically more impaired campers, should consider a model that offers one-on-one partner pairings between those with and without ID. Conversely, camps that serve a more homogeneous age group and/or less impaired campers

should consider an inclusionary structure that does not differentiate partners and campers, but recognizes both participants with and without ID as campers with equal status.

Third, while the six Camp Shriver sites varied considerably with regard to the age and disability status of campers, they varied little with regard to how camps were positioned in the community and the venues chosen to host the camps. That is, most Camps Shriver sites were set in suburban communities and drew campers from the existing SO programs in the area. One camp, Camp Shriver Boston, was situated in an urban area and as a result, its participants were drawn from racially and ethnically diverse inner-city neighborhoods. Since in the past, individuals with ID living in inner-city neighborhoods have had limited access to SO, consideration should be given to how Camp Shriver can appeal to different segments of the population, particularly those from urban areas. This will position Camp Shriver to attract new athletes to the greater Special Olympics movement.

Fourth, running a camp demands a major commitment of resources, and many of the Camp Shriver sites had substantial resources available to them—both financial and in-kind. Future camps wanting to replicate the positive results of these pilot camps should closely examine the resources required to achieve these results. Overall, for camps to meet the needs of their constituency by providing a fun and quality camp experience, adequate facilities and equipment, an experienced staff, and transportation to and from camp are required. To enable camps to provide such a quality experience, a mechanism for strengthening the funding for Camp Shriver needs to be considered.

Fifth, while the present evaluation provided valuable information about the start up of Camp Shriver in four of the five pilot sites, it is our hope that to ensure success, future evaluations address what particular aspects of the camp experience have the most beneficial effects on the campers, staff, and volunteers involved. In turn, these findings can be used to maximize the value and impact of future camps on participating children, adolescents, and adults.

Overall, the implementation of the six Camp Shriver sites was led by camp directors and staff who were motivated to provide individuals with ID with a memorable recreational camp experience. The camp experience was successful in that it improved the sport skills of participants, fostered social relationships, and promoted positive perceptions of individuals with ID. We believe that what was learned from this evaluation will be of benefit in the future planning of Camp Shriver as it continues to provide a positive camp experience to individuals with ID in the coming years.

REFERENCES

- Brannan, S., Arick, J., & Fullerton, A. (1996). The impact of residential camp programs on campers with disabilities National Camp Evaluation Project (NCEP): 1993-96. Portland State University, Portland, OR.
- Brannan, S., Arick, J., Fullerton, A., & Harris, J. (1997). Inclusionary practices: A nationwide survey of mainstream camps serving youth. *The Camping Magazine*, 70(1), 32-34.
- Brannan, S., Arick, J., Fullerton, A., & Harris, J. (2000). Inclusive outdoor programs benefit youth: Recent research on practices and effects. *The Camping Magazine*, 73(4), 26-29.
- Brannan, S., & Fullerton, A. (1999). Case studies reveal camper growth. *The Camping Magazine*, 72(1), 22-26.
- Lieberman, L. J., & Wilson, S. (2005). Effects of a sports camp practicum on attitudes toward children with visual impairments and deafblindness. *RE: View*, 36(4), 141-153.
- Mandigo, J. L., & Natho, K. (2005). Examining summer campers' quality of experience. *Palaestra*, 21(2), 26-31.
- Marsh, P. E. (1999). Does camp enhance self-esteem? Good news for the future of camping. *The Camping Magazine*, 72(6), 36-40.
- Mulvihill, B. A., Cotton, J. N., & Gyaben, S. L. (2004) Best practices for inclusive child and adolescent out-to-school care. *Family & Community Health*, 27(1), 52-64.
- Ponchilla, P. E., Armbruster, J., & Wiebold, J. (2005). The national sports education camps project: Introducing sports skills to students with visual impairments through short-term specialized instruction. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, 99(11), 685-695.
- Rothman, D. (2001). Yes I can! A vision for inclusive programming. *The Camping Magazine*, 74(5), 48.