Student Legal Issues that Impact Post Secondary Education
The Good, The Bad and The Ugly

Stewart Roberts
Claims Manager
Property – Claims Frequency

CURIE Property Claims (#)
Total number of reported claims January 1, 1988 – December 31, 2011

- Water, 418
- Fire, 132
- Various Other, 158
- Wind, 20

Total number of property claims - 728
Property – Claims Severity

CURIE Property Claims ($)
Total Claims costs January 1, 1988 – December 31, 2011

- Fire, $66,789,419
- Wind, $7,313,672
- Water, $45,289,267
- Various Other, $2,303,260

Total property claims payments and reserves - $121,695,618
## Underwriting Period – Loss Severity December 31, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Liability</th>
<th>Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURIE 1</td>
<td>$6,291,881</td>
<td>$ 3,114,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURIE II</td>
<td>$18,270,072</td>
<td>$ 4,402,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURIE III</td>
<td>$23,979,916</td>
<td>$ 5,567,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURIE IV</td>
<td>$21,945,561</td>
<td>$31,167,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURIE V</td>
<td>$11,207,852</td>
<td>$77,443,884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Liability - Claim Frequency

CURIE Liability Claims (#)
Total number of reported claims January 1, 1988 - December 31, 2011

Total number of liability claims - 3472

- Slip & Fall, 1405
- Defamation, 193
- Sports, 298
- Educational Malpractice, 137
- Medical Malpractice, 202
- Alcohol, 82
- Harassment, 47
- Maintenance, 278
- Research - Medical, 10
- Various Other, 263
- Employment, 45
- Glass, 53
- Bike, 54
- Vehicle, 297
- Vet Malpractice, 22
- Water, 25
- Lab, 61
- All Other, 820
Liability - Claim Severity

CURIE Liability Claims ($)
Total Claims costs January 1, 1988 - December 31, 2011

- Slip & Fall, $19,913,384
- Defamation, $12,464,593
- Sports, $11,040,629
- Educational Malpractice, $9,160,097
- Research - Medical, $4,681,038
- Medical Malpractice, $4,351,840
- Alcohol, $3,280,391
- Maintenance, $2,953,483
- Harassment, $2,527,476
- Various Other, $6,093,314
- Employment, $965,944
- Glass, $889,524
- Bike, $858,660
- Vehicle, $709,011
- Vet Malpractice, $634,156
- Water, $608,277
- Lab, $563,465

Total liability claims payments and reserves - $81,695,281
Total liability claims incurred including IBNR - $103,843,166
## Liability – Loss Severity December 31, 2011
Per Claim Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURIE</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURIE I</td>
<td>$11,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURIE II</td>
<td>$17,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURIE III</td>
<td>$27,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURIE IV</td>
<td>$33,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURIE V</td>
<td>$30,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alcohol Related Losses

• January 1/03  -  New Year’s Eve
  - Student Union Bar
  - overcrowded, over-serving
  - fire alarm pulled
  - brawls break-out in parking lot
  - plaintiff suffers a serious head injury
  - settled $3,613,919
Alcohol Related Losses cont.

- 2009/2010 School Year
- two students fell thru a skylight falling 37 feet
- coroner investigates and makes recommendations to the university
- three months earlier a student died falling out of a window
- No claims were made against the university
Alcohol Related Losses cont.

• April 2007
  – Fraternity house party on campus
  – President of Frat House was on the roof
  – Gained access through a window
  – Was drinking “Nytol Martinis”
  – Was greeting another student and fell off the roof
  – Landed head first on concrete sidewalk
  – Suffered a traumatic brain injury
  – There are six parties being sued
  – Slow-moving litigation
• September 2011 - first-year student dies during fresh week
  - alleged to have consumed 4-6 beers,
  - and 26 ounces of rye between 6 p.m. and 10 p.m.
  - was put to bed about 11 p.m. and was checked on
  - just after midnight an ambulance was called
  - around noon the student died
  - coroner investigation
Statistics

• How many are binge drinking, five or more drinks at one time?
  16% once a week
  18% once a month

Grade 9: 12%
Grade 10: 23%
Grade 11: 23%
Grade 12: 39%
Percentage reporting drinking 5 or more drinks on one occasion, 12 or more times in the past year, by age group and sex, household population aged 12 or older, Canada 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 to 17</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or older</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stats Canada
A Class Action Primer
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Introduction to Class Actions

- A procedural vehicle that allows a group of individuals to have their claims heard together
- A class proceeding is a distinct kind of proceeding
- Class proceedings are subject to their own rules governed by statutes in each province. In Ontario, class proceedings are governed by the *Class Proceedings Act, 1992, S.O. 1992, c.6.*
Functions of a Class Action

• Litigate small damage claims
• Correct wrongful corporate behaviour
• Uniformity of decisions
• Promote efficiency and fairness
• Assess liability without consideration of each plaintiff’s damages
Certification of a Class Action

• Cause of Action
• Identifiable Class
• Common Issues
• Preferable Procedure
• Representative Plaintiff
Cause of Action

• Do the pleadings disclose a cause of action?

• Courts will consider whether it is plain and obvious that the claim cannot succeed. Such claims will be found not to disclose a cause of action.
Identifiable Class

- Identifies the persons with a potential claim
- Describes who is entitled to notice
- Identifies the persons bound by the result of the action
- Describes the persons entitled to relief
Common Issues

• Common but not necessarily identical issues of fact, or

• Common but not necessarily identical issues of law that arise from common but not necessarily identical facts

  *Class Proceedings Act, 1992*

• The Courts in Ontario have interpreted the common interest requirement generously
Preferable Procedure

- Is a class proceeding a fair, efficient and manageable method of advancing the claim?

- Is a class proceeding preferable to other procedures?
Representative Plaintiff

- Must fairly and adequately represent the interests of the class

- Plan for the proceeding that sets out a workable method of advancing the proceeding on behalf of the class and of notifying class members of the proceeding

- Does not have a conflict of interest with the interests of the other class members
Stages of a Class Action

• Pleading
• Notice of Certification
• Discovery
• Discontinuance, Abandonment
• Settlement
Cost Consequences

- Each party bears a measure of the risk
- Role of the Class Proceedings Fund
- Funding Agreements
The Danger of Class Actions

- Many class actions are brought on the basis of minor damage to a significant number of individuals.
- Corporate incentive to “buy peace” and resolve the matter.
- Legalized extortion?
- Canadian courts deal with this concern by requiring that settlements be approved by the courts.
Opting Out of Class Actions

• Can a corporation require customers to sign an agreement opting out of any future class action?

• Can a university require this from its students and/or employees?
  - AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion, 584 F. 3d 849 (2011)
  - Seidel v. Telus Communications, 2011 SCC 15
Class Actions and Universities

- Fraudulent or Negligent Misrepresentation and Breach of Contract
- Barriers to Establishing Common Issues
- Behaviour Modification
- Protecting against Class Actions
Trends in Canada

• Generally expansive and plaintiff-friendly approach to class actions

• Ontario Court of Appeal’s trilogy of decisions allows overtime employment class actions
  ▪ Fresco v. Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, 2012 ONCA 444
  ▪ McCracken v. Canadian Railway Company, 2012 ONCA 445
Trends in Canada Continued

• Wrongful dismissal class actions

• Market timing
  - *Fischer v. IG Investment Management*, 2012 ONCA 47, leave to appeal granted

• Pleading prior to certification
  - *Pennyfeather v. Timminco*, 2011 ONSC 4257
Trends in the United States

• Systematic Discrimination

• No certification where damages cannot be proved on a class-wide basis?
  - *Comcast Corp. v. Behrend*, 655 F. 3d 182 (3d Cir. 2011)

• Trivial claims

• Large Punitive Damage Awards
Watching the Clock in Different Time Zones

Understanding Limitation Periods Across Canada
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What is a Limitation Period?

- The time period after which legal rights will be extinguished for a given cause of action.
- The defendant has the onus of raising the expiry of a limitation period as a defence.
Why Have Limitation Periods?

• Peace of mind
• Evidentiary problems
• Legal standards change
• Economic reasons
Historical Development of Limitation Periods

• Originally, no limits on when a plaintiff could commence an action

• Beginning in 1235, England created statutes aimed at specific causes of action

• Canadian provinces created legislation based on the various English laws
Historical Development of Limitation Periods

• There have been attempts to unify the provinces’ approaches to limitation periods (Uniform Limitations Acts)

• Since 1999, several provinces have reformed their limitations laws

• The trend is to create a short limitation period that applies to all causes of action
“We can see no reason why it should take longer to decide whether or not, for example to bring a claim for professional negligence, than it did to fight the second world war.”

The Landscape

• BC – 2, 6, or 10 years
• Nfld – 2, 6, or 10 years
• NS – 2 – 20 years (+ discretion)
• Ont – 2 years
• Sask – 2 years
• Ykn – 1, 2, 6, or 10 years
The Landscape

• The provincial statutes do not capture all actions
• Federal statutes
• Specialized areas
Discoverability

- Accrual vs. Discoverability
- Discoverability codified in many limitations statutes (e.g. s. 5 of Ontario Limitations Act)
- The “ultimate limitation period” may apply
Discoverability

“A cause of action arises for purposes of a limitation period when the material facts on which it is based have been discovered or ought to have been discovered by the plaintiff by the exercise of reasonable diligence”

Peixerio v. Haberman, SCC, 1997

- Plaintiff was injured in a motor vehicle accident in 1990
- Medical assessments found soft tissue damage
- In 1993, plaintiff realized there was a herniated disc
- Court determined that the plaintiff did not know that he met the “threshold” until he discovered the severity of his injuries
Sexual Assault: *M.(K).* v. *M.(H).*., SCC, 1992

- At 28 years old, plaintiff sues father for incestuous abuse that happened between when plaintiff was 8 and 16

- Plaintiff argued that the abuse was only discovered after entering therapy as an adult

- The court determined that the action was discoverable after the plaintiff attended therapy
Sexual Assault: *M. (K).* v. *M. (H)*., SCC, 1992

“The tort claim, although subject to limitations legislation, does not accrue until the plaintiff is reasonably capable of discovering the wrongful nature of the defendant’s acts and the nexus between those acts and her injuries.”
Legislative Provisions for Sexual Assault

• An exception exists in many limitations statutes (e.g. s. 2 in MB):

  “an action for assault is not governed by a limitation period and may be commenced at any time if…the assault was of a sexual nature…or at the time of the assault, the person commencing the action had an intimate relationship with the person…was financially, emotionally, physically or otherwise dependent on the person…”
In 2003, the city hired an architect and an engineer to design a washroom facility for a public park.

Construction was completed in 2004.

In 2009, a grade 9 student was killed when a concrete wall collapsed in the washroom.
R v. City of Guelph, Ont Sup. Crt, 2012

• The city, the engineer, and the architect were all charged pursuant to the *Occupational Health and Safety Act*

• The Act reads: “no prosecution…shall be instituted more than one year after the last act…upon which the prosecution is based…occurred.”
R v. City of Guelph, Ont Sup. Crt, 2012

• The claims against the architect and the engineer were statute-barred
  
  ▪ “The giving of advice which endangered a worker - took place when the wall construction was completed”
  
  ▪ The discoverability principal could not be imported into the legislation, given the clear wording of the statute
R v. City of Guelph, Ont Sup. Crt, 2012

• The claim against the city was not statute-barred, as it had a continuing obligation to ensure the safety of the washroom facilities.
Summary

• There is no universal source for limitation periods in Canada

• Determining the correct limitation period requires a determination of which statute governs, and an understanding of the relevant common law principles
Informative
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RMS INSPECTION UPDATE

- INSPECTIONS BEGAN 2009 – STAGE 1
- PROPERTY & LIABILITY HAZARDS
- OVER 50 UNIVERSITY VISITS
- RISK REGISTER
- 2012 – STAGE 2
RISK MANAGEMENT SERVICES

• AQUATIC SAFETY AUDITS
  – LIFESAVING SOCIETY

• PREMISES LIABILITY SURVEYS
  – TIM HIGHAM & ASSOCIATES
RISK MANAGEMENT SERVICES

• ListServ
  – Internet discussion list
  – Private non-moderated list
  – Facilitate information sharing
  – CURIE member universities
RISK MANAGEMENT SERVICES

• ENGINEERING SERVICES
  – RMS – AN SCM COMPANY
  • Chemical Labs and Storage Reviews
  • Plan Reviews
  • Water Supply Surveys
  • New Building Inspections
RISK MANAGEMENT SERVICES

• STUDENT EVENT RISK MANAGEMENT
  – MCGREGOR & ASSOCIATES
    • 3 Stage Program
      – Stage 1 – Off site risk assessment
      – Stage 2 – On site visit including 3 workshops
      – Stage 3 – Follow-up visit
RISK MANAGEMENT SERVICES

• SPORTS LIABILITY ASSESSMENTS
  – MCGREGOR & ASSOCIATES
  • 3 Stage Program
    – Stage 1 – Off site risk assessment
    – Stage 2 – On site visit
    – Stage 3 – Follow-up visit
RISK MANAGEMENT SERVICES

• ONLINE COURSES
  – S2 LEARNING
    • International Travel
      – Traveler’s Risk
      – Security Solutions
      – Institutional & Personal Liability
    • Lab Safety (Fall 2012)
      – Identifying and Controlling Hazards
      – Preventing Laboratory Accidents/Incidents
      – Responding to Laboratory Emergencies
RISK MANAGEMENT SERVICES

• ONLINE COURSES
  – MCGREGOR & ASSOCIATES
    • SportRisk Webinars
      – Negligence & Risk Management Series
      – Sport Clubs & Travel Series
      – Emergency Response Plan Series
RISK MANAGEMENT SERVICES

• ONLINE COURSES
  – MCGREGOR & ASSOCIATES
    • Risk Management for Recreation Professionals
    • Strategic Risk Management
    • Sport Clubs
    • Special Events
    • Youth Camps
RISK MANAGEMENT SERVICES

• YOUTH CAMPS CANADA
  – MCGREGOR & ASSOCIATES
  • 4 Week Program – January 2013
  • Small Class Size – Interactive
  • Develop network of colleagues
  • Develop skills to organize and manage safe youth camps
EXCESSIVE HOARDING
You do NOT need that many pizza boxes
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Benefits and Experiences at SFU
Benefits

1. Old issues resolved
2. Priorities established
3. New issues added by SFU
Benefits

1. Old issues resolved
2. Priorities established
3. New issues added by SFU

Approach

1. Resources
2. Process
Benefits

1. Old issues resolved
2. Priorities established
3. New issues added by SFU

Approach

1. Resources
2. Process

Experiences

1. Staff appreciation
2. Use of photos
3. What some recommendations led to
About SFU

- 29,000 FTE’s
- 7500 Faculty / Staff
- 3 Campuses
- 47 Years old
- 247 Recommendations
2012: 9
2011: 88
2010: 103
2009: 47

247 Rec’s
Variety of Recommendations

- Some Easy

*Post Occupant Load Signage*
Variety of Recommendations

- Some Easy

- Some Challenging

Post Occupant Load Signage

Playground Equipment Codes
Benefits
Benefit #1

- Old issues revealed

Unused Theatre

Dining and Meeting Facility
Benefit #2

- Priorities Established

*Physics Lab*
(wiring and window security film)

*Chemistry Lab*
(expired chemicals)
Short Term Plans
Short Term Plans

Long Term Plans
Benefit #3

- New Issues Added by SFU

Roof not designed for public access – no railing
Approach
Approach #1

- Memo to VP Finance
Approach #1

- Memo to VP Finance
Approach #1

Memo to VP Finance

1) Currently paying a penalty
2) New Risk Register system may help reduce penalties
3) Anticipated savings
   - 5% of premiums
   - Further savings by addressing hazards
Approach #1

- **Memo to VP Finance**
  - 1) Currently paying a penalty
  - 2) New Risk Register system may help reduce penalties
  - 3) Anticipated savings
    - 5% of premiums
    - Further savings by addressing hazards

- **Risk assistant hired**
  - Cost was 2% of premiums
New fields added for internal logistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Date of Recs</th>
<th>Repeated Recommendation dates</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Individual Assigned</th>
<th>Hazard Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/17/2010</td>
<td>Convocation Mall &amp; Plaza</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Lee Gavel &amp; Sam Dahabiah</td>
<td>Bolts holding the steel sheet cover on the north overhead walkway had come loose which may result in a trip and fall injury.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9/29/2009</td>
<td>West mall complex - sprinkler room</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Lee Gavel, Sam Dahabiah &amp; Bohnan Kostecyk</td>
<td>It appeared that the current sprinkler system incorporates Omega sprinkler nodes which have been recalled. (Found in sprinkler cabinet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9/29/2009</td>
<td>West mall complex - Halls &amp; Exits</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Lee Gavel, Sam Dahabiah &amp; Bohnan</td>
<td>There is an exterior door stop located at the top of the concrete stairs at Entrance 11 to the West Building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause &amp; Effect</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons walking in the area may trip and fall, injuring their feet on steel metal at this location. At the time of the inspection it was noted that the deficiency was noted, however, it had not been repaired.</td>
<td>In order to reduce the potential for injury at this location consideration should be made for repairing the walkway cover. Repair will reduce the potential for injury as pylons may be moved/stolen thereby eliminating warnings at this location.</td>
<td>Building/Grounds Superintendent to remediate, new plates installed and bolted down. June, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Omega sprinkler nodes have been recalled due to manufacturing defects and may not operate as designed in the event of a fire. The affected nodes are no longer listed and do not meet the requirements of the BC Fire Code.</td>
<td>In order to adequately protect the building and ensure that the system will operate in the event of a fire all affected nodes should be replaced by a qualified technician. Check the sprinkler heads to ensure they are not recalled.</td>
<td>Troy Sprinkler investigated - no Omega heads found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The door stop located at the top of the stairs poses a trip and fall hazard.</td>
<td>Remove the door stop to avoid someone tripping and falling down the concrete stairs.</td>
<td>Building/Grounds Superintendent to remediate. Complete.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approach #2

1) Recommendations separated into 28 departments
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Approach #2

1) Recommendations separated into 28 departments

2) Sent all lists to all departments
   - Privacy concerns
   - Budget timing
   - Compliance with other standards

3) Championed by VP Finance

4) Strived to have all recommendations acknowledged

5) Department staff agreed to remedy within
   - a week
   - a month or two
   - a long term plan
Experiences at SFU
Experience #1

- Staff appreciative of inspector insight
  - Not aware of recall
  - Not aware of bent sprinkler heads
  - Appreciated time the inspector took to explain issues
Experience #2

- Photos very useful to explain recommendations

**Recommendation:**

Area of Refuge is Blocked
Experience #2

- Photos **very** useful to explain recommendations

**Recommendation:**

Area of Refuge is Blocked
Experience #3

Some recommendations led to broad changes

Students move tables in front of exits

Library now open 24/7 during exams
Unforeseen Problem...

Risk Register vs Risk Register
Thank you
My Doctor said "Only 1 glass of alcohol a day". I can live with that.
Agenda

1. Context
2. Course Content
3. Unique Features
4. Role of Campus Risk Managers
5. Next course
Key Findings:

1. Policies for background checks on employees and volunteers were significantly inadequate.
   - “In 2010, 5 coaches with criminal records were allowed to work summer youth programs”

2. For the past several decades, the Athletics Department was permitted to become a closed community.
   - “where staff members lived by their own rules”
Key Findings:

3. University policies regarding programs for minors were inconsistently implemented throughout the University.
   - Sandusky allowed to conduct football camps without any direct oversight by University officials.
Recommendation

Consolidate oversight of University’s policies and procedures involving non-student minors in the Office of Human Resources, and appoint a coordinator to oversee the implementation of these policies.
1. Athletics Department ran Varsity and Rec camps (separate)
2. Rec camps well administered
3. Varsity camps – few guidelines
4. Within Varsity camps, BB camp ran as an ‘outside camp’
   - Insurance?
   - Name?
5. No department camp coordinator
Youth Camps Online Course
Instructors

Ian McGregor  McGregor & Associates
Alison Fisher  Children’s Program Coordinator
              University of Regina
Melisa Yestrau  Director, Science Venture
               University of Victoria
Ben McAllister  Risk & Insurance Analyst
               University of Victoria
Course #’s: 31 (representing 17 schools)

Target: All Camp Directors on campus

Why? Consistency an issue
Concern for campus Risk Managers
Youth Camps Online Course

Week 1: Structure and Philosophy

Camp Assessment
- Philosophy
- Types of camps

Operational Structure
- Staffing
- Qualifications, job descriptions, Hiring, performance mgmt.

Structural Audit
Week 2: Camps Management

Data Collection
- Security of data
- Participant documentation

Supervision and Instruction
- Ratios, lesson plans
- Pre/post camp supervision

Training

Parental Communication and Sign Off

Camps Management Audit
Week 3: Managing Risk

Emergency Response Plan
  Who needs to be trained in what?
  Missing Camper plan

Security Issues
  Sign in/out
  Police background checks

Facilities & Equipment

HR Issues

Risk Management Audit
Youth Camps Online Course

Week 4: Day Trips; Residence Camps

Transportation Issues
- Vehicle, drivers
- Supervision

Residential Camps
- Urban vs. rural
- Residence policies and procedures
- Staffing
- Supervision
- Additional programming

Day Trips and Residence Camps Audit
Some Unique Features

- Weekly Forum (live)
- Week 3 Project ‘Code Adam’
- Meet with your Risk Manager (after course)
Role of campus Risk Managers

1. Communicate with Camp Directors
2. Meet with participants after course
1. Course evaluations very positive

2. Feedback from Risk Managers also very good
1. Earlier communication with campus Risk Managers re. course

2. Establish expectations for course participants re. follow up with Risk Managers

3. Cap # participants/course
   (run 2 parallel courses if needed)
Next Course (starts Feb 4, 2013)

www.sportrisk.com/youth-camps-canada-outline/