**On-Boarding Best Practices**

We want to equip you to recruit the best Group Leaders and have the most beneficial on-boarding experience. Our desire is for you to build genuine relationships with your leaders to create community amongst your team. Your Kids and Students will benefit from leaders who are committed, trained and gifted to work with the next generation.

**General Best Practices:**

* Your relationship with a potential leader starts at Growth Track, or perhaps before! Stay in relationship with them as they walk through the GrowthTrack experience; checking in weekly and seeing what they are discovering about God and about themselves.
* Once the Application and Background Check are completed, you will schedule an interview. This should be a formal sit-down experience, perhaps over coffee.
  + Per Ministry Safe’s recommendation, it is best practice for interviews to be conducted by two people (one male and one female.) This allows for more than one perspective and gives a third-party witness if any challenges should arise. Some suggestions: Ask another staff member to join you or ask a Team Lead to join you
  + When it’s not possible to have two people conduct the interview, the staff member leading the interview should be the same gender as the potential leader. Work together with your Family Ministry Team to make this happen.
* The interview should be professional yet friendly. You are getting to know a hopeful teammate, not interrogating.
* Look for Direct Answers vs. Non-Answers
  + Direct Answers:
    - “No I have not”
    - “No”
  + Non-Answers:
    - “To me the answer is no.”
    - “What do you mean by that?”
    - “I don’t appreciate you accusing me of that.”
    - “I don’t believe so.”
* Every potential group leader needs to go through the onboarding process. Let them opt out if they want to. Don’t chase them. It’s ok to let potential leaders know our process and how serious we take it.

**Screening Information:**

* Be aware of potential grooming behaviors and risk behaviors
  + Gift Giving
  + Kid-magnet activities (Ex. Video Games)
  + Touchy; pushing physical boundaries, playful but inappropriate
  + Repeated alone time with the same child/student
  + Breaking rules and then justifying the behavior
* Background Checks
  + Less than 10% of abusers ever encounter the justice system. Just because a check is “clean” doesn’t mean they are safe to work with kids/students
  + Red Flags on checks:
    - Offering alcohol/tobacco/porn
    - Contributing to delinquency
    - Exhibitionism (flashing)
    - Voyeurism (peeping tom)
    - Assault
    - Any crime that is sexual in nature
  + If a check comes back with a record we may need more information about the underlying charge. If needed, ask the potential leader to bring a copy of the arrest record, in the case the charges have been minimized, or any other additional context with them to the interview.
* Calling References:
  + Use the questions provided
  + Look for poor or remote relationships with references (Ex. Much older people or much younger people, or “I don’t know them very well” or “I haven’t seen them in a while”)
  + No reference in “kid context” (Ex. On paper it looks like they would be great with kids, but no reference who knows them with a history of working with kids.)
  + They didn’t identify a past employer or supervisor
* Male Characteristics of Offenders
  + Frequent activities with kids/students, usually with a specific age and gender
  + Sets up 1:1 interactions
  + Looks for “trusted” time alone
  + Unrealistic beliefs concerning children (Ex. Pure/Innocent. Not even parents do that.)
  + Unstable work history/frequent relocations
  + Abrupt or unexplained relocations (Ex. They are being questioned or a child has “aged” out of their preference)
  + Overqualified, but takes the job anyway
  + Doesn’t care about pay
  + No ambition or possibility of advancement (Ex. Just wants access)
  + Allows special privileges; give gifts
  + Dating single moms
  + “Kid Magnet” – hobbies, toys, activities
  + Photographing/Videoing kids/students
  + Describe kids/students as possessions (He belongs to me)
  + Rarely team players; Maverick
  + Unwilling to accept the role as adult, identify with children, “a big kid”, a peer-like involvement with kids/students, becoming an ally with kids /students against someone in authority (Ex. Parent)
  + Limited social interaction with peers
  + Grooms gatekeepers and kids/students
  + Gains immediate insider status with adults (Ex. “Like a family member” in a very short period of time. Nobody can imagine how we lived without him.)
  + Failure to honor appropriate boundaries
  + Pushing back physical boundaries (Ex. tickling, wrestling)
  + Gains adult approval for borderline behavior
  + Offensive response when confronted with allegations (Ex. They have had this conversation multiple times. Staff is more likely to be uncomfortable and backs down)
  + Paraphilic Behavior – crossing multiple sexual boundaries (most common – flashing and peeping toms)
* Female Characteristics of Offenders - 10% of prosecuted offenders
  + Type 1
    - Illogical thinking patterns
    - Poor school performance
    - May be unemployed/underemployed
    - Easily angered/impatient
    - Negative attitude
    - Socially isolated/may have married as a teen
    - Raised in a strict, religious home
    - Past abuse; critical father
    - Married, but a bad or abusive marriage. Older husband.
    - Seeking affection in the sexual relationship with

child/student

* + - More likely to seduce than coerce a sexual act
    - Blames the child/student
    - Likely to claim that the child/student initiated behavior
    - Caregiver services
  + Type 2 (Resembles many of the male characteristics)
    - Married or unmarried
    - Well educated
    - Type A
    - Position of trust (Teacher, coach, etc.)
    - Well liked/respected
    - Twice the age of the victim
    - Pursues a teen (Male or female)

**Risk Factors to Look For:**

* Abrupt relocations
* Narcissistic/maverick
* Animated around kids/students
* Pattern of work with age/sex of kids/students (There are logical reasons for this; Ex. teaching degree)
* Poor peer relationships
* Kid/Student magnet
* Unrealistic view of kids/students (Ex. Pure)
* Gaps in employment or residence (Ex. They won’t include a location where an abuse situation happened. Ask more questions if there is an unaccounted-for length of time.)
* Unanswered questions (Instead of answering with a lie, they often don’t give a direct answer. They avoid the question like a politician; rationalize the behavior)
* Focus on personal needs (Ex.” I want to serve because I feel good when I’m around kids.”)
* Non-answers to direct questions concerning abuse
* Paraphilia’s (flashing/peeping tom)
* Describes a child/student as a best friend
* Stair- step grooming offenses in background check (Ex. Red Flags)
* Vague about how they learned of the program
* Questions about overnight trips
* Wants the organizations “gear” quickly (Ex. Wants the t-shirts, hats, etc.)
* Excessive concern about being liked by kids/students
* Expresses concern or discomfort with the information we are asking (Ex. “I don’t want to answer that question.”
* Describes physical interaction with kids/students
* Inconsistences in information (Can they keep their stories straight?)
* History of abuse/neglect, especially if severe
* Military history (Cut them free rather than criminally prosecute)
* History of alcohol or drug abuse
* History of extreme depression
* Individual who lives outside of the service area
* Applied, but wasn’t accepted by another program
* Job requires frequent travel out of the country (Ex. Males will use job to participate in sexual tourism)
* Extreme behaviors (Ex. Secretive, can only speak briefly, whispers on the phone)
* Impatient or anxious to get started (Ex. “How long will this process take? When will I be ready?” Calling repeatedly)
* Repeated inquiries about the same question (Ex. “Do we have overnights?” Asking multiple people)
* Inappropriate questions or comments