Chapter 3

The Second Mile Cover-Up

“We’ve had to tell him to back off certain kids before.”
-- Katherine Genovese, November 2008
The Erasures

Graham Spanier and Joe Paterno were removed from their jobs in November 2011. The Patriot News (P-N) won the Pulitzer Prize for local reporting in April 2012. In June 2012, Sandusky was convicted of 45 of 48 counts. One month later, former FBI Director, Louis Freeh, accused Penn State officials of a cover-up. The NCAA piled on in July and said the Penn State culture put football ahead of the welfare of children. The court of public opinion had its verdict and Penn State was guilty of enabling Sandusky’s crimes.

After all of that had passed, on August 12, 2012 the P-N finally wrote a report about what happened inside The Second Mile (TSM) charity. The charity had concerns about Sandusky prior to 2008 and “had to tell him to back off certain kids before.” Then, the P-N tried to “erase” what it wrote.

Fortunately, the internet is like Las Vegas. What happens on the internet, stays on the internet.

While the P-N deleted the damming quote referred to above, several blogs and on-line publications had picked it up, most notably the Non-Profit Quarterly.

If you follow the link from the quote in the NPQ, you’ll arrive at Part 4 of Ganim’s 5-Part series – but you will not find that quote anymore. In fact, around 1,400 words of the original 1,900 word article were deleted.
Fortunately, a web archive contained the entire 1,900 word article, revealing that Ganim had originally reported other potentially damaging information surrounding the management of the charity and potential conflicts of interest with Governor Tom Corbett. Corbett was the former AG responsible for 2008 Sandusky investigation.

Screen shots of the archived article follow showing the deleted information. Information that is quite derogatory to the charity and Governor Corbett appears in red boxes.
That never happened.

It’s impossible to say for sure if it would have changed anything. But perhaps when Penn State athletic director Tim Curley went to Second Mile chief Jack Raykovitz in 2001 and said there was another incident reported in that same shower facility, Raykovitz might have responded differently.

Instead of hearing about a concern for the first time, Raykovitz would have known this was a second report.

**DPW says it is not conducting an internal review of how the agency handled interactions with Sandusky during the last several decades.**

As a foster and adoptive parent and the founder of a child care agency that aided foster families, Sandusky had a lot of dealings — mostly positive — with the welfare department.

But one, which would eventually lead to his arrest, was in November 2008, when Victim 1 told a counselor that he was being abused.

Immediately upon hearing the allegation, Gerald Rosamilia, director of Children and Youth Services in Clinton County, called The Second Mile.

Rosamilia was associated with the Clinton County branch of The Second Mile, and told Genovese over the phone that he needed to cut all ties with the charity because one of its employees was under investigation.

She pressed him about who. He told her it was Sandusky.

Several people with knowledge of that conversation say that Genovese responded by saying, “We’ve had to tell him to back off certain kids before.”

A source close to the couple vehemently denies that.
In any case, the state law that says a written safety plan should be put into place was again not followed.

There also has been criticism of Gov. Tom Corbett, who was attorney general for the first two years of the grand jury investigation.

Current and former Second Mile board members, their businesses and families, contributed more than $640,000 — according to a tabulation done by Deadspin.com — to various runs for office since 2003, including more than $200,000 to his gubernatorial campaign. Corbett accepted the money in 2010, knowing the charity’s founder was under investigation by his office.

Corbett also knew Sandusky was still attending fundraising events until his retirement but didn’t say anything to charity officials about the nature of the allegations.

Corbett says he couldn’t, citing grand jury secrecy rules. He also defends giving The Second Mile a $3 million grant after taking office as governor.

In interviews following Sandusky’s arrest, Corbett also said The Second Mile charity was never under investigation. Given the scope of current federal probes, some have questioned why he would not have taken a closer look at the organization before giving it state money.

The criticism continues to haunt him. Just last month, Corbett was caught on video angrily chastising a reporter who asked if the former AG would have done anything differently in the Sandusky investigation.

That state grant — it was later rescinded — was supposed to have gone to the building of a recreation center. The project has now been abandoned. But one of the charity’s biggest financial supporters is suing the organization over his donation to the project.
Local businessman Lance Shaner said he wants his $250,000 back, but the charity has resisted, saying it was advised not to move any money.

**Scrutiny of Raykovitz, Genovesa**

There is no doubt that The Second Mile made a significant and memorable impact on the children who attended its summer camps and after-school programs. As scrutiny mounted, and a black cloud settled above its State College offices, youngsters began writing in: "Please let me come to camp." Several young adults who were former campers went on national television to talk about their positive experiences.

Even now, there remains a group of supporters who see the charity as the 11th victim of the Sandusky case.

They blame sensational headlines, such as those that offer no proof but theorize that The Second Mile was a prostitution ring for high-paying pedophiles.

It's something that federal investigators could have in the scope of their probe, although there has been no indication that children at The Second Mile were abused by anyone but Sandusky.

Mostly, it's just become a subject of conjecture on Twitter that started when a New Jersey man, Greg Bucceroni, told a blogger that he was brought to Second Mile fundraisers by a man who he says was sexually abusing him. However, he told the blogger he wasn't a victim of Sandusky. Bucceroni then posted to the comments section of the Penn State student newspaper, The Daily Collegian, that he was a Sandusky victim from the 1970s but was "blackballed" from testifying at the trial.

Hours later, he wrote on Twitter that he and Sandusky talked about exchanging "sex with me for $$$" money. He also tweeted about being interviewed by federal investigators about Philadelphia "mobsters" sharing child pornography.

Bucceroni couldn't be reached for comment for this story. But he did talk to a Philadelphia Inquirer reporter in December -- on the heals of Sandusky's arrest -- about his convicted abuser, and that reporter said he never mentioned Sandusky or The Second Mile.

So there is overreaction on both sides.

It's more likely federal investigators are focused on The Second Mile's advertising.
Brochures and radio advertisements promoted that the charity reached more than 280,000 children across the state each year. Most of those children reached were simply given trading cards printed by The Second Mile with inspirational messages and helpful tips.

That’s how the numbers ballooned from reaching about 6,000 families through direct services — such as its leadership institute, counseling services, foster family support and early intervention programs.

Andrea Boyles, the director of the Youth Service Bureau in State College, said she noticed that distinction when she was considering acquiring some of The Second Mile programs in the wake of the scandal.

When compared to an organization such as Big Brothers Big Sisters in Centre County, the funding-to-child ratio for direct services is lower and the staff salaries are higher, said Boyles, who reviewed its finances before deciding to begin her own camps instead.

No doubt those larger numbers helped the charity raise an average of $2 million a year. Sandusky’s name and a strong affiliation with Penn State helped, too.

Despite criticism of some programs and the high salaries of the staff, Bonnie Marshall, who was the director of development for The Second Mile, said she never had any doubt the money it brought in was going to help kids.

But she paused at the concept that $230,000 — nearly one-eighth of what she raised — went to one household through the salaries of Raykovitz and Genovese.

Marshall wasn’t a fan of the couple’s management style, which she said was not open and inclusive.

“Talk to the other development directors who worked for me, they’d say my management style and [Raykovitz’s]

management style was night and day,” she said. “As the vice president of development, I was not involved in the level of discussions that I felt would be helpful. It was just not an inclusive, collaborative atmosphere.”

Marshall has spent her career raising money.

She has raised money for several colleges within Penn State, the University of Notre Dame and other universities.
hospital and the annual Arts Fest.

But this was an experience complicated by working for a married couple.

"Should it have been? No," she said, when asked if she thought the board should have allowed Raykovitz and Genovese to be in the top two charity positions after they married. "Any good management person would say that."

Many people said Raykovitz and Genovese were very good at keeping their personal lives separate from work. So good that some board members didn’t even know they were married.

The ignorance was their own fault. The marriage is no secret — it’s disclosed on the charity’s tax forms each year.

Still, there was an infamous story about board members learning only by attending the couple’s Christmas party, held at their home, that they were husband and wife.

Claudia Williams was one of the newer board member who didn’t know about the relationship.

"I was surprised that it wasn’t something disclosed up front," Williams said. "This was my first participation in a nonprofit board. So I think it’s fair to say I learned a lot about what I want to know up front, what to ask. I was completely naive to think that nonprofit meant nonprofit. Who knew Jack Raykovitz and Katherine Genovese were married and making a ton of money."

Supporters of Raykovitz and Genovese argue that he could have been making a lot more money in private practice, and the salaries of the entire charity staff were on par with other nonprofits.

That hasn’t stopped the scrutiny.

Heim, who was interviewed by federal investigators and is scheduled to appear before the state grand jury on Wednesday, said the questions he was asked were mostly about the couple, their salaries, the decision to allow
The common thread between this edit and the P-N’s edit of a January 8, 2012 column is the negative information about The Second Mile (TSM) and the government (i.e., DPW, CYS, and Corbett) was wiped clean. A summary of the information deleted from Part 4 includes:

- TSM knew that Sandusky had conducted himself inappropriately with children.
- TSM operated at relatively high costs compared to other charities and that its top management team did not have an open and/or inclusive management style.
- TSM may have inflated the reach of its programs and may be under investigation (by the Postal Inspection Service) for fraud.
- Corbett, former AG, had taken considerable donations during his gubernatorial campaign from TSM members while Sandusky was under investigation by his office and knew that Sandusky was still involved with the charity. He also did not stop disbursement of a $3M grant to the charity for its Center of Excellence once he became governor.
- Governor Corbett angrily defended his investigation as AG, which did not look into the possible role of TSM as an organization involved in child sex trafficking and in covering up Sandusky’s crimes.

Sara Ganim was a Pulitzer Prize winning reporter and her original column had made it through editorial and legal reviews, as was the practice at the P-N. There may have been a number of reasons for this deletion, but taking the deletion as a whole, it indicates a cover-up of epic proportions.

Abetting TSM’s Child Protection Smokescreen

Once the P-N broke the story of the Sandusky grand jury investigation, it sat back and did little in the way of reporting about the “victim factory” known as TSM. Instead, the P-N provided a platform for TSM to mislead the public about the charity’s operations and actions in the wake of Sandusky’s abuse investigation.

The P-N published multiple op-eds from TSM’s Executive Director, Dr. Jack Raykovitz in March and April 2011 and then a statement from the charity on November 4, 2011 when the arrest was announced. All of them had the same theme -- that there had been no reports of abuse and protection systems were in place.

The P-N never questioned the veracity of those statements – and it continued to repeat the falsehood that the charity had ‘banned Sandusky from programs involving children’ even in its August 12, 2012 expose’.

This excerpt from Part 2 of its 5-Part series demonstrates that the P-N was publishing a known falsehood by endorsing the charity’s story.

Sandusky forced out

On Nov. 25, 2008, Jerry Sandusky told Second Mile leader Jack Raykovitz that he had been accused of something inappropriate by a Clinton County boy.

Sandusky said the accusation involved touching, over clothing, and he insisted he was innocent.

That boy later became known as Victim 1 — the teenager who is credited with launching the investigation that led to 10 child sex abuse victims, a nationally conversation about sex abuse, and allegations of a systematic cover-up at Penn State. Sandusky was convicted in June on 45 counts of sexual abuse of 10 victims.

Raykovitz, a well-known and respected child psychologist in central Pennsylvania, immediately removed Sandusky from all events involving children, and strongly urged him to stay away from children outside of charity functions, too.

A Children and Youth Services investigation began, and a hearing in 2009 — it was closed to the public because it wasn’t a criminal case — was scheduled.

Sandusky vowed to fight the allegations, but changed his mind after Victim 1 told authorities he was subjected to mutual oral sex over several years. When the hearing was over, Sandusky lost his clearance from Childline — the state sex abuse registry and reporting center.
On November 11, 2011, Pittsburgh’s KDKA reporter, Marty Griffin, blew away the notion that Sandusky was kept out of children’s activities.

Mother Claims Second Mile Lied About Sandusky’s Presence At Camp

November 11, 2011 10:20 PM

(Credit KDKA)
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Marty Griffin
Looking for some inside juice? Marty Griffin is your man. Born and... Read More

PITTSBURGH (KDKA) — A local mother of a troubled child is angry tonight.

She says she was lied to by camp leaders at The Second Mile, the organization founded by Jerry Sandusky, the man at the center of the child sex abuse scandal at Penn State.

She says she was told that Sandusky wasn’t at the camp with her son, but he was.

The Second Mile camp is held on the Penn State campus. The kids stay in the dorms. Sandusky was a fixture there.

Also, according to a June 19, 2012 NBC News article by Michael Isikoff, Sandusky was permitted to speak at a family banquet after his abuse finding.
“According to a local newspaper, he was still slated to speak at a Second Mile fundraising banquet in February 2009 geared toward local families.”

However, the proof of the P-N cover-up comes from the P-N itself, which reported that Sandusky had abused Victim 9, a TSM participant, up through his sixteenth birthday in July 2009. With so many reporters on the Sandusky story, the editors obviously couldn’t clean up everything, thus the column by Matt Miller remained on their web-site and exposed the P-N’s attempted cover-up.

As noted in Chapter 6 (The Corbett Cover-Up), subsequent reports by the P-N all truncated the end date of Victim 9’s abuse to make it appear as if it ended in 2008.
“Concerns About Sandusky and Certain Boys”

During the first few weeks of the Sandusky scandal, the news came fast and furious— from all directions. From November 4th until mid-December, the news constantly churned, often with new twists and turns that commanded national headlines.

Such was the timeframe from the November 9th firings and riot to November 21st, when Louis Freeh was announced as the lead investigator for the so-called “independent” investigation of Penn State’s involvement in the Sandusky scandal.

After the media frenzy erupted over the firings and smouldered during the emotional Nebraska football weekend, complete with protestors from the Westboro Baptist Church, the news cycle heated up again with a new report that Mike McQueary had sent an email that told a different story than the grand jury presentment. That was almost immediately followed by the announcement that Joe Paterno had lung cancer. And just days after that, PSU announced that it would conduct an internal investigation led by Louis Freeh.

Lost in the mayhem were three P-N columns from November 15th, 17th, and 18th that reported “the charity already had concerns about Sandusky and certain boys.” The November 18th column had an additional statement from an unnamed TSM board member who clarified the concern was about Sandusky’s mentoring style.

The Patriot-News has learned that in 2008, Second Mile executive Katherine Genovese told a person in authority that the charity already had concerns about Sandusky and certain boys.

That conversation is said to have occurred around the same time that a Clinton County boy came forward with detailed allegations of sexual abuse. Genovese, Second Mile’s vice president of development, is married to Jack Raskovitz, who resigned on Sunday as

By and large, the public and the national media was so focused on PSU that this news hardly made a ripple in comparison to the more sensational stories. The P-N didn’t elaborate on what those concerns were until the August 12, 2012 five-part series, when it temporarily reported that the charity had to “tell him to back off certain kids before.” As noted earlier, that quote was later scrubbed from the article.

In December 2011, the AP reported the Genovese comment somewhat differently, but the same theme prevailed— TSM officials knew Sandusky’s relationships with the children were inappropriate. The P-N linked the AP story, but did no exclusive reporting or follow-up.¹

¹ The AP article also noted disgust by TSM’s donors and Board over being kept in the dark, however the P-N never did any exclusive reporting on those issues. These are examples of a recurring theme that revealed when information surfaced that challenged the narrative of a PSU cover-up, the P-N refused to cover it or, at worst, printed falsehoods to defuse the story.
And the head of Clinton County's child welfare agency, where the 2008 investigation began, said Raykovitz's wife told him in November 2008 that Sandusky had been spoken to about getting "too close" to children involved with the charity. Gerald Rosamilia said Raykovitz's wife, Katherine Genovese, who helped run The Second Mile, did not define what was meant by "too close" or give a timeframe.

Part 3 of the series reported that PSU AD Tim Curley informed TSM Executive Director, Dr. Jack Raykovitz about the shower incident in 2001. Raykovitz failed to share that information with the TSM Board (under the advisement of board member, Bruce Heim).

The evidence, therefore, reveals that TSM was aware of an incident of inappropriate conduct involving Sandusky and a boy in 2001 and that they were aware of other incidents in which they had to tell him to “back off some kids” prior to the 2008 allegations, in which they learned Sandusky was under investigation for child abuse.

Despite all this knowledge of inappropriate behavior, the P-N’s coverage reflected a tacit approval of a suspected pedophile/child molester keeping his association with a children’s charity up until the point of his arrest.

The Failure to Report Child Abuse Cover Up

One of the greatest powers of the media is not reporting the news. This occurred quite often in the P-N’s Sandusky coverage, but the most egregious omission by the paper of record was its failure to mention that Dr. Jack Raykovitz was a mandated reporter of child abuse.

It was an inexcusable omission.

From the moment the grand jury presentment was released, the public learned that PSU officials had informed Dr. Raykovitz of the 2002 (sic) incident. The presentment also included a citation of the Commonwealth’s child abuse reporting statute (Child Protective Services Law: 23 Pa.C.S. § 6311).

Anyone with a computer and the internet could have found out what it said, however, the P-N never reported on the legal requirements of the statute. As noted earlier, Sara Ganim stated the stories were “very well lawyered.” That being the case, how did the P-N lawyers let Ganim and the editorial board incorrectly report that PSU had a legal requirement to report Sandusky’s abuse, but then never once mention that Dr. Raykovitz was a mandated reporter?

The law is clear:

(b) Enumeration of persons required to report.—Persons required to report under subsection (a) include, but are not limited to, any licensed physician, osteopath, medical examiner, coroner, funeral director, dentist, optometrist, chiropractor, podiatrist, intern, registered nurse, licensed practical nurse, hospital personnel engaged in the admission, examination, care or treatment of persons, Christian Science practitioner, member of the clergy, school administrator, school teacher, school nurse, social services worker, day-care center worker or any other child-care or foster-care worker, mental health professional, peace officer or law enforcement official.
For the sake of completeness, the definition of a student makes it rather clear that PSU was not considered a school under the child protective services law and that the University administrators facing charges were not mandated reporters. This determination originates from the definition of a student under 23 Pa.C.S. § 6303. Definitions. (a) Student.

Student." An individual enrolled in a public or private school, intermediate unit or area vocational-technical school who is under 18 years of age.

From that definition it is obvious that “school” rules in the statute apply to public school students ages K-17, thus PSU was not an educational institution under the statute. That did not stop the P-N from falsely reporting that school rules applied to PSU.

In a November 13, 2011, Op-Ed, it reported:

Those who see or hear of child abuse are expected to report it, but if someone works at an educational institution, they are only required to report it to the “person in charge,” a term not clearly defined.

Please note that all three defendants in the case have moved for dismissal of the failure to report charge based on the plain words in the law. This fact has also gone unreported in the P-N’s reporting on the motions of the defendants.

The Pulitzer committee stated the P-N’s reporting showed “expertise.”

Crime and courts reporter, Sara Ganim, covered the Sandusky case for over a year and never once reported the contents of the child abuse reporting statute.

Never once.

The Nittany Lion Mascot Deflection

The P-N used deletions, omissions, excuses, smokescreens, and falsehoods in an effort to cover up the misdeeds of TSM, but on November 17th, 2011, they used “deflection” to focus the public’s attention away from the conflicts-of-interest between TSM, Governor Corbett, and the PSU Board of Trustees (BOT) and divert attention on less meaningful ties between PSU and the charity.

As noted in the first part of the article, the P-N temporarily reported about potential conflicts of interests in Part 4 of the 5 Part series (later deleting that information). The relevant part of the deletion follows:

---

2 All three PSU defendants have cited that they were not mandated reporters under the 2001 law in a motion to dismiss the charges.
Current and former Second Mile board members, their businesses and families, contributed more than $640,000 — according to a tabulation done by Deadspin.com — to his (Corbett) gubernatorial campaign, which he accepted knowing the charity’s founder was under investigation by his office.

Corbett also knew Sandusky was still attending fundraising events until his retirement but didn’t say anything to charity officials about the nature of the allegations.

Corbett says he couldn’t, citing grand jury secrecy rules. He also defends giving The Second Mile a $3 million grant after taking office as governor.

In interviews following Sandusky’s arrest, Corbett also said The Second Mile charity was never under investigation. Given the scope of current federal probes, some have questioned why he would not have taken a closer look at the organization before giving it state money.

The criticism continues to haunt him. Just last month, Corbett was caught on video angrily chastising a reporter who asked if the former AG would have done anything differently in the Sandusky investigation.

That state grant — it was later rescinded — was supposed to have gone to the building of a recreation center. The project has now been abandoned. But one of the charity’s biggest financial supporters is suing the organization over his donation to the project.

A reasonable person reading that passage would certainly believe that the ties between Corbett and TSM provided the perception of a conflict of interest. Unfortunately, the P-N didn’t even tell half the story (before they deleted it).

This brings us back to the Nittany Lion Mascot.

The November 17th story, which was part of the Pulitzer Prize winning entries by the P-N, was a rather extensive, but misleading, column about the ties between PSU and TSM.

Its print story had the title, “ONE BIG FAMILY,” and pictured Joe Paterno, Tom Ridge, and Kerry Collins standing on a dais at a TSM event. The article went on to mislead the readers into believing that Paterno gave TSM considerable assistance with fund raising and that PSU was using TSM to build its brand.

The reality was the opposite. Paterno, nor Curley, Schultz, or Spanier for that matter, were listed as a donor on any of TSM’s annual reports from the year 2000 to 2010. TSM was actually...
using PSU to build its brand through a practice called “brand association,” where a brand of lesser equity (TSM) ties itself to a brand of higher equity (PSU) to boost its brand.

However, the article really went into deflection mode when it characterized the importance of certain donors having a “bond” between PSU and TSM. The column focused on the donations of Drue Ann Schreyer and the Schreyer Foundation and those of Lloyd and Dottie Huck. The late Bill Schreyer was the past chair of the PSU BOT from 1993 to 1996 – hardly recent history. The late Lloyd Huck was an emeritus trustee, whose wife was a board member of TSM. However, the bias in the article was apparent when the P-N tied Merck’s donations to Lloyd Huck.

Kenneth Frazier, Merck’s CEO, was sitting on the PSU BOT at the time of the article went to press, yet the article didn’t mention this obvious connection. Merck donated between $2,000-$4,999 between 2005 and 2009 – but abruptly stopped giving in 2010.

The P-N’s Donald Gilliland conducted most of the research on the story, utilizing the charity’s Annual Reports and IRS 990 forms, to uncover the (cherry picked) data used by Sara Ganim and Jeff Frantz for the column. However, this passage takes the cake for innuendo about PSU’s alleged role in the Sandusky scandal.
There has been absolutely no evidence produced to date that Spanier, Paterno, Curley, and/or Schultz were made aware of the 2008 Sandusky investigation until PSU received a subpoena for their testimony in late 2010, but this column is written as if PSU knew about the investigation and continued to give tremendous financial support the charity. The financial donations cited in the column were paltry at best. The Lake Erie Chapter of the Penn State Alumni Association gave between $500 and $999 while the Penn State Altoona Campus and Penn State Milton S. Hershey Medical Center each gave between $1000 and $1999.

The truth was that the bigger money was flowing between other TSM Board members and from some PSU BOT members. In other words, the possible conflicts of interest between TSM, PSU, and Governor Corbett went completely unreported.

For example, three TSM Board members (Poole, Struthers, and Gall) and/or their families had business dealings with PSU and served on PSU’s Campaign for the Future with then PSU BOT members, John Surma, Karen Peetz, Ted Junker (emeritus) and James Broadhurst.

**Robert E. Poole** was the Chairman of the Board of TSM and served as the PSU Campaign for the Future, Major Gifts Chairman. Poole owned Poole/Anderson Construction which had over a dozen major construction projects with PSU. He was awarded the contract for TSM’s Center for Excellence and received a payment of over $100,000 for work on the project in 2010 – prior to the charity’s collapse. Poole also held fundraisers for Corbett in his home. Poole donated between $20,000-$49,999 per year to TSM from 2005 to 2010.

Amazingly, Poole’s name wasn’t mentioned at all in the 5-Part story that ran in August 2012.

**Richard (Ric) K. Struthers** was on the board of TSM and also a PSU distinguished alumni. He is an at-large member of the Campaign for the Future. Struthers’ MBNA/Bank of America credit card deal with PSU involved paying $30 million dollars to the University for exclusive use of its alumni lists for sales and marketing from 1994 to 2010. Struthers donated at least $50,000 per year to TSM in 2005, 2006, and 2007. He donated at lower levels in 2008 through 2010. His family foundation donated $250,000 to the Building Fund for the PSU Smeal College of Business in 2010.

Linda Gall was also a member of the Board of Directors for The Second Mile, who also sat on the Executive Committee for the Campaign for the Future. She is the chair of the Stewardship Committee for the campaign. Linda’s husband, Blake, is the founder and president of Micro Plus Plus Investments and is a member of Penn State’s Investment Council. The Galls donated over $50,000 per year to TSM from 2005 to 2010.

Paul Silvis, PSU BOT member until 2014, and his company, Restek, donated between $2000-$4999 from 2005 to 2010 to TSM. Silvis is also a member of the Advisory Board for the For the Future: The Campaign for Penn State Students.
Similarly, the CEO of United States Steel, John Surma, was the vice-chair of the PSU BOT when the article went to press. U.S. Steel donated between $5,000-$9,999 per year from 2005 to 2008, and then decreased its gift to $2,000-$4,999 in 2009 and 2010.

In summary, the P-N highlighted some rather paltry donations and spurious connections between PSU and TSM, while completely whiffing on the significant financial and business associations revolving around TSM. After reading this assessment, why would anyone take the P-N’s reporting seriously?

**The Jake Corman “Mistake”**

In June 2012, Senator Jake Corman, (R-Centre County) opined that the transfer of TSM’s assets to Arrow Ministries was a positive because it would keep some of the charity’s “programs alive.” In November, Corman told various media outlets that he was kept in the dark about Sandusky’s abuse and didn’t find out about it until the P-N reported about the Sandusky investigation in March 2011.

As noted in the previous section, the P-N staff did rather extensive reviews of TSM’s Annual Reports in November 2011. It is clear on both the charity’s Annual Report and IRS 990 form (below) that Corman was a member prior to August 31, 2009. Sandusky announced his abuse finding and resignation that fall.

![Image of Annual Report and IRS 990 form](image)

However, the P-N reported that Corman joined the TSM Board in 2010 – an obvious falsehood.
Was this an honest mistake or was it part of the P-N’s practice of protecting influential members of the TSM Board? See Cliff Benson.

The Cliff Benson Appointment

In February 2014, Governor Corbett appointed former TSM board member Cliff Benson to the PSU BOT. Benson’s former association with TSM was first highlighted by the Associated Press and then the P-N ran two stories on the appointment. In neither of those stories did the P-N make the important observation that Benson – like Corman – was on the charity’s state board for the year ending August 2009. The significance of the date is that Sandusky announced his resignation from the charity that fall at a Second Mile board meeting.

As Sara Ganim reported, the charity’s board was split on what to do about Sandusky, but eventually agreed to let him keep his association with TSM for the purposes of fund raising. Benson’s continued association with the TSM board could be considered tacit endorsement of the decision to conceal Sandusky’s abuse finding from the public.

The P-N’s coverage of Benson’s appointment to the PSU BOT used the smokescreen of discussing Benson’s association with the charity with then President David Woodle. Woodle also dodged the issue.
of Benson’s knowledge of Sandusky’s 2008 abuse finding, but may not have done Benson any favors by associating him with oversight of the charity’s finances.  

According to its IRS 990 forms, TSM had not had an outside audit of its books from 2004 to 2011. The P-N’s report on Benson may result in some unintended consequences.

**Obfuscating the Mismanagement at TSM**

While deletion was the P-N’s tool used in Part 4 of the 5-Part series on TSM, obfuscation was the tool of choice in Part 3. While some may try to argue that the P-N was merely incompetent, the evidence that they were perpetrating a fraud on the citizens of Pennsylvania and the nation is just too overwhelming.

The P-N’s report of the discussion that took place at TSM after the 2001 incident could be considered obtuse at best. It provided no context, leaving the public unable to understand just how negligent Bruce Heim and Dr. Raykovitz were in not reporting the 2001 incident. These men were in oversight positions of a children’s charity with the responsibility to protect the children – and they failed miserably.

Here are the highlights of the discussion...

Curley **told** Raykovitz **only** that someone had witnessed something inappropriate, it was investigated and the result was to **tell Sandusky not to shower on campus with kids**.

Heim asked Raykovitz **if anything inappropriate happened** between the boy and Sandusky, and Raykovitz answered, "No."

---
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“They looked into it,” Raykovitz told Heim, according to Heim’s memory. “And nothing inappropriate happened.”

“For five years, I worked out at the football facility, several times a week, and saw Jerry showering with children.”

Sources say Raykovitz told Sandusky that as silly as it might sound, maybe he should wear swim trunks if he’s showering with kids after a workout.

Here is the excerpt from the column.

According to the grand jury presentment, Curley told Raykovitz only that someone had witnessed something inappropriate, it was investigated and the result was to tell Sandusky not to shower on campus with kids.

Raykovitz in turn told a few members of his staff and the board’s executive members what Curley had told him.

Bruce Heim was one of them.

“It goes right to the heart of what Tim Curley said to the grand jury, and that is that Tim Curley told him that he didn’t want Jerry Sandusky on campus anymore in the showers, because we were in a day and age where that was inappropriate,” Heim said.

Heim asked Raykovitz if anything inappropriate happened between the boy and Sandusky, and Raykovitz answered, “No.”

That’s what Raykovitz believed, based on what Curley had told him.

“They looked into it,” Raykovitz told Heim, according to Heim’s memory. “And nothing inappropriate happened.”

Raykovitz then asked Heim — a local real estate investor and someone who isn’t shy about his loyalty to Penn State, the Paterno family and many of the key players in this scandal — if he should relay this to the full board.

“And I said no,” Heim said.

“For five years, I worked out at the football facility, several times a week, and saw Jerry showering with children,” he said. “I said I don’t think it’s relevant. It happens every day at the YMCA. I remember the conversation specifically because it seemed like a nonstarter because of what Penn State said went on.”

On that advice, Raykovitz didn’t tell the board. He did have a talk with Sandusky, and told him to be more careful.

Sources say Raykovitz told Sandusky that as silly as it might sound, maybe he should wear swim trunks if he’s showering with kids after a workout.
Undoubtedly, Dr. Raykovitz and Bruce Heim were informed of a breach of child protection protocol, but refused to recognize it as such. As a reference, here are examples taken from a child protection guide on inappropriate methods of attention. I have footnoted violations by Sandusky.

2. The following forms of affection are considered inappropri
te with children and youth in ministry setting because many of them are the behaviors that child molesters use to groom children or youth and their parents for later molesta
tion or can be, in and of themselves, sexual abuse.

• Inappropriate or lengthy embraces.4
• Kisses on the mouth.5
• Holding children over three years old on the lap.
• Touching bottoms, chests or genital areas other than for appropriate diapering or toileting of infants and toddlers
• Showing affection in isolated areas such as bedrooms, closets, staff only areas or other private rooms.6
• Occupying a bed with a child7
• Touching knees or legs of children or youth.8
• Wrestling with children or youth.9
• Tickling children or youth.10
• Piggyback rides.
• Any type of massage given by a child or youth to an adult.
• Any type of massage given by an adult to a child or youth.11
• Any form of unwanted affection.12
• Comments or compliments (spoken, written, or electronic) that relate to physique or body development. Examples would be, “You sure are developing,” or “You look really hot in those jeans.”
• Snapping bras or giving wedgies or similar touch of underwear whether or not it is covered by other clothing.
• Giving gifts or money to individual children or youth.13
• Private meals with individual children or youth.

---

4 Sandusky admitted to hugging Victim 1 for 5 to 20 minutes at a time.
5 Testified to by several victims.
6 Testified to by most known victims.
7 Testified to by Victims 1 and 7
8 Testified to by all known victims.
9 Testified to by Victims 1, 4, 5, 6, and 10 plus non-victims
10 Testified to by Victim 6
11 Testified to by Victim 1.
12 Testified to by most known victims.
13 Testified to by Victims 1, 4, 9, and 10
The lack of understanding of the practices for the protection of children by TSM officials was clearly one of the key enablers of Sandusky’s abuse, but neither the P-N nor any other media outlet exposed this obvious failure. Instead, the P-N would summarily excuse Sandusky’s unacceptable practices of showering and being alone with children by framing them as “merely” things that made someone at PSU uncomfortable.

Penn State officials did notify The Second Mile, according to the grand jury. In fact, the university supposedly banned Sandusky from bringing Second Mile boys into the football locker room, though a top official admitted the ban was “unenforceable.”

Charity officials have said they were merely told an employee was “uncomfortable” about seeing Sandusky in the locker room shower with a boy, and that an internal investigation revealed no wrongdoing.

Sandusky continued his Second Mile activities and fundraising after the 2002, and received an annual consultant fee of $57,000 from the charity.

What were these men doing in positions as Directors of a youth organization? And come to think of it, no one at the P-N, especially Sara Ganim, should be entrusted with a child if their reporting is a reflection of their view of proper child protection protocols.

The P-N’s reporters also whiffed on yet another key issue with the management of the charity: a lack of qualified individuals. Ironically, as mentioned earlier, a former TSM member, Cliff Benson, was recently appointed to the PSU BOT by Governor Corbett.

According to information provided by TSM to the Pittsburgh Foundation for its 2010 report, the TSM Board was composed of the following individuals.

Mr. Cliff Benson - Retired, Deloitte Tax LLP - Voting (recently appointed to PSU BOT)
Mr. Jerry Burton - Certified Brain Specialist - Voting
Mr. Donald Carlino - President, Airgas Safety, Inc. - Voting
Sen. Jake Corman - Pennsylvania State Senator - Voting
Mr. Neal DeAngelo - Owner, DeAngelo Brothers, Inc. - Voting
Ms. Anne Deeter Gallaher - Owner, Deeter Gallaher Group LLC - Voting
Mr. Edward Dunklebarger - President, Susquehanna Bancshares, Inc. - Voting
Mr. Kenneth Ewing - Retired, Hershey Foods Corporation - Voting Mr.
Michael Fiaschetti - Senior Vice President, Highmark Blue Shield - Voting
Mr. Michael A. Fiore - Executive Vice President, Leonard S. Fiore, Inc. - Voting
Mrs. Linda Gall - Community Volunteer - Voting
Mr. Mark Greenberg - Director, The Prevention Research Center, College of Health and Human Development, Pennsylvania State University - Voting
Mr. Bruce Heim - Chairman, Keystone Real Estate Group, LP – Voting
Mrs. Dorothy Huck - Community Volunteer - Voting
Mr. Dick Kile - President, Tri Emerald Financial Group - Voting
Mr. Tom Knepley - Sales and Marketing Coordinator, Techblhrs - Voting
Mr. Michael Kuntz - Vice President and General Manager, Turner Construction - Voting
Mr. William Martin - Certified Financial Planner, uFinancial - Voting
Mr. Matt Millen - ESPN Football Analyst - Voting
Mr. Daryl Milliner - Regional Vice President, Paradigm Partners - Voting
Ms. Heidi Nicholas - Real Estate Developer & Manager, CEI, Inc. - Voting
Mr. Michael O’Donnell - Vice President, Wealth Advisor, Morgan Stanley - Voting
Ms. Kim Ortenzio-Nielsen\(^{14}\) - Community Volunteer - Voting
Mr. Chuck Pearson - Retired, Bank Chairman, Waypoint Financial - Voting
Mr. Eric Peterson - CPA, Walz, Deihm, Geisenberger, Bucklen & Tennis - Voting
Mr. Robert Poole (Chairman) – Poole/Anderson Construction - Voting
Mr. Alec Pringle - Real Estate Appraiser/Developer - Voting
Mrs. Nancy Ring - Realtor, REMAX Centre County - Voting
Ms. DrueAnne Schreyer - Community Volunteer - Voting
Mr. Steve Seltzer - President, Steve Seltzer Honda - Voting
Mrs. Lauren Shank - Corporate Attorney and Community Volunteer - Voting
Mr. Louie Sheetz - Executive Vice President Marketing, Sheetz, Inc. – Voting
Mr. Clyde Shuman - Principal, Precision Medical, Inc. - Voting
Mr. Fred Strouse - Realtor, Kissinger Bigatel Brower - Voting
Mr. Richard Struthers - Retired, Bank of America - Voting
Mr. Michael Sullivan - Owner, Automated Records Centre - Voting Mr.
David Woodle - Chairman & CEO, NanoHorizons, Inc. - Voting

The list of directors is dominated by individuals in the real estate, construction, and financial industries, while only two have any professional experience related to health and human services. If you were looking for a board to raise money and construct buildings, this would be ideal. Unfortunately, the primary role of TSM was to help at-risk children.

**Lack of Child Protection Policies**

The P-N was similarly obtuse in failing to call out the lack of common-sense policies that would be expected in a youth organization. Ganim reported in a matter-of-fact manner that Sandusky had unfettered, one on one access to children, without the consent of the parents.

\(^{14}\) Kim Ortenzio-Nielsen is employed a physician’s assistant
A former TSM employee and two of its counselors confirmed that TSM had no rules or written policies about contact with children.

The counselors said their training was informal and mostly focused on recognizing signs of suspected abuse in the children who came to the camp, how to ask appropriate questions (e.g., non-leading questions) in order to determine whether a call to CYS was needed, and how to make these calls.

The counselors noted that there were also policies on appropriate consequences for children who needed discipline during the week (e.g., no physical/corporal punishment etc.) However, there was no formal training regarding contact with the campers. There probably was some brief training of appropriate boundaries and/or what constituted an inappropriate/appropriate touch with campers, but there was no formal written policy/procedure in place.

One counselor noted he had also worked as a camp counselor at a Boy Scout camp and that the Scouts had well documented policies. He noted that TSM “had nothing as specific or strict.”

It was the lack of these policies, as well as the organization of TSM, that enabled Sandusky to abuse so many children. Recall that Sandusky started the charity in 1977 as a foster home and would simply inform individuals that they were on the charity’s board. It was a completely “by the seat of the pants” operation with few if any formal policies. And that’s pretty much the way it stayed. The Commonwealth’s foster family policies contain no requirements about appropriate or inappropriate contact, aside from citing disciplinary methods.

In order for the public to understand just how lax the protection of children was at TSM, I have provided an example of child protection policies from the Episcopal Church- Church Pension Group, “Model Policies for the Protection of Children and Youth From Abuse.” I have denoted the child protection policies that were violated by Sandusky in **bold**.

**MONITORING AND SUPERVISION OF PROGRAMS**

1. Every program for children and youth must have established ratios for adults and children. Compliance with the established ratio is required at all times, including activities that occur off church premises.\(^{15}\)

\[^{15}\] Sandusky would take car loads of children swimming or to activities with no other adults present.
2. Church Personnel are prohibited from being alone with a child or youth or multiple children or youth where other adults cannot easily observe them.  

3. Church Personnel over the age of 21 must directly supervise Church personnel under the age of 18 and be physically present during all activities.

4. An up to date list of approved congregation-sponsored programs for children and youth will be maintained in the church office or other place where church records are kept.

5. Church Personnel are not permitted to develop new activities for children and youth without approval from the rector or canonical equivalent. Requests to develop new activities should be submitted in writing to the rector. The rector will consider whether the plan for a new activity includes adequate adult supervision.

6. Each program will develop age-appropriate procedures to ensure the safety of children and youth using restrooms and showers or baths.

7. When supervising or assisting private activities such as dressing, showering or diapering infants or children, Church Personnel will remain in an area observable by other adults or work in pairs.

8. At least two unrelated Church Personnel must supervise activities. When both boys and girls are participating, male and female adults must be present.

GENERAL CONDUCT FOR THE PROTECTION OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH

1. All Church Personnel who work with children or youth must agree to comply with the [Parish] Guidelines for Appropriate Affection (Appendix A).

2. No person will be allowed to volunteer to Regularly Work With Children or Youth until the person has been known to the clergy and congregation for at least six months.

3. Programs for infants and children under six (6) years old will have procedures to ensure that children are released only to their parents or legal guardians or those designated by them.

4. Church Personnel are prohibited from the use, possession, distribution, or being under the influence of alcohol, illegal drugs, or the misuse of legal drugs while participating in or assisting with programs or activities specifically for children or youth.

16 Id.
17 Sandusky had created individualized programs that were not maintained by TSM, such as the “Golf for L.I.F.E Mentor Program” and the “Positive Action Program” for Victim 4.
18 Id.
19 Sandusky showered with teenage and pre-teen children.
20 Id., page 11
21 TSM encouraged one-on-one contact between adults and children in the Friend Fitness program.
22 Obviously, no such policy existed at TSM.
5. Parents or guardians must complete written permission forms before Church Personnel transport children and youth for a church sponsored activity or for any purpose on more than an occasional basis. 23

6. Church Personnel will respond to children and youth with respect, consideration and equal treatment, regardless of sex, race, religion, sexual orientation, culture or socio-economic status. Church Personnel will portray a positive role model for children and youth by maintaining an attitude of respect, patience, and maturity. They will avoid even the appearance of favoritism.

7. One-to-one counseling with children or youth will be done in an open or public or other place where private conversations are possible but occur in full view of others. 24

8. Church Personnel are prohibited from dating or becoming romantically involved with a child or youth. 25

9. Church Personnel are prohibited from having sexual contact with a child or youth. 26

10. Church Personnel are prohibited from possessing any sexually oriented materials (magazines, cards, videos, films, clothing etc.) on church property or in the presence of children or youth except as expressly permitted as part of a pre-authorized educational program.

11. Church Personnel are prohibited from using the Internet to view or download any sexually oriented materials on church property or in the presence of children or youth.

12. Church Personnel are prohibited from discussing their own sexual activities, including dreams and fantasies, or discussing their use of sexually oriented or explicit materials such as pornography, videos or materials on or from the Internet, with children or youth.

13. Church Personnel are prohibited from sleeping in the same beds, sleeping bags, tents, hotel rooms or other rooms with children or youth unless the adult is an immediate family member of all children or youth in the bed, sleeping bag, tent, hotel room or other room. It is acceptable to have multiple adults sleep with all the children or youth participating in one open space such as a church basement or camp lodge. 27

14. Church Personnel are prohibited from dressing, undressing, bathing, or showering in the presence of children or youth. 28

15. Church Personnel are prohibited from using physical punishment in any way for behavior management of children and youth. No form of physical discipline is acceptable. This prohibition includes spanking, slapping, pinching, hitting, or any other physical force. Physical force

23 Many victims testified that Sandusky called them directly to arrange activities, with no notice to parents.
24 Counselors stated that Sandusky would arrive at Summer Camp activities with the young man he was mentoring in tow.
25 Sandusky’s relationship with Victims 1 and 4 was described much like a teenage romance.
26 Sandusky was found guilty of having sexual contact with Victim 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, and 10.
27 Sandusky admitted to spending overnight stays in the same room (alone) with Victim 1.
28 Sandusky frequently showered with TSM children.
may only be used to stop a behavior that may cause immediate harm to the individual or to a child, youth or others.

16. Church Personnel are prohibited from using harsh language, degrading punishment, or mechanical restraint such as rope or tape for behavior management.

17. Church Personnel are prohibited from participating in or allowing others to conduct any hazing activities relating to children’s or youth ministry or camp activities.

The evidence of the failures of TSM to establish a system of controls for the protection of children was a key enabler of Sandusky’s abuse, yet the P-N never reported this fact. Nor did it bring to light any judgment on TSM officials for not only their failures to recognize the signs of possible child sexual abuse, but who simply told Sandusky “to back off certain kids” when he got too close. In other words, they recognized inappropriate behavior but only intervened enough to move him onto the next victim.

A reputable news organization would have demanded the charity be shut down for these behaviors. Instead, the P-N crucified Penn State, and projected the shortcomings of The Second Mile directors, who were in charge of Sandusky and responsible for the welfare of the children, onto the PSU officials.

One thing is for certain, it has been more than obvious from the outset that the OAG, the P-N, and Governor Corbett were all attempting to preserve the charity and its associates. This is proven by the absence of charges brought against TSM and lack of critical reporting on the directors’ failures.

Does the Pulitzer committee really believe the P-N’s reporting, which kept TSM children at risk, was “courageous?”