



The Mandatory Reporting Task Force | Meeting 18 May 8, 2024

Reporting Processes Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

Facilitators: Doris Tolliver

Members: See Appendix A

<p>Subcommittee Conversation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Doris Tolliver welcomed the subcommittee. She started with reviewing the survey results.• Doris asked questions in the order of the survey results linked above. For the first question, there was an overwhelming 'yes' to amend the section. She asked for thoughts. Zane Grant said his concern is distinguishing the difference between multiple reporters who directly observe the same situation vs. delegating a report. He said that he doesn't want to get people off the hook. Jordan Steffan said that there is a lot of overlap of the directives; the CPO team has tried to isolate them as best as they could so they can form the baseline for the recommendation. Doris thanked them. Zane said that he is still thinking about how every direct observer should have to make their own report. Doris said that he responded yes to this question and explained that most of the comments around this question indicated that one person can make a report if there is identical information or the person to make the report should have the most information. She also highlighted his comments around others retaining documentation that a report was made with the identical information. Zane thanked her and said that he doesn't want to make a loophole unintentionally. He wants a mechanism that the reporter can fall back on to prove that a report was made. There can be reciprocity in the system; DHS can provide a reference number to reporters. He is not sure if every county is providing a reference number or proof. Doris thanked him. Jessica Dotter said that this recommendation could use clarity around 'cause to be made'. She suggests removing this phrase to clarify that the reporter has this duty. Doris asked how she responded. Jessica said that she responded yes; she'd rather just have two people calling in. Doris thanked her. Michelle Dossey said that people often have different information. But, it can be taxing for the system to generate multiple reports. TRAILS only allows for one name and one set of information. TRAILS can be modified to allow for multiple reporting parties. Perhaps there can be an option for people to add their name or add information to a report. She also thinks that not every county is supplying a reference number or confirmation. Doris thanked her. Jennifer Eyl said that she is thinking about taking out 'cause to be made' since this is similar to other directives. Being able to share the confirmation number with the other reporters could be beneficial. She doesn't want to imply that people cannot make a separate report. Doris thanked her and highlighted Jessica's electronic chat. Doris asked for more comments. There were none.• Doris moved to the second question; there was an overwhelming yes response. She asked for comments. Kevin Bishop said that he thinks he responded no because he is not sure of the benefit to reporters by providing knowledge that a previous report has been made other than record keeping. It doesn't prevent a
----------------------------------	---



call and requires DHS and law enforcement to coordinate with each other which can be difficult. Once a reporter gets the reference number, he is unsure what to do with it and how it can protect a child. Doris thanked him and said that the reference number is most important for reporters who did not make a report. Jordan confirmed that this question is about reporters obtaining the confirmation number so they can check in on a report. Jessica said that she agrees with Kevin; there should not be a requirement. In the bigger picture, this is a procedural issue and different counties will deal with it differently. Reporters can call in to confirm that a report was made; there is an exception for this already. This question falls low on the value scale for her. She thinks that it is highly unlikely that it occurs that someone calls in to get a confirmation number. She thinks that it is unlikely that someone is charged for a failure to report because they were an additional person who knew that another person reported. Systems already have it in place to get confirmation numbers. Doris thanked her. Jennifer said she was confused by the question; it would be a confidentiality issue if anyone can call and get a DHS confirmation number. But there should be some piece of information that a primary reporter gets that other secondary reports can have. Doris thanked her. Zane said that he disagrees; every county is using TRAILS and that has a reference number. Reporters should be able to get this back in return. He hears the complaint that DHS does nothing after a report is made. There needs to be accountability on the county side after a report is made. This piece is for reporters but also for accountability for DHS. Getting a number back gives him confidence for tracking. He feels strongly about this. Doris thanked him and highlighted Gina's electronic chat. Gina Lopez said that she wants to see reciprocity and consistency across rural and urban counties. She also brought up clarity as well as community programs and members working together to support families and keep children safe. Doris thanked her and reminded that the question is about some kind of information DHS would give back to a reporter when a report has already been filed on this incident for this child. Michelle Dossey said that the statewide hotline was designed to mitigate the concerns Zane brought up. All calls are recorded which should mitigate people changing information to keep the referral with the information. The child welfare system currently interprets the statute that they cannot confirm or deny that a report was made. They take a separate report which takes extra time and can be duplicative. She thinks that everyone should not be off the hook but everything can be added to one referral by adding an addendum, for example. She also mentioned that a family has a total number of referrals made against them tallied in their risk assessment profile; the task force would not want to penalize a family when multiple reporters have the same information but it turns into multiple reports. She's suggesting that they should modify TRAILS to add to a report as well as statute clean up to be able to share confidential information. Doris thanked her. Stephanie Villfuerte said that she agrees with Michelle Dossey. Having a space to list everyone and giving people a referral number would be beneficial. Referral numbers are being generated. She sees the subcommittee members as saying the same thing. This would be a cleaning up



process rather than doing anything new. Doris thanked her. Jessica said that she never knew that risk assessments take duplicative calls and count them each against a family. This changes her basis since that seems unfair. She agrees with Stephanie; there should be a process for DHS to include anyone else that has this information. Doris said that this information is captured but not in a way that satisfied a mandate to report. Michelle Dossey said that there is an enhanced screening guide that counties are required to use. It asked who else would know about the abuse or neglect. She also offered clarification about the risk assessment; the risk assessment counts investigations against a family not necessarily reports. Doris thanked her; someone going out to investigate increased the score rather than the number of calls. Michelle Dossey confirmed. Doris thanked her and highlighted an electronic chat about red teams. Michelle Dossey said that during the red team, they can determine how many calls were screened in, founded, and screened out. They teach that the more referrals there are, the more dangerous a situation is. There is still a consideration about how many calls are made during the red team. Doris thanked her.

- Doris moved the conversation to question 3; she read it. Jordan explained further about the question; there could be reporters with similar information but have key differences so they want to address gathering information that could be different between reporters. Michelle Dossey said that there can be situations where the information is identical which can be exhaustive and she hopes the subcommittee cleans this up. Doris thanked her. Cris said that she understands how exhausting it can be on the system to have multiple reports but everyone has a different perspective. Her concern is who is reporting it and who's name goes on it. Everyone has a different training so people will not see things identically. Doris thanked her. Kevin said that he was confused by the question. When there are multiple reporters for the same incident, he would support that not everyone would have to make a report and this might be more procedural and legislatively. A legislative mandate feels big so he prefers to make these changes procedurally. Doris thanked her and said that the task force can make procedural recommendations rather than legislative. Stephanie said that she has a different view of DHS; they would collect this call and TRAILS can list other witnesses to an event. Until DHS said they will go assess and since they are not assessing when a call comes in, she is not seeing that DHS would have the ability to begin the assessment; it is the collection point. The assessment happens in the red team and with supervisors; there would be a list of other witnesses and then they would act on the assessment. She is not sure of the need to have multiple people call in a report but she is sure of the need to have their information documented. She wants to trust in DHS and law enforcement to do the work that they are trained to do. She wants to distinguish a hotline call. She also added that, when talking about legislation, the task force can frame things to encourage people to still call even if they have duplicative knowledge. Many people want to call in to add their additional knowledge. The recommendation is not barring people from calling if someone else already called it in; it is allowing for efficiencies in the system. She also mentioned that, people will generally call in if they suspect child



abuse. Jennifer said that she wants to disagree with the idea that this should not be in statute; reporters and their obligation is in statute so they should include this idea in statute. She appreciates Cris's idea about different perspectives in the room however this is not always the case. The task force is trying to streamline things for the department, law enforcement and reports. Doris thanked her.

- Doris said that people are bringing up delegation so she wants to jump to this question. There was an overwhelming no to this question in the survey. Jennifer said that delegation means giving responsibility to someone else as opposed to one person with the most complete information making the report to cover the responsibility of everyone who has information. These are two different questions. Jordan said that this is broken out into two conversations; Doris raised question 5 about institutional policies. Jennifer said that the answer is no from most of the subcommittee since this is a different conversation. Stephanie asked for more clarification. Jennifer said that designating one person to make a report when multiple people have the information is different than going to someone else who did not have the information and asking them to make the report. Doris thanked her and highlighted electronic chats from the subcommittee that they had the same thoughts. She also highlighted the consideration about delegation being to someone who did not otherwise have the information and deciding that not everyone with the same information has to make a separate report. Jennifer said that she wants to add that reporters can make a separate report if they want to but their obligation is fulfilled when someone else with the same information makes a report. Doris agreed and asked for more comments. Michelle Dossey said that she often hears reporters deferring to supervisors about making a report. This part of the legislation must be cleaned up so that a supervisor/ an organization shall not inhibit someone from making a report and it shall not be delegated. She is very passionate about this. Doris thanked her.
- Doris moved to the question regarding internal policies; there was an overwhelming no. The policies should not restrict the reporter from making the report themselves. Gina said that she is stuck on shared knowledge. She asked how a group of reporters could have the exact same information. She is concerned about joint knowledge and how people would know. She is concerned about rural communities and 'ganging up' on someone. Doris thanked her; if there is a group of people, they can influence each other and they could come up with a single story that someone might not have come up with on their own and this could be weaponized against some families. Gina agreed. Kevin said that he is not in support of greasing the wheels so more reports aren't made. People already do not trust professionals so he would not want someone inhibited to seek professionals. Doris thanked him and reiterated his point of not wanting to widen the door. Michelle Murphy said that she is confused about the purpose of collaborating reports. She said that internal policies should be permissive. Doris thanked her. Stephanie said that institutions should get guidance as well as considering time constraints. For example, some professions are very busy. The subcommittee should investigate institutions allowing employees space to report. Reports get delayed without this. If immediately means a day then there needs to



	<p>be space for reporters to make a report. This is different from encouraging people to report. She also brought up the notion of creating a single story; the process that the subcommittee is suggesting would be one report instead of multiple and listing each reporter. She brought up having to trust DHS to do their job. A mandatory reporter's job is to report. Doris thanked her.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Doris moved the conversation to the last question; she is skipping the question about the size of an institution. That question had an overwhelming no; most members indicated that they did not want organization size to be the determiner. She read the last question. Zane said that this question goes back to how much the subcommittee wants to dictate policies for institutions. Institutions can make their policy in accordance with the law. He appreciates the conversation but he thinks that the recommendations should be what the laws says and the institutions can make their own policy. Doris thanked him. Stephanie said that Zane's comments are accurate. Institutions can make policies; making a law that prohibits employers from inhibiting a report since that will cover it. Doris thanked her and asked for last comments. Michelle Dossey said that the thing that causes the most confusion is the 'cause a report to be made'; this is a loophole that confuses and allows institutions to dictate how a report is made. This statement needs to be addressed.
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Doris thanked the subcommittee for their comments and directed members to rejoin the large group discussion.

Appendix A:

Ashley Chase
Kevin Bishop
Jessica Dotter
Stephanie Villafuerte
Jennifer Eyl
Zane Grant
Dr. Kathi Wells
Kevin Bishop
Michelle Dossey
Gina Lopez
Cris Menz
Michelle Murphy