



The Mandatory Reporting Task Force

Data Subcommittee Meeting Minutes | June 5, 2024

Facilitators: Doris Tolliver

Members: See Appendix A

Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Doris Tolliver welcomed the subcommittee and explained more about the subcommittee topic. There will be time for the subcommittee to explore other state’s online reporting mechanisms. Bryan Kelley will also share the information from his conversation with Weld County. She asked for any questions; there were none.
Online Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Bryan shared information from Weld County. Weld County did not have anyone available to speak but Bryan can share this information. He explained that this allows for 24/7 reporting; if it is an emergency situation, then someone should call. He explained that all entries go into TRAILS. He said that 31% of the referrals entered using the online system and most were made by teachers and law enforcement. He said that other groups like neighbors and family members also rarely use it; they are more likely to call in. He continued that law enforcement value it for the 24/7 availability. He said that there is a challenge with incomplete reports that lack all the needed information; staff need to reach back out to reporters to chase down details which can sometimes take more staff hours. He said that Larimer County also had an online reporting tool but it was ended due to more staff hours. He explained that there are trainings for online reporting, especially for law enforcement who use it frequently. He continued that phone calls are more likely to capture all the information and online reporting requires more follow up. He said that there are pros and cons of every reporting mechanism. He continued that online reporting could make it easier to report which can mean that more reports that do not meet a threshold get made; this can cause families to be involved in the system. He asked questions.● Doris asked when it started. Bryan said he did not have an exact year but it was about 4 years ago; it’s new but not super new. She also asked if he knew the volume of online reporting. Bryan said that he did not; the only stat he had was that 31% of the referrals were from online reporting. He also shared that they also noted a drop down in the summer due to



teachers not making reports. He continued that the county had an email reporting process which got developed out to online reporting. She finally asked about disproportionality as a negative consequence of it being easier to use the online reporting tool; she asked about data on this. Bryan said that this information was not ready to share; he thinks that they had a problem in TRAILS where it was hard to determine reporters that were made by phone or online. Bryan also said that people can click through the reporting tool to see it as a dummy test but he asked that they not submit it. Doris asked if there are other counties using online reporting. Bryan said he is not sure; Michelle Dossey said she is not sure. Yolanda Arredondo said that she knows of counties using a hotline email but this is more for law enforcement rather than public.

- Michelle said that, from a large county perspective, Arapahoe County has considered an online reporting tool but has had challenges with people leaving information without accountability as well as a lack of an opportunity to gather more information. She also said that there is a state requirement to conduct advanced screening to ask additional questions. She thinks that someone cannot construct an online reporting tool to replicate this to ask follow up questions. She also wondered about review time management if the online tool is not staffed 24/7. She said that law enforcement advocated for an online reporting tool since they struggle with making an immediate call in their busy work day however she said that she worried about immediate safety concerns being submitted using online reporting. She explained that judges in juvenile court could make online reports which would result in a scheduled hearing with minimal information, prompting staff to need to chase down information. She said that this is a waste of time and county resources especially since they often would not get calls back; this resulted in staff making bad decisions with little information. She said that these are decisions her county thought about all the time but could not resolve the challenges. Doris thanked her.
- Yolanda asked if Weld County has a comparative sense of the time it takes for phone calls versus online reporting. Bryan said that the summary is that there is a substantial difference between times; the sentiment was not that counties should not use online reporting but that it requires



certain considerations. Yolanda asked if the data in TRAILS is when the report was made online or when the staff person was able to call the reporter back and get more information. Bryan said that the county was not able to differentiate between the referrals in TRAILS made by phone or online. Yolanda said that she wonders about this lack of differentiation since in a manual entry they can add how the referral was taken. Bryan asked for more information on this. Yolanda said she will follow up and suggested adding an additional value for online reporting on TRAILS as there are more counties using it. She is not sure how someone could determine the effectiveness of online reporting without analyzing it this way. Bryan thanked her and said that they only had stats on the percentage of online reports made; he is not sure if that data was collected during a particular time.

- Donna Wilson said that her concern is that using technology can create a technology divide; it is important to be mindful about it to avoid putting people on the margins. Michelle said that this includes offering to report in different languages or with a disability; she said that when she was looking at the website, she wondered if everyone knew the definitions used. Shawna said that the focus is on disparate outcomes and she wants to dive into how online reporting would address these goals. Doris thanked her and said that these are all topics to discuss in more detail.
- Doris asked about data around use of hotline reporting and the way in which a report was made since more counties are more adept and using other reporting tools; she wonders about a lack of awareness of the different reporting mechanisms differentiation in TRAILS. Yolanda said that CDHS gets the information off the pick list in TRAILS as to who the reports are made. Doris thanked her and said that they can continue offline to discuss more. Yolanda said that Weld County contracts with the state, she wonders if this allows the county the capacity to do the follow up. She said she would investigate this more. Doris thanked her.
- Michelle said that it would be interesting to share the enhanced screening guide in this conversation as well; it is required to be used by the state in any information gathering and is something the community knows little about. She offered to share it. Doris thanked her and added the consideration of if these questions get asked in the online reporting tool.



She also brought up if the questions in the enhanced screening are information by the conversation; this can make it more difficult to do online.

- Yolanda electronically shared the enhanced screening questions and explained it, there are prompts to the call taker to gather more information. She also said that, to Michelle’s point, this is why online reporting is challenging and also why CDHS decided not to have an online reporting tool; it is a disservice to families to intervene with little information. Michelle asked about assignment rate, based on Weld County data, by online reporting or phone reporting to help understand disproportionality more. Doris thanked her and said that they can compare online reporting from other mechanisms; this could maybe be done statewide. Bryan asked if there is a way to gather this. Doris reiterated that Yolanda indicated that there is a selection in TRAILS for the manner in which the report was submitted; the question is if Weld County is using this when entering into TRAILS. Yolanda said that she is going to share the specific categories in the drop down when she has that information available; she said it would be possible to add this option in. Bryan said that this data could be available, then, in a few months. Doris said she is curious about the options in the drop down. Michelle said she is almost positive that they can get this data since the online reports would not have a call recording. Yolanda said she can pull this data; her question is what staff are training to list an online report as. Doris asked if this can be a follow up question to Weld County; ‘how do they type up the reports given online?’. Bryan said he will do that and that when he is clicking through the online reporting, there are no follow up questions that pop up; this leads him to believe that it is not using enhanced screening. Michelle said she wonders how this is allowed. She continued that the subcommittee should keep compliance in mind. Bryan said that, continuing moving through the online report, there are follow-up questions about the family including their language and race; it is still an open question if the tool uses enhanced screening. Doris said that he can include this question in his follow up with Weld County.
- Bryan reiterated the state analysis document that contains the links for their online reporting tools. He noted that some states only have the



online tool available for mandatory reporters so those states are marked as such. He said that California is a county administered state and only Los Angeles County has an online reporting tool. He read Missouri's language. He also said that most states stipulate that if the situation is an emergency, then someone should call; the online reporting is only for non-emergency situations. Doris thanked him and electronically shared a note document for subcommittee members to add their thoughts as they are looking at each state's online reporting. She provided time for the subcommittee members to look at the online reporting tools and explained that there will be a break after that time.

- Doris brought the subcommittee back to have a discussion. She highlighted a common question around data to track efficacy and efficiency in online reporting processes. Michelle said that some options look good but she would need to see supporting data; some states discussed false reporting and its consequences and she would be curious to know how state's handle that. She brings this up in a context of custody battles or if someone makes a report as someone else. She said that there is something to be said about calling in; it confirms some accountability to track phone numbers, recording of the call and hearing someone's voice. She said that it makes sense that Los Angeles County, the biggest child welfare office in the county, would need an online reporting tool but she is curious about how the state got there. Doris thanked her.
- Doris asked Bryan for data on systems that implemented online reporting; he said he had not come across any but he had not deeply looked. Doris thanked him and said that she has contact in Los Angeles County; she can try to obtain some efficacy data from them. She said that she has heard this emphasis in conversations with impacted families; it can be used against parents in domestic violence or custody battles.
- Michelle said that people falsify information and she wonders how this is tracked; it's harder to falsify in a phone call. Doris thanked her and asked for more questions.
- Yolanda said that most online reporting sites include a statement about using it only in non-emergency situations so she wonders about how many online reports result in immediate responses. Doris thanked her and said that many people noted that they liked that online reporting



cannot be used for emergency situations and the explanation included examples of emergency situations. She also mentioned how this is tracked. She asked for more thoughts.

- Yolanda added that Texas’s online reporting included an explanation that if not enough information is provided, staff will reach out for more information and that a report might get screened out. She is curious about screening rates for hotline calls versus online. She liked that Texas included this explanation. Doris thanked her and said that this is similar to Michelle’s comments.
- Michelle said that many states include explanations that if not enough information is provided, then a child might be left unsafe or a family might get investigated unnecessarily. She also mentioned data points on crashing/ down sites as well as data breaches. Doris thanked her.
- Adrianna Hartley said that Texas doesn't allow for anonymous reporters; she liked the requirement of a user name to have an extra layer of identification to have people take online reporting seriously. Doris thanked her.
- Donna said that some jurisdictions allowed anonymity but required a log in to make a report so she wonders how this data is stored; this is doublespeak. She likes Texas’s model of not allowing anonymity. Doris thanked her.
- Michelle said that she wonders about people going to the site to start a report but not finishing it due to concerns with tracking information. She wonders how in depth law enforcement will investigate this data. She brought up that the state legislature grappled with anonymous reporting; she said that she can see arguments on both sides. She said that Arapahoe County found that some substantiated reports came from anonymous reporters. She said that there is a value in accountability as well as allowing those who cannot make a report to make one anonymously. Doris thanked her and highlighted Bryan’s electronic chat about how many states include a right to remain anonymous but those people would need to call in to make a report. She also mentioned the difference between anonymous and confidential. She asked for more thoughts; there were none.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Doris explained the other theme she saw in the electronic note document; non-emergency situations. She asked for more thoughts like stipulating use to certain hours. Donna said that she liked some of the live chat features to allow someone to monitor the online reporting; she asked about someone being able to receive the online reports during business hours. She said that she thinks it was Kansas. Bryan said that Kansas is the only online reporting that has a chat feature but it is a robot. Donna said that she like the robot less than a real person. Doris thanked her and said that a live chat feature with a hot line staff person could be useful in the online reporting.● Yolanda said that she wanted to share that she met with Safe to Tell and the Colorado Crisis Line which has chatting via text with a live person; the state considered pursuing this since this is an important feature, especially for younger generations who do not usually make calls or it is not safe for them to make a call. She explained that these examples were older so the technology has improved since then; one of the recommendations can be a talk to text feature. She explained that it could be difficult for a call taker to talk and text at the same time so they can make shifts to respond to the texts and take corresponding actions. She said this could be an alternative to an online report. Doris thanked her and asked what kind of organization Safe to Tell is. Yolanda said that it is an organization for younger children to have to way to communicate concerns that they may have; when it is child abuse and neglect concerns, staff can cross report to CPS. Doris thanked her and ask for reactions about the concept of other ideas to make a report.● Bryan said that at the bottom of the resource, there is a map by Child Help Hotline.org which indicated that Mississippi had an app to make a report; he could not find that app. He mentions this as another option as an alternative. Doris thanked him. Michelle said she is interested in that, especially if they can get information from a live agent via text. She said that the alternative needs to be implementable for all counties since the staff level varies; there should be other alternatives. She also mentioned that there is a cost and the hotline is already very busy. Doris thanked her and highlighted Adrianna’s concern about who is taking these new reports. Adrianna agreed and said that is can really effect the rural
--	--



counties. Yolanda said that when CDHS was looking into the text features, it would have been a function of the state operations; it was not an expectation of other counties to do a talk to text feature. She wants to look into this again since it can be a safer option and more accessible; it can also allow for follow up questions. Doris thanked her and asked why the state did not move forward with it. Yolanda said that there was different leadership; the cost of creating the technology as well as the additional staff was a concern. She explained that there was not a full analysis of the cost and the benefit; there is also different leadership currently that is more interested in these questions. Doris thanked her. She brought up the consequences of alternative ways to make a report like additional staffing. Yolanda said that she electronically shared the method of reports that TRAILS records currently; the subcommittee can start there. She said that her data team can investigate to give an idea of some of these questions like which method do people prefer. Doris thanked her and said this could be a good proxy.

- Michelle said that she would want to think about when someone calls the state hotline and gets diverted to their county's hotline; her concern is that it would divert the call volume around. She brings up this concern if there would be a statewide talk to text feature but not at each county. She is wondering about the logistics of this as well as the equitability since every county has a different set up; there should be some consistency and the subcommittee should work though these concerns. Doris thanked her and said that this will have to be a part of every recommendation.
- Bryan asked if the reporting method question in TRAILS is required or not. Yolanda said that it is a required question. She explained that hotline calls will automatically attach the recording. She also explained that there is a manual entry method. She is curious about the number and the percentage of the methods for Weld County. She is also curious about how the county staff are trained on which method to select when it is the online reporting option. She said that her data team can look into these. She wants to know which method is the most selected of the current pick list when it is an online report. Bryan thanked her and said that he will contact Weld County and share the insight with Yolanda. Yolanda thanked



him and asked if the data team should look at the reporter type. Doris said yes. Yolanda also said she wants to look at response times, reporter type, call method, screening rate, as well as anything else the subcommittee wants to know. Bryan asked if there is a question pertaining to if the reporter is a mandatory reporter or if that is determined by occupation type. Yolanda said that she doesn't see that question. Michelle said that she thinks that there is that question. Yolanda said it might be in the referral stage since she is not seeing it in TRAILS for the hotline record. She said that there is an anonymous question. She said that there is a longer pick list to determine if a reporter is specified in the referral stage. Adrianna asked if there could be data on how many online reports are founded or not; she knows this is a complicated question. She is wondering if these numbers are skewed and this means something. Yolanda said that it would not be a one for one correlation but there is a way to determine which reports were screened in. Michelle added that most counties are differential response so a founded report can mean a different thing in a different county. Yolanda said that the data team can do subsets from these questions; this is helpful data. Doris thanked her and agreed.

- Doris noted a last theme about training and guidance; some states have an FAQ before someone can even make a report to provide information if a report is suitable or if a situation is an emergency. She asked for more comments. Shawna said that reporters should be walked through, step by step. She liked some states with a video explanation. She also said that she likes that people can work through a situation on the phone with someone. She also liked the online reporting tools that were only for mandatory reporters rather than the general public. Doris thanked her and brought up additional guidance and mandatory reporters being the only ones with access to the online reporting to ensure that the people using it have a stronger understanding. She asked for more thoughts about any of the themes or any additional themes.
- Yolanda said that she appreciated everyone's thoughts on unintended consequences; she likes that the subcommittee is doing due diligence on this. Doris thanked her.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Doris reviewed the next steps. She asked Yolanda about her electronic chat. Yolanda said that if people call Weld County, they are most likely speaking with a state staff person since they have a contract. She suggested that Bryan ask about their staff used to respond to online reports since this would be supplemental. Michelle emphasized that there is an inconsistency in resources in the state; there is a statutory responsibility to provide 24/7 access and this looks different across every county. She brings this up since it is hard to compare counties as well as to make recommendations that fit for every county. Doris thanked her and mentioned how it is important to be thoughtful about different impacts of recommendations on different parts of the state.● Shawna asked how many other counties have their own 24/7 hotlines. Yolanda said that the big ones do; Denver, Broomfield, Boulder, Douglas, Morgan, Arapahoe. She has to ask Jefferson County and Adams County since they had an after hours call system but all these counties take their own call directly or have law enforcement take calls after hours. Shawna said this is helpful for the statewide perspective. Yolanda said that there is a coverage map that outlines each county's call system; there are three categories which are a county takes all their calls, the state takes all their calls, or the state takes after hours calls. Michelle said that there is no delineation between counties that have after hours calls directed to law enforcement. Yolanda said that she will share the map with the subcommittee. Doris thanked her.
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Doris thanked the subcommittee for their thoughtful conversation. She directed the subcommittee to rejoin the main session.

Appendix A:
Yolanda Arredondo
Michelle Dossey
Tara Doxtater
Adrianna Hartley



Lori Jenkins
Leanna Gavin
Sara Pielsticker
Donna Wilson
Kelsey Wirtz
Shawna McGuckin