



The Mandatory Reporting Task Force | Meeting 16

Training Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

Facilitators: Trace Faust

Members: See Appendix A

<p>Introduction</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trace Faust welcomed the group and did a quick roll call. They outlined the roadmap for the subcommittee meetings going forward. They shared the two directives that will be the focus of today's meeting which relate to standard training. These directives relate to analysis. Trace provided the note catcher folder electronically. They also outlined the specific conversation for today. There will be time to become familiar with the database and for members to include their thoughts in the note catcher. First, the subcommittee will focus on standardized training for implicit bias. The note catchers include questions regarding aspects from other states to consider as well as member's own thoughts and perspectives. Bryan Kelley provided a quick overview of relevant portions of the database. He reviewed the statutes of DC, Illinois, and New York. Bryan reminded the subcommittee that the Child Protection Ombudsman is not endorsing these examples by providing them to the task force. Trace thanked him. Trace moved the group to reviewing the database, giving members time to review on their own before reconvening.
<p>Implicit Bias Training</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trace brought the subcommittee back and asked them what they liked. Margaret Ocho said that she likes the collaboration across departments in the DC model. The statute should contemplate that there are a lot of people working on these issues so everyone should be brought to the table to finalize issues. She also liked including the training for welfare workers. Trace thanked her. Yolanda Arredondo said that she looked at Illinois and liked their inclusion of training. Her question is who logs that and who tracks compliance. She also wonders about consequences for non-compliance. She did not like the word racial and ethnic sensitivity since she doesn't know what they meant by that. Trace thanked her. Trace asked for more comments about what people liked. Leanna Gavin said that she likes that Illinois asked reporters to do a pre-test and post-test to measure implicit bias. She liked addressing people's own implicit bias. Trace thanked her. Shawna McGuckin said that she struggled with this. She wondered if the state statute should be this detailed since it might be good to have guidance on how to make training rather than making it prescriptive. Roshan Kalantar said that she also likes the pre-test and post-test. She appreciated what Shawna said about being in the weeds but there are many implicit bias trainings and shifting the focus to oneself is important. Trace asked her to clarify. Roshan said that, as opposed to sensitivity, shifting the focus to one's own limitations would be valuable to make happen. Trace said that this is a good moment to pivot to state provisions that subcommittee members disliked. Margaret said that the DC language was limited to only consider race rather than many other biases. Trace asked if she would want additional examples or to not



give examples at all. Margaret said this is a good question; she liked Illinois' listing of categories of implicit biases. She also said that people who do not believe in implicit bias will come out against this but it is important to call these out. Trace thanked her and asked for more comments.

- Kelsy Wirtz said that she likes the examples. She did not like the example of only including race as an implicit bias. Trace thanked her
- Shawna said that, as opposed to DC just saying the training needed to be done, she liked Illinois that explained the goal of the training. Their goal was more radical to eliminate discriminatory behaviors. Trace thanked her.
- Bryan said that, in Illinois, the training was required every 3 years so they can consider this repeated training requirement as a possible policy mechanism.
- Adriana Hartley said that she supports the requirement of updated training. She doesn't want it to be a burden but the directive is to eliminate bias so they should collect data to see if they are reaching this goal. She thinks this would be critical as one of the requirements. Trace thanked her.
- Leanna said that she agrees with Adriana. She called out New York's statute about children with disabilities and training reporters on how to identify abuse in children with disabilities. She said that the requirements should be inclusive and include more than racial bias. It should be more than a list but a history of the biases in legislative history; these biases should be in the training specific to each bias since they can look very different. Trace thanked her. They asked about an additional analysis using data to inform the training. Leanna said yes but also that each bias should be called out and that the data should be used to inform the training.
- Trace called out Bryan's chat about using the note catchers to write the recommendations; there will be time for task force members to include more thoughts after this discussion.
- Roshan said that the training needs to be refreshed and based on data. The system might never be able to not cause harm; there will always be a way to cause harm so people need to stay on it and stay in dialogue with it. She likes the idea of the data since things can change. Trace thanked her.
- Sara Pielsticker said that she wanted to call out language changing constantly so it's important to update training with that in mind too. She also liked that New York called out disability. She thinks it's important to have training specific to disability status. Training should be all encompassing. She also called out training around parents with disabilities too, making this more inclusive instead of just focusing on children with disabilities. Trace thanked her.
- Yolanda said that she agrees with a lot of things already said. In the Iowa training, it excludes medical professionals who do not always treat children; she is curious about this exception. She is wondering how this is tracked and if people complete the training. She did not have issues with the timelines (within 6 months and every 3 years after) in the laws but she wonders about the tracking if that would be a database or something else. She is wondering about central oversight. Trace thanked her.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bryan said that in the mandatory reporting database resource, the final question addresses this. They coded it by states that require training for some reporters or all reporters. Iowa stuck out for compliance since, without the training, a person would lose their license. California is also interesting since some occupations require training but others strongly encourage training. This exemplifies a multitiered approach. Louisiana allows the offering of continuing education credits for those who take the training, acting as a carrot rather than a stick to prompt compliance. Trace thanked him.• Margaret said that she shares Yolanda's concern since state government officials do not like being compliance officers since it discourages collaboration. She also said that, to Bryan's point, the consequence should fall on employers and, if someone is self-employed, then the compliance would fall on the license. She likes Louisiana's incentives to tie training to continuing education. She doesn't like California's 'strongly encouraged' language since those people probably do not do the training. Their statute looks like Colorado's with a lot of jobs called out but she thinks that everyone should get training. Trace thanked her and brought up their experience of employers tracking employees' training compliance.• Roshan said that once training is mandated, they need to think about who does the training. It should not fall to a wide variety of people since this information is important and there are wrong ways to talk about it. Once it is mandated, it creates a cottage industry and people claim they have expertise when they are not actually experts. It should sit with a department and have guidelines about what the training should look like. There are questions about who domestic violence experts are. She suggests that, if the training is filtered out, then it might not serve the purpose. Maybe it should be more centralized. Trace thanked her and asked Bryan about this.• Bryan said that an example seen in other states is naming the stakeholders required to build the training rather than who will execute it. Naming where that training is housed could be included in the recommendation. Trace thanked him.• Trace recapped the conversation and said that there are a few questions that the group is discussing; one question is about accountability (who is tracking it) and the other is the quality of it (who is doing it). Putting these questions on the shelf, Trace asked if the subcommittee supports training. Roshan, Sara, Kelsey, Leanna, Margaret, Yolanda all said yes. Trace said that the group is on the same page about making this a requirement. They also asked for more challenges with the recommendation beyond the two that they called out. Yolanda called out timeframes. Trace asked what she meant. Yolanda called attention to the larger question of when the trainings are to be completed. Trace thanked her.• Trace directed the group back to the notecatchers to write their thoughts around accountability and quality. Margaret asked about the difference between accountability and compliance. Bryan said that compliance lives in accountability.• Trace brought the group back; the facilitators will take the notes from this conversation and the notes to bring another conversation to talk in detail about the identified challenges. They moved the group to the next directive.
--	--



<p>Standardized Training</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bryan said that a key word to consider in this directive is “standardized”. This could imply a central training that is the same across the state and used for all occupations. The question is what does standardized mean and should there be an agency to organize this. In other states, training is a requirement for all or some occupations as well as incentives for training. Trace thanked him. Bryan said that Iowa is the firmest state on this question. The training is needed to maintain a license. This is another way to think about what policy can do. Trace thanked him.• Trace broke the group for more time working in the notecatchers. Bryan reminded people of the narrative option included in the tool. Trace also moved the group to a break.• Trace brought the group back.• Margaret said that she got caught up in timeframes given the bureaucracy in many systems. She liked Nevada’s 90 days time frame to get someone the training; beyond that seemed attenuated. She liked Iowa’s example in which employers have a policy to get the training in the hands of those reporting in 30 days and completion is required within 90 days. Trace thanked her.• Yolanda said that she is curious about what employers would say about time frames since there is a lot of information in onboarding. 90 days might be a sweet spot but she thinks the sooner the better. Trace thanked her.• Roshan said that given all the turnover in these fields, it’s important to give a time frame. If the training is available easily then it could be required sooner than if it is only offered once a year. Trace thanked her.• Trace asked the group if they agree that a standardized training should be required for all mandatory reporters, knowing there are more details to figure out. Margaret, Kelsey, Shawna, Sara, Leanna, Roshan and Yolanda all said yes. Roshan called out taking some people with confidential information off the mandatory reporter list. Yolanda also called out going through Colorado’s list of mandatory reporters. Trace thanked her. Trace asked Bryan if this is a directive. He said yes, this is in the specialized occupations subcommittee. Trace thanked him.• Yolanda said that she has a bias on who would hold the training. She liked Louisiana’s language about the child welfare division being responsible for the training. If there is another training, it has to be approved by the child welfare division. She said that since she is in the Colorado Department of Human Services (CDHS) she thinks CDHS should be responsible for the training with the input from experts. Trace asked for clarification. Yolanda said that she was calling out a bias that she holds as she likes the language about state departments of child welfare being responsible for the training. This will help standardization. Trace thanked her.• Bryan said that Michigan has an interesting system. He read the statute. The agency creates training materials; it is a centralized agency making the materials. Employers have to provide training materials to employees, there is no requirement to go over the materials but the one state training must be given to employees. Trace thanked him.
------------------------------	---



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Margaret said she likes the centralized training with flexibility in implementation. Some schools want in person trainings due to abuse situations that are specific to their context. This is to not limit them too much. Trace thanked her. ● Roshan said she thinks that the subcommittee can separate basic training with complicated nuanced training. They can happen at different times. There can be an initial piece and then a nuanced training. People should not have to wait but the nuanced training shouldn't be shallow. She said that someone could use bad data when conducting the training so there could be guidelines around who can conduct the training. State recognized trainers are important parts of this. Trace thanked her. ● Trace asked the subcommittee on their thoughts on this concept. Bryan said that, going back to the charter of the task force, the implicit bias and standardized training are separate considerations. Trace thanked him. ● Yolanda said that she was envisioning an integrated approach for a standardized training to go over technical aspects. She said that this would be integrated with an implicit bias framework and having conversations about biases. Trace thanked her. They asked the subcommittee if they support integrating implicit bias training into the standardized training. Roshan said that she is not in support of anything that makes implicit bias an afterthought but would support integrated implicit bias training in the standardized training. Trace thanked her. ● Trace asked the broader question of what is a non-negotiable aspect of the training. Yolanda asked for input on the timeframes as well. Trace said that time frames could be in the compliance/accountability aspect. They directed the subcommittee to add their thoughts to the notecatcher about accountability and quality, including timeframes and any other considerations members have. ● Trace brought the group back and highlighted Roshan's comment about people with lived experience being seen as experts to inform the training. They asked for other points about the quality of the training. ● Leanna said that she doesn't agree with CDHS being responsible for the training. She thinks that it should be a separate entity like CPO. CDHS is a part of the problem in the child welfare system and the biggest perpetrator of harm done to families and children. They should not regulate themselves regarding people that receive the training; this would be problematic even though CDHS employees are not the only mandatory reporters. Trace thanked her; there will be a larger conversation to hold later. ● Margaret said that she shared Leanna's concerns. If there are multiple voices and it is available in multiple formats and people committed to conducting the training, then this can be worked out. The training has to instruct people on what to do when. The language in the statute is vague and creates confusion. She wants this changed in statute and included in explanations in training. Trace thanked her. These details will be discussed more in another meeting in the series of subcommittee meetings.
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Trace thanked the subcommittee and welcomed the large group discussion.



Appendix A:

Yolanda Arredono
Adriana Hartley
Shawn McGuckin
Sara Pielsticker
Margaret Ochoa
Roshan Kalantar
Kelsey Wirtz
Trace Faust