



The Mandatory Reporting Task Force | Meeting 17 April 24, 2024

Training Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

Facilitators: Trace Faust

Members: See Appendix A

Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Trace Faust welcomed the training subcommittee.● Bryan Kelley shared examples from other states that were relevant to today's conversation, taken from the CPO's database resource. Today's conversation would overlap with the conversation from the previous directives. He shared the bill language electronically. One example included Iowa which stipulates that a license can be conditional on taking mandatory reporter training. This is the only direct state example. He opened the conversation up to subcommittee members' thoughts.● Sam Carwyn asked about other states to review. Bryan said that this conversation is different from the exact policies presented in the resource; he electronically shared Iowa's statute language which seemed most relevant. He also explained that focusing on Iowa is not CPO endorsing any policy, it was simply one of the only examples that he found. Trace Faust said that the task force members can be creative since there might not be many examples from other states.● Adriana Hartley asked if the reason for their not being other state models is because of other states not being up to date in terms of new ways of thinking about mandatory reporting or if they do not care. Bryan said that another way to look at this is that many states require some named professions to take the training; this is less specific than the question of licensing. Other states highlight the importance of training in different ways; in terms of policy mechanisms, there can be carrots to positively incentivize training, and sticks to negatively incentivize training. Iowa uses a stick in potentially withholding licensure or certification due to not taking training. Louisiana uses a carrot incentive since agencies can grant continuing education credits after the training. These are different ways to get people to take the training. Adriana said this clears up her questions.● Trace directed subcommittee members to take notes in their notecatcher document, electronically. They asked for any questions. Sam asked about the questions the subcommittee should focus on; Trace responded that it's important to think about what the subcommittee members would like to see in this topic. Sam said that is helpful.● Bryan said that there could be policy mechanisms to differentiate between professions that do and do not have licenses to approach this topic. Sam asked for the list of mandatory reporters. Bryan said that he can share the list electronically.
Training Requirement and Licenses	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Trace brought the subcommittee back and said that they noticed a common theme of placing importance on this topic. There are also concerns about how to track compliance of those who have taken training. They asked Sara Pielsticker



to share her thoughts. Sara said that in the legal field, there are required continuing education credits so this could be replicated; there could be a special requirement so this training is prioritized. Trace asked about how this would work; would this be additional to a standardized training? Sara said that someone can take the course and it can apply to the continuing legal education (CLE) requirements. There can be a dual measure. Leanna Gavin said that there would be a standardized training and this training can get approved for credits, it wouldn't be different but then it could avoid having multiple trainings on top of each other. Trace asked if this would be training by profession and by the licensing body. Bryan said that the Louisiana requirement is loose and it allows for tailoring in a specific way. Trace said that there could be tailoring so it can apply to specific requirements and the training could translate to CLE credits with the licensing body. Trace asked for Yolanda Arredondo's thoughts.

- Yolanda said that the requirements can change based on being a mandatory reporter due to employment rather than licensure. She said she has questions about if the training is approved. She is also wondering about the language around "may" and "strongly encouraged" instead of a "shall" or "must" since she is wondering about enforcement.
- Ida Drury said that she is also wondering about "shall" since there are so many different professions that are reporters. She is also wondering about tracking completion. Anyone can take the training and get a certificate. The certificate can be difficult to obtain due to the quantity of people taking the training. There is a technical aspect about enforcing this across a diverse group of people; it gets expensive since people do not already have accounts. Child care has a copy of the certificates in their learning management system in English and Spanish; it gets to be a lot in terms of tracking since it's not a formal learning system. Trace thanked her.
- Roshan Kalantar said that she is curious about how much control we have over licensing at the state level. Trace said they don't know this answer but the recommendation can address this. Sam said that it could look like a requirement for the fields in which the input of reports are high and the output of findings are low. For example, teachers report very frequently and they have low findings. Trace thanked her and suggested updating the training and requiring an updated training.
- Donna Wilson asked about any states that require an annual update to account for old training. She suggested entertaining something like this. Bryan said that some states require training every 2 or 3 years as a recurring requirement. New York has recently done work legislatively about training on implicit bias. Everyone must get the new training by 2025 to complete the requirement, even if they had already received an older training. This is to make sure there is enforcement around people getting updated training.
- Trace asked about regulatory power recommendations from this subcommittee. Bryan said that he focused on statutes in the online database, but that is not the only way to encourage something. Statute is not the only tool; there also can be regulation, recommendation, or agency decision making. For the task force, the



bill requires an analysis. The task force doesn't have to make statutory recommendations for every directive. Trace thanked him and asked for other thoughts.

- Shawna McGuckin asked about the state's ability to enforce quality training for people who need it. She also brought up ensuring updated training. It is a huge group of mandated reporters so she wonders about getting this out to everyone. She said that this is a sticking point for her. Trace asked her to restate this. Shawna said that she wonders if there is a need to differentiate professional licensures from everyone else on the list. She also said that she is thinking about rolling it out; she did not like the looser language in California but it directly stated where the training lands and who does it and oversees it. She said that the oversight entity is going to oversee a long list of mandated reporters. Trace asked for reactions. Sam said that it's important who is doing it. She mentioned the focus on the topics to include implicit bias and other components of quality training. She said that it's hard to know the best oversight entity right now. Shawna said that it can be a nice carrot to get people with a license a continuing education credit but she wonders about including differences for these folks beyond a carrot. Sam said that she is wondering who is responsible for monitoring. Trace relayed the themes; training should be standardized from the oversight entity and the tracking is important to ensure accountability. The question is where this lies. Donna added skill acquisition and what people are accountable for. Aspects could include a test at the end to make sure people are tuned in. There is value in a pass/fail score with a certificate and not only clicking through a training. It's moving past a compliance-based mentality. Trace thanked her.
- Bryan said that to Donna's point, Illinois has an implicit bias training that has a pre-test and a post-test. The statue does not indicate a required growth point or a certain score but it speaks to progress and meaning. This is another mechanism to ensure learning rather than clicking through. Trace thanked him and noted a lot of non-verbal approval. They reiterated Donna's point of skill acquisition versus compliance.
- Roshan said that if we care enough to make someone a reporter we should make sure that they do it well. She also said that looking at the list, it is probably based on an assumption that it's best to cast a wide net to have everyone with eyes on kids making reports and then have the system sort it out. We now know that this is not always ethical. She brought up veterinarians being on the list. There are a lot of areas where people might see abuse but not understand it. A shorter list is a really important consideration.
- Trace thanked everyone and asked for anything else that is missing in this conversation before recommendation language is drafted. They also invited subcommittee members to write their thoughts electronically. Bryan brought up the themes from the last conversation around accountability and quality. The recommendations will overlap on the directives. Trace emphasized Bryan's points and said that this will help add to more complete recommendations.



County Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Trace moved the subcommittee to the second directive and read it. They explained that this directive is analyzing the merits of including information about the whole reporting process within the overall training a reporter receives on whether they should make a call. They asked for thoughts on this.● Roshan said that this is super important. Sometimes families get bad information about what happens during a report. She also said that people have different assumptions about what happens during a report. This will help reporters make a decision since they will know more about what happens. Trace thanked her and asked Yolanda for her thoughts.● Yolanda said that it is really important to myth bust and share information about the screening process and assigning decisions. She said that the more information shared the better and that there is a challenge about an expectation of something to happen after a call is made. When this expectation is not met, there is usually an issue. This might not eliminate the disconnect between expectation and reality but it's a good idea to share the context about what is actually possible. It's important when people call for support to a family; there are opportunities for a warmline and other tools here. There is an opportunity to share information about what can happen or what usually happens. It will also be important to reduce the disappointment when expectations are not met. Trace thanked her. Yolanda said that it connects to the implicit bias conversation. This will help challenge implicit biases about how children should be living. Trace thanked her and asked for Aletha Jenkin's input.● Aletha said that in her role as an assessment supervisor, they send a letter to the reporter when their concern did not meet criteria. The reporter can call back to understand more about why it did not meet the criteria. The reporter can also call the supervisor to understand further. This will help the reporter learn more about the system. She said that not all calls should result in an investigation; they can result in prevention methods like family empowerment. The county encourages that if there is a concern, they should call it in since a call can result in challenging implicit biases and/or result in families being provided resources. Trace thanked her and asked Sam for her thoughts.● Sam said this is an opportunity to discuss the potentially traumatic outcomes of making calls. The subcommittee can name this since it's possible that someone might go out and interview a family so then families might not be as open as before. A call can create trauma and can prevent families from being honest with reporters going forward. This is a place to voice this. Furthermore, this is another place to emphasize the warmlines, not as an aside but a primary concept. She also brought up how many mandatory reporters interact with families; there will be more calls due to numbers. The access to mandatory reporters is biased. Trace thanked her.● Trace directed subcommittee members to the electronic notecatcher documents.● Trace brought the subcommittee back and asked for anything to add before the other subcommittee returns. Sara said that she is concerned about privacy rights for families. This needs to be a primary concern around what can be shared and what can't. Trace reiterated about what information is shared back and making
-----------------	--



	<p>this consistent across counties. They asked for more comments. They reiterated that members are in favor of recommending a specific mention of training around the mandatory reporting processes, what could happen, and what usually happens. They asked if anyone is not in favor of this. There were no further comments. Bryan said that it is nice how much the conversations overlap. Trace said that there is one more meeting in this subcommittee to draft language and discuss it as a group. Then, the language will be shared with the full task force; the other subcommittee will also share their language. Trace invited feedback on facilitation.</p>
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Trace thanked the subcommittee. They then welcomed and reconvened the entire task force.

Appendix A:

Yolanda Arredono
Adriana Hartley
Shawn McGuckin
Sara Pielsticker
Roshan Kalantar
Aletha Jenkins
Donna L Wilson
Ida Drury
Leanna Gavin
Sam Carwyn
Trace Faust