



## The Mandatory Reporting Task Force | Meeting 11

### Meeting Minutes

January 24, 8:00 am-11:00 am Virtual Meeting (Zoom)

Facilitators: Doris Tolliver and Trace Faust

Members: See Appendix A

Welcome & Approval of Minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Chair Stephanie Villafuerte welcomed the group, and took attendance. She then asked for any edits to the minutes; Sara Pielsticker said that her last name was misspelled. Margaret Ochoa motioned to approve and Dr. Kathi Wells seconded. The minutes were approved. Stephanie then moved to the meeting recap; there were no edits. Margaret Ochoa motioned to approve and Dr. Kathi Wells seconded. The recap was approved. Gina Lopez abstained from both votes due to absence.</li></ul>
Procedure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Jordan Steffan noted that Carrie Gillit is filling in for Michelle Dossey. She then welcomed the group and said that today, the task force group would dive back into the topic of the definition of neglect. The task force would go over feedback from the survey going provision by provision. Doris and Trace will lead the group through a conversation about general support or opposition as well as additional feedback. This will be the end mark of the work on the definition. The task force will look at it one last time in July at the final report; after today, Jordan and Bryan Kelley will draft language for the final report. The topic will be revisited during revisions to the final report. Standards for reporting is the next topic. In November, Bryan sent out a 50 state analysis about the standards of reporting. This topic is about the mechanisms in the law that lead to a report including defining words like 'reasonable', 'reason to believe', etc. The memo will be re-sent as well as a new survey; the survey will ask similar questions about which state models people like and dislike as well as asking for draft language. She stressed the importance of the surveys as they inform the conversations and draft language. Then, there will be a conversation about the themes of the topic. Jordan and Bryan will take this information to create a draft recommendation for the group to review. Then, the group will look directly at each portion of the recommendation, note people's support or opposition and generally provide feedback. These topics will be reviewed at the end of the year during final report revisions. She then reminded folks of the roadmap and breaking into subcommittees. She asked people to think about what group they want; there might be some changes based on numbers and experience. She asked for questions and there were none.</li><li>Doris Tolliver said that today we will walk through the content of the specific provisions about the definition of neglect and the clarifications. They will highlight the themes in the survey and move to a robust conversation about the components in each of the provisions. The goal is to provide Jordan and Bryan clear guidance on changes needed to the provisions. The language and the corresponding comments have been pulled out into a different document. Doris will highlight the themes in each and then invite discussion.</li></ul>



Provisions Exercise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● <a href="#">Addendum</a></li></ul>
Poll	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Jordan wanted to take a poll of the group before moving on to the next provisions. The poll will be to gather a rough idea on language to see if the group would like to move forward with the more general suggestion that Stephanie had of a broader non-discrimination statement . The group can discuss later where that language will live in the statute. Jordan wrote what Stephanie said and put it in the chat. This will be helpful to her and Bryan in their drafting as it will inform future conversations on the roadmap.</li><li>● Trace Faust asked people if they were in agreement with this language, to raise their hands. They can also include their agreements in the chat.</li><li>● Jordan reiterated that the language will not be final but she needs to know if the group wants to move in this general direction.</li><li>● Roshan Kalantar asked what language the group was voting on. Jordan clarified that she is talking about the inherent characteristic provisions.</li><li>● Michelle Murphy asked if this language would replace the longer definition with the explanatory language. Jordan said yes that this would be in place of the detailed provisions.</li><li>● Yolanda Arredondo called out the conversations in the chat about hesitations on voting due to use of the word inherent. She knows that this might not be the exact final language. Jordan asked for clarification; the language isn't specific. The group can include categories discussed but she is trying to get structural terms. Her question regards if the group supports a broader exclusion into statute. The group can return to language so she encourages people not to get stuck on specific words. She is talking about the method. Yolanda said that this is the point of contention since Jordan put specific language in the chat and then asked the group to vote. She asked if she is voting towards the idea of inherent characteristics of people or the concept. Jordan said that she is speaking to the concept; the language was general.</li><li>● Roshan asked if what they were agreeing to would be ahead of what was already proposed or to replace it. Jordan said that the idea would be to replace the detailed recommendation. This would be a more broad concept like Stephanie proposed rather than listed specific examples. Jordan wants this poll taken since it will inform what exclusions to include in the warm line discussion.</li><li>● Michelle said that she is struggling because the breakout language does more than prevent discrimination, it also helps people understand what is and is not abuse. She is somewhere in the middle since likes simplification but she thinks, like Jennifer Eyl, that we also need more specific language to vote on because there are other protected classes. She is hesitant to raise her hand especially when other experts in the field are not raising their hand. Trace suggested getting clear on the language and to then put it in a survey since the group needs to move on. Jordan said that is fine; she stressed again responding to the survey. It is needed to move on to subcommittee work.</li><li>● Michelle said that she would appreciate that. She pointed out that CDLE and CDEC have rules and then they have guidance and interpretive documents; she</li></ul>



thought that maybe the group could benefit from something like this. The group is not opposed to simplification but they want to help people understand what is and is not discriminatory. Jordan said that they lack enough from the group to draft that yet. But she can put this conversation into notes. She needs enough to get going to inform future conversations.

- Stephanie said that, to respond to Zane Grant, she is suggesting a general non-discrimination statement. It was framed after brief reflection. The group can try to draft a fuller statement but before that the group should know if this is something that they support or not. The question regards if the group supports conceptually of a general non-discrimination statement which Jordan and Bryan will take back and draft for the group to further review in a survey. She encouraged full participation since the last survey only had 16 responses; it is not sustainable to continue with this practice. Trace gave the group 30 seconds to take a poll.
- Michelle said that she agrees.
- Zane said that he likes the non discrimination statement. He likes it as a value statement to indicate caution about protected classes going forward and coding this into law.
- Yolanda called out chats about hesitations about this statement replacing other languages that the group worked on. Stephanie clarified that her intention is that the language replaces the specific clauses in the recommendation. Her reason is that, when beginning to narrow the definition of neglect and carving out exceptions for topics like disability, she does not want the group to miss people and she hears people's conversations around child impact. Her proposal is that this language would exist in lieu of the other language.
- Roshan argued in the other direction; poverty is not a protected class and she said that she feels like the new language would undermine the previous work. She said that it oversimplifies the situation on the ground because if people did not discriminate, they would not be having this conversation. She is saying no and that it feel rushed. She is frustrated by the request, not the argument. The voting feels confusing.
- Stephanie said that she appreciates that and clarified that she is using the term non discriminatory as a very broad term. Her question is if the team should spend time looking into this rather than eliminating all the previous conversations. To her, it incorporates the year's worth of conversation.
- Jordan said that these conversations will be included heavily in the report to highlight points of tension, all aspects and context to the recommendations. Her concern is that she is unclear on the direction the group wants to go. She stressed that the group is running out of time on some of these topics. She is asking for a direction rather than trying to rush people. Jordan asked to take a roll call to get clear notes on the poll. She asked the group if the group is conceptually in favor of a general non discrimination statement to replace specific recommendations.
- [Poll results](#)



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stephanie asked if it was recorded if people are in support of it conceptually but as an addition. Jordan said that she made a record of the people who said that they supported the language as an addition to the other language. Stephanie also asked if people could elaborate which recommendations they would include as the addition. Jordan said that she is going to get more thoughts from people, specifically the people who answered yes.</li> <li>Yolanda said that she abstained because there was not an option to vote for 'yes, in addition to'. The question she heard was if this was going to take the place of the other provisions. She said this doesn't feel like a clean vote. The people who voted 'yes, in addition to' was not a true yes.</li> <li>Jordan said that she will go back through and ask people if they would like to change their vote to that position. She is glad to include the provisions people want included as well.</li> <li><a href="#">Poll results (repeat)</a></li> <li>Kathi said that the group should get responses to this as soon as possible since it will likely have a big impact on future conversations. A shorter timeline to respond will help the next meeting. Jordan said that she and Bryan will convene right after this meeting to draft language and put it in a survey. They will also think about how to make space in the timeline for this conversation.</li> <li>Ashley said that she could understand if the facilitation team is frustrated with the group at the moment; she apologies. She thought that she responded but it looks like she did not. She asked if there could be a way to check or confirm responses. This time of year is especially busy for her. Trace thanked her.</li> <li>Trace asked Jordan if she has what she needs; she said yes. They turned it back over to Doris and named that there is some tension and passion about this topic. They appreciated their commitment. Doris also thanked the group for their input.</li> </ul>
Provision Exercise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="#">Addendum (repeat)</a></li> </ul>
Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No public comment</li> </ul>
Next Steps and Adjourn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Doris said that the group got a lot done, including the pivot conversation! This work is messy since it is so complex! On the other side of this is real impacts to children, families and communities. She thanked the group for their commitment. Jordan and Bryan have a lot to work on for something to further refine the ideas of the group.</li> <li>Trace invited Stephanie to share thoughts. They also mentioned that the next meeting is on February 7th.</li> <li>Stephanie thanked the group for their perspectives and their lenses. She reiterated what Doris said. The work is not getting done unless people have the hard conversations. If it was easy it would have been solved already. The work of this group is courageous! She encouraged participation as well!</li> <li>Trace adjourned the group at 11 AM.</li> </ul>



**Appendix A:**

Carrie Gillit  
Adriana Hartley  
Ashley Chase  
Brittany Nobel  
Bryan Kelley  
Doris Tolliver  
Jordan Steffan  
Stephanie Villafuerte  
Trace Faust  
Cris Menz  
Crystal Allen  
Dawn Alexander  
Donna Wilson  
Gina Lopez  
Heather Thompson  
Ida Drury  
Jade Woodard  
James Connell  
Jennifer Eyl  
Jessica Dotter  
Jill Cohen  
Kathi Wells  
Kaycee Headrick  
Kevin Bishop  
Leanna Gavin  
Margaret Ochoa  
Melanie Jordan  
Roshan Kalantar  
Sara Pielsticker  
Shawna McGuckin  
Yolanda Arredondo  
Zane Grant