Name:Shawna McGuckin

|  | What do you like in examples from other states? | What do you not like in examples from other states? | Do you have suggestions on language? | Additional Notes |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Standardized Training for Implicit Bias | Like how IL really stated who should be part of creating the training (cross agency)  IL and NY addresses who the training is for - MR. Other states just state a “training” but don’t clarify who the training is targeted for.  DC’s was direct which I liked about a training addressing bias but didn’t address what the goal of the training and providing the information would do -  IL was very detailed on this… to reduce the implicit bias section must provide tools to adjust automatic patterns of thinking and ultimately eliminate discriminatory behaviors. | NY didn’t spell out how the hotline protocols reduce bias. It’s too general.  Illinois was so specific that it appears they had a training already in mind. If the training needs to be changed or adjusted I worry that such detailed lingo in state statute would limit an agency's ability to modify in future years. | NY addresses updated training in 2024, but no states address having up-to-date and current training. I imagine the training will need to be updated as times change. Adding something about providing a currently relevant training that the cross-section reviews and approves on a yearly basis… Something…  Imp. bias training addressing biases in racial, disabilities, gender, economic differences and others.  Training that is updated to be relevant as time goes by.  Adding timelines to refresher and who’s tracking this all. | **Accountability / Compliance - considerations**  Needing to spell out a department to oversee this.  The department needs to oversee all of the various MR fields and outline how each of those fields will be served to ensure compliance (schools, physical health, case managers in nonprofits)  It should be spelled out (within the first 6 months of employment and then every 3 years there after). I like that. It is also up to the individual or employer to track the renewal.  Incentivising this with CEUs is great, but the overseeing department can figure that out and not needed in statute.  **Quality - considerations**  There needs to be one department overseeing the nuts and bolts of this training.  The larger stakeholder group that creates the first version of the training should convene every 2 years to update it.  Part of their initial task will be to create a training that can provide feedback and evaluation of it success.  Revisions to the training needs to be data informed.  NY goes into addressing local protocols to reduce bias.. That’s not our task with this deliverable and I thought it was too general.  I would like to cross collaboration in the development of the material, but who (what dept), at the end of the day, is tasked with providing the training? I think that needs to be spelled out so one agency has the charge.  Required as a training - who’s tracking this and doing the oversight of this. |
|  | Liked | Didn’t Like | Suggested Ling | Additional notes |
| Standard Training regarding requirements of the law | I like how Michigan places the burden on the employer but didn’t like that they must “distribute” and not ensure the training is done.  I liked NY’s statement as to “encourage the fullest degree of reporting”  IL - was direct but didnt’ address who oversees this.l  Iowa -  The department shall conduct a **continuing publicity and educational program** for… MRs … to encourage the fullest possible degree of reporting of suspected cases of child abuse.  Could say… encourage the fullest degree of the mandatory reporting training | Not a fan of just calling this out for particular MR fields. If you’re a MR, then this training should be done. There’s not one field better than another.  DC - training which shall be conducted by OAG, CFSA, or a third party.” (third party is confusing) |  | Quality  Who, how,  This needs to live DHS and they will have to develop a stakeholder (lived experience) group to develop and update this and determine a web-based 2 hour zoom function to train the state. This will be huge… could be zoom monthly like the standards of quality.  This should not be a train-the-trainer model. Things get distored there.  How often -   1. One thing to address is new staff   Within the first 3 months of employment   1. For existing staff as this gets rolled out - within the year from the date it goes live. 2. I also like that once employed, employers much have this in their policy to give staff what their MR responsibilities are 3. When to renew - every three years would be fine - as things change 3 years seems appropriate. 4. Paid time - this will have to be provided for free but should include CEU credits.   Accountability Compliance - Time frame  Would love to hear from Iowa their process and if they have data to show their impact. |