



## The Mandatory Reporting Task Force | Meeting 19

### Meeting Minutes

May 22nd, 8:00 am-10:00 am Virtual Meeting (Zoom)

Facilitators: Trace Faust and Doris Tolliver

Members: See Appendix A

Welcome & Approval of Minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Task force Vice Chair Dr. Kathi Wells welcomed the task force. She turned attention to approval of the materials. She first asked for edits to the minutes; there were none. Michelle Dossey motioned; Margaret Ochoa seconded. There were no oppositions. The minutes were approved. Kathi then asked for edits to the recap; there were none. Margaret motioned; Michelle Dossey seconded. There were no oppositions. Recap was approved.</li></ul>
Procedure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Trace Faust welcomed the group and electronically shared the roadmap of the upcoming meetings; they highlighted striking the August 28th and September 15th meetings. They also electronically shared the phase 1 directives as well as the upcoming phase 2 subcommittees and directives. They recommended that task force members watch emails to make sure members end up in the correct subcommittees. They asked for questions about the process; there were none.</li><li>Trace outlined the agenda for the day which will include reviewing the recommendations from the subcommittee meetings. The conversation will start with the <a href="#">training subcommittee recommendations</a>. They highlighted that this is an open conversation and should be less concerned with 'wordsmithing'. They provided time for the task force to review the recommendations.</li></ul>
Training Subcommittee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Trace brought the task force back and asked Gina Lopez for her thoughts. Gina said that she appreciates keeping folks involved in the training as well as highlighting the disproportionate impacts component. She also appreciated the consistency of not just requiring the training but thinking about how it is required to ensure that people pay attention. Trace said that the subcommittee focused on accountability which aligns with her comments. Trace thanked Donna Wilson for her work on drafting the recommendations; they also thanked the subcommittee as a whole. Jennifer Eyl asked if the subcommittee talked about making the training available to people who are not mandatory reporters to ensure that more people understand. She also brought up taking people off the mandatory reporter list. Trace said that they did not hear that component explicitly from the subcommittee but this could be a recommendation. They also highlighted that this concept is tied to 'who are mandatory reporters' which will be an upcoming conversation. Trace asked Roshan Kalantar for her thoughts. Roshan said that having the training available would be amazing. It can be confusing to know when to report when domestic violence is involved so it would be helpful to shed light on that for everyone. Trace thanked her. Margaret said that she agrees with Roshan and said that it would be helpful to have more people understand different professions. She said that there is rarely physical evidence in sexual assault situations which can lead to a culture of disbelief of survivors; starting with believing should be included in the training and it should be available for</li></ul>



educators or other professions who work with children. Trace thanked her and highlighted head nods from the task force. Trace said that the public access to training components can be readdressed in the upcoming conversations about specialized occupations. Ashley Chase said the task force needs to take a look at who is reporting since she does not want untrained mandatory reporters; the list should be people who can be trained so these components are tied together. Trace thanked her and said that this topic will be worked into future conversations. Trace also explained that the first part of the recommendation is an overall sentiment with following component recommendations.

- Trace electronically shared the first recommendation and asked if the task force is comfortable with the language/ if there were any missed marks or red flags. Margaret said that she struggles with a lack of clarity on the cadence of training; she would love a recommendation for a specific cadence defined in statute about how often to train. Trace asked if this component could be a sub-recommendation about a specific cadence without prescribing what that cadence is specifically. Margaret agreed. Doris said that there should also be a call out for new employees to take the training within a certain amount of time after hiring and then a specific cadence thereafter. Trace thanked her and said that this can be a sub-recommendation. Sam Carwyn said that she wants to be mindful of professions that cannot get training immediately. Trace thanked her and said that the recommendation can be mindful of any challenges of organizations since the task force is not prescribing time but highlighting a value of 'as soon as possible.' There were no other comments.
- Trace read the second recommendation and asked for any missing components. Bryan Kelley said that this topic is also captured in the first sentence of the recommendation so it is a key point throughout. Trace thanked him. There were no other comments.
- Trace read the third recommendation and explained it, including that this task force could be considered as an external entity to counsel the training. They asked for more comments; there were none.
- Trace read the 4th recommendation and explained it. They asked for more comments; there were none.
- Trace read the 5th recommendation. They asked for more comments; there were none.
- Trace read the 6th and 7th recommendations. They asked Aletha Jenkins to explain more; Aletha said that this recommendation was based on situations when reporters tell families to expect a call from the department after a report is made, which is not always the case. She said that she is concerned about the wording since it could be interpreted that reporters have to know county standards for meeting a threshold of abuse or neglect. Trace asked her to explain more. Aletha said that the recommendation alludes to a reporter knowing which situations meet the threshold of abuse or neglect. Trace thanked her and said the facilitation team can go back to make sure this is captured. Kathi suggested adding 'in determining' or something to this effect. Aletha agreed. Trace thanked them. Roshan said that this recommendation was also to address a family getting



bad information about what to expect. She suggested taking out 'meeting the threshold'. Trace thanked her. Jennifer said that the task force might be conflating different things; reporters should know county processes but they do not have to tell families all of that. Reporters can tell families about the process but the main focus is having reporters know what happens after a call is made. Trace thanked her. Doris Tolliver said that she thinks that there are two interpretations of process. One is what happens after a report is made so the language could be 'educate reporters on county processes'. The other interpretation is insight on what may meet the threshold of abuse and neglect to ensure that there is a greater understanding around it not being okay to always make a report. Trace thanked her. Jordan Steffan explained that this recommendation was targeted to ensure reporters have a better understanding of what counties do after a report is made; it was not intended to give reporters any directive to explain processes to the families. Trace thanked her. Michelle Dossey said that, in her experience, there are things reporters need to understand and case examples are helpful for this. She also said that reporters want to know what information to have ready for a call and that they want to know what happens after a call is made. She also highlighted system impacts and how reporters need to understand what that means. Trace thanked her. They moved the task force on to the 8th recommendation.

- Trace read the 8th recommendation and explained it. Bryan added that the X, Y, Z can be stakeholders that were not determined yet. Trace thanked him. Trace asked for high level stakeholders to add. Gina said to include tribal social services folks to prompt the cross community collaboration. Trace thanked her. Shawna McGuckin thanked the subcommittee for their work and said that she is understanding this entity as the same body as the third recommendation. She wonders if this entity is something separate. Trace said that the assumption is that it can be two different groups; the advisory committee might not be a correct entity to develop the curriculum. They said that the advisory council can be one of the groups but the training development might be more specialized. Shawna said that there will be overlap. Trace thanked her and highlighted Doris's electronic chat about content and training experts. Trace asked for more additions; there were none.
- Trace read the 9th recommendation. Kathi said that this is a really important component and suggested calling out a specific process for evaluation to the state legislature. Trace thanked her. Kathi said that there can be specific components to ensure effective evaluation. Trace thanked her. Jennifer brought up the disparate impact component and said that it is too narrow; it excludes LGBTQ+ folks. Trace thanked her and asked if 'marginalized communities that include but are not limited to' works. Jennifer said yes. Trace said that the facilitation team can work on broadening this. They asked for any other comments.
- Trace read the 10th recommendation. They brought up including specific timelines into this recommendation; the timelines would be similar to the other recommendations. They asked for comments; there were none.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Trace thanked the task force for the discussion and the subcommittee for their work. They explained that the next time to review these recommendations will be when the report is being finalized.</li></ul>
Reporting Processes Subcommittee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Doris provided time for the task force to review the <a href="#">recommendations from the reporting process subcommittee</a>.</li><li>• Doris brought the task force back; she read the first recommendation asked for comments. Jennifer said ‘as soon as reasonably possible; is redundant; it should either be ‘as soon as reasonable’ or ‘as soon as possible’, especially since there is a 24 hour time limit. Doris thanked her. Margaret said that she is happy to see this. Sam said that it is helpful to have real conversations with families so they do not feel blindsided. Doris thanked her. Doris asked for more comments and highlighted safety considerations of having time frames on reports being made. She asked Jennifer to say more about her electronic chat. Jennifer said that there are occasions when a reporter can hold off on making a report to give a family time to get safe. Jordan said that this is the exact discussion for upcoming meetings. Doris thanked them.</li><li>• Doris read the second recommendation and explained it. She asked for comments. Jennifer said that the subcommittee discussed how county departments cannot add additional witnesses to report and have to make a new report for an individual with the exact same information. She also brought up the department’s confidentiality concerns and how they cannot disclose that a report about a situation was already made. She said that the department should not be able to disclose this information. Doris asked for anything to add. Michelle Dossey said that they cannot confirm or deny that a report was made; there would need to be changes to the law to allow for that. She also said that TRAILS cannot add multiple people and they must generate a new referral for each person. The subcommittee wanted to clean this up since it is time consuming and can count against families. Doris thanked her and asked for any more comments; there were none.</li><li>• Doris read the third recommendation and explained it. She asked for comments. Margaret said that she had a negative response to this recommendation; she brought up a court of appeals case that ruled that a reporter's duty is 24/7/365. She said that this recommendation can create confusion and well-intended people could get prosecuted. Doris thanked her. Roshan said that different reporters have different requirements and it can be very complicated. She suggested this recommendation could be different for DV/SA advocates. Doris thanked her. Jennifer echoed Roshan and said that professional capacity needs to be clearly defined. She also said that it can be harmful to be a mandatory reporter all the time and that this recommendation needs to be very specific. Doris thanked her and asked for more comments; there were none.</li><li>• Doris read the 4th recommendation and explained it. Michelle said that the word could be ‘shall’ instead of ‘may’. Jennifer agreed. Jordan said that she can look into the language to make sure the recommendation is not discretionary. Michelle thanked her. Jill said that she does not support this recommendation; institutions</li></ul>



	<p>should be able to have a policy to ensure reporting happens. Doris thanked her. Jordan said that delegation is separated by institutional policy as well as personal. She asked Jill for her thoughts on this separation. Jill said that she has not thought about this detail. Jordan asked what situations Jill would support delegation. Jill said that, for example, if she was a volunteer coach at a school, she would be okay with the principal making a report. She also brought up that the person with the most knowledge will not be able to make a report within 24 hours. Doris thanked her. Sam said that it's important to think about how things get lost in translation. Someone with a relationship to the family will communicate with more grace and a second party might communicate with more bias. She said that she understands the difficulty but 24 hours is enough time to consult others before making a call. Doris thanked her. Michelle said that she agrees with Sam; the person with the information is the best person to make the call. She also brought up the subcommittee addressing others deciding when to report or not. Doris thanked them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Doris read the 5th recommendation. She asked for comments; she asked for Jill's thoughts. Jill said that she feels the same, if anything more strongly, about this recommendation. She said that professional institutions should be able to delegate. Doris thanked her and asked for more comments. Sam said that there is a distinction around delegating and joint decision making. This can be a focus in the training; delegating is someone doing something and joint decision making is advice on a matter. Doris thanked her. Dawn Alexander said that the internal protocols are done by CDEC which stipulates every suspected situation must be reported; she wants to ensure this continues. Doris thanked her. Dawn also said that early childhood teachers have to sign a paper that they understand what abuse and neglect is and that they must report every suspected situation. Doris thanked her. Kathi suggested a consideration of delegating to someone with equal or greater knowledge. Doris thanked her and said that this was a part of the conversation. Michelle Dossey said that she is interested in Kathi's comments; it's okay to delegate as long as the person with the most information is reporting. However, it is not okay for someone to delegate to someone who did not receive the information, firsthand. Donna agreed. Doris said that reporters cannot delegate to someone without direct information or who did not receive the direct information. Jordan said that this could be addressed in the other recommendations too. She asked for thoughts on this. Doris said that this is what she heard too since there can be changes when someone hears information from someone else so it would be helpful to reflect this in all the recommendations. She asked for any more thoughts; there were none.</li></ul>
Conclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Trace thanked the task force for their hard work. They reminded everyone to watch their emails for new subcommittee preferences. They also said that these recommendations will be reviewable in the full package of recommendations after the facilitation team reflects the discussed changes. They also reminded the task force of the meeting cancellations. They asked for any questions. Margaret asked about the new subcommittee process. Trace said that folks can opt in and the</li></ul>



	<p>facilitation team will ask folks in the specialized occupations to be in the specialized occupations subcommittee; beyond that, the subcommittees will be self-selected. They said that the new subcommittees will start during the June 5th, 2024 meeting. Jordan said that she will try to give people their first choice but that there might be some changes.</p>
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>• Trace dismissed the group. The task force adjourned at 9:58 AM</li> </ul>

**Appendix A:**

- Roshan Kalantar
- Shawna McGuckin
- Donna Wilson
- Jennifer Eyl
- Tara Doxtater
- Sara Pielsticker
- Sam Carwyn
- Aletha Jenkins
- Margaret Ochoa
- Britany Noble
- Jill Cohen
- Ashley Prow
- Gina Lopez
- Leanna Gavin
- Adriana Hartley
- Jade Woodard
- Ashley Chase
- Cris Menz
- Michelle Murphy