



# Mandated Reporting to Community Supporting

*Communities Keeping Children Safe and Families Together*

## MANDATED REPORTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SUMMARY: March 26, 2026

### REFERENCE MATERIALS

- [Meeting Agenda](#)
- [Meeting Slide Deck](#)
- [The Art of Conversation Behaviors](#)
- MRAC Workgroup Metric Request Feedback (see breakout team responses on pages 3 - 5 below)
- [Questions to Answer](#)
- [Meeting Participants](#)
- [Members](#) (updated December 2025)

### DISCUSSION HIGHLIGHTS

#### • WELCOME, CONNECTIONS, AND HOUSEKEEPING (10 minutes)

- Reflections shared from the statewide prevention convening, including positive feedback on community pathway presentations and alignment with county efforts toward prevention
- Emphasis on lived experience, community voice, and broader system change
- Introduction of new MRAC member Kula Koenig, Chief Policy Officer at Safe and Sound.
  - Kula Koenig, who was raised in Liberia, West Africa, shared her personal background and “her why” for doing this work, emphasizing the importance of family support, community systems, and advocacy in helping children and families.

#### • DATA & ACCOUNTABILITY WORKGROUP (DAAWG) (60 minutes)

The Data & Accountability Workgroup, led by Tri-Chair Alicia Garoupa, introduced a proposed data framework and a draft set of core metrics to guide and monitor MRAC implementation efforts.

#### Key points included:

- Presentation of a draft data framework to support tracking of MRAC recommendations and system impact

- Overview of two measurement approaches:
  - Child-Level Data Reporting
    - Tells us how many children are entering the system and if they are safe over time; publicly reported, and effective at understanding who is affected and how
    - Used to track population-wide trends and overall safety outcomes for individual children within the system
    - The primary goal is to assess whether long-term trends are shifting in the desired direction after policy changes
  - Referral-Child Level Data Reporting
    - Tells us how the system is making decisions about those children once a report is made
    - Focuses on the internal workflow and decision paths of specific reports as they progress through the child welfare system
    - Used to evaluate whether specific pathways, like those narrowed by AB 2085, are actually decreasing in practice
- Introduction of five proposed cross-workgroup core metrics:
  1. Number and Proportion of Reports by Mandated Reporter Category
  2. Screen-In vs. Screen-Out Proportion at Hotline Intake and Reports Resulting in Referral to Community Services
  3. Proportion of Allegations Substantiated (Overall and by Allegation Type) including Tracking General Neglect allegations overtime (pre-post AB 2085) screening, and substantiation data
  4. Rate of Involvement Across Child Welfare Continuum by Race/Ethnicity
  5. Percent of Repeat Reports Involving the Same Child or Family

Discussion included:

- Emphasis on disaggregating all metrics by race/ethnicity to support analysis of disproportionality
- Discussion of how metrics can be used to evaluate the impact of mandated reporter training and changes in reporting behavior
- Consideration of how reporting behavior may vary in practice, including how mandated reporters engage with the system and how proximity to mandated reporters may influence reporting patterns
- Consideration of how “child safety” is defined and measured within the system
- Consideration of hotline decision-making processes, including screen-in and screen-out determinations and use of Structured Decision Making (SDM) tools
- Recognition of the importance of combining quantitative data with lived experience and storytelling to provide context and support narrative shift efforts
- Concerns raised that certain metrics, such as substantiation rates and repeat reports, may be misinterpreted without appropriate context or supporting data
- Identification of limitations in current data availability, including challenges accessing cross-system data (e.g., child welfare to juvenile justice)

- Recognition that children move through a system "pipeline" once they enter, including different points of decision-making and sorting processes, shapes their path through services and interventions
- Discussion included questions about who has access to supports, diversion, and prevention services, and what data is available or needed to better understand disparities
- Concerns raised regarding equity and transparency in access to services and resource allocation, including how decisions are made about who receives supports and the need for greater accountability in those processes
- Concerns raised regarding how referral data is used in practice, including how parents may be impacted by prior or related referrals and how this information may influence decisions about intervention levels
- Questions raised regarding how CARES may improve data visibility and what information is not currently publicly available but may be needed to address disparities
- Discussion of how metrics can reflect a shift toward prevention and support tracking of connections to community-based services

### Workgroup Breakout Discussions – Metric Effectiveness

Members reviewed each proposed core metric in small groups. Discussion focused on the effectiveness of each metric in tracking MRAC impact, how the metrics could be used over time to support implementation, and opportunities to strengthen them by incorporating storytelling and lived experience.

#### CORE METRIC 1

Core Metric	MRAC Breakout Feedback
Number and Proportion of Reports by Mandated Reporter Category	All metrics need to be disaggregated by race. Seems to be a base metric we must track, how do we report out the supporting piece, how do we track the capacity building and the prevention piece. Question #2 must build accountability and transparency about how the organizations are chosen for the prevention network, shift in decision maker process and transparency will highlight the impact or lack thereof of the CP, it will help us capture who is taking training or not and whether the training is effective. Question 3 The number tells the story about who is and isn't buying in to training. We need to understand the perspective of the reporter and the reportee.

#### CORE METRIC 2

Core Metric	MRAC Breakout Feedback
Screen In vs. Screen Out Proportion at Hotline Intake and Reports Resulting in Referral to Community Services	Question 1 - yes, we feel this is an effective metric. The concept inherently changes the mindset for mandated reports. Consider SDM data and whether anyone is looking at it. Is there data available for hotline to helpline? Question 2 - From training perspective - consider how the new mandated reporter training will help with mindset shift. The hotline worker will have a different lens and may be more accurate as to whether the child may need child welfare support. Hope that training results in less calls to the hotline that don't meet criteria for an investigation. And that families are getting connected elsewhere to more appropriate supports. Question 3 - Recognize the value of lived experience and agree that it should be incorporated as it brings data to life.

#### CORE METRIC 3

Core Metric	MRAC Breakout Feedback
<b>Proportion of Allegations Substantiated (Overall and by Allegation Type) including Tracking General Neglect allegations overtime (pre-post AB 2085), screening, and substantiation data</b>	<p>Yes. Historically, pre 2085, MR's conflated poverty &amp; neglect. IF bill is implemented to fidelity, we should see this go down. IF reports are more accurate, substantiation rate will go up. Prep for that narrative. Have to put the hotline data in context with other core metrics and not substantiation rate alone (Policy). Specific narratives to the MR category. If MR's did NOT call due to their training, how can we get that storytelling?</p>

**CORE METRIC 4**

Core Metric	MRAC Breakout Feedback
<b>Rate of Involvement Across Child Welfare Continuum by Race/Ethnicity</b>	<p>Yes. It was already insisted that the metric be tracked in Humboldt when FFPS started. Is JJ also part of the continuum? The tracking is separate from the CW system tracking. Can we track the number of kids that go from CW to JJ. We would need to get access to the JJ system data. Don't currently have access to the justice system data. Tracking CW to JJ may make an even better case for MR reform work.</p> <p><u>Narrative Shift</u> - One of the key messages link to disproportionality. Having this data would be very helpful in building awareness about disproportionality and build the messaging across all of the implementation work. Having this data readily available and updated 2x/year will enable us to create more robust messaging and build awareness.</p> <p><u>Policy</u> - Would like to see if we can identify more Native Americans, and support individuals in identifying when they may not have in the past.</p> <p><u>Training</u> - highlights the point of having standardized training and being able to highlight the data throughout the training.</p>

**CORE METRIC 5**

Core Metric	MRAC Breakout Feedback
<b>Rate of Repeat Reports Involving the Same Child or Family</b>	<p><u>Breakout Response</u> — Core Metric #5 (Repeat Reports) Arati, Jannay, Leah and Jane (Petie).</p> <p><u>Why it matters:</u> Helps identify recurring concerns, potential gaps in follow-up, or patterns in how reporting is used.</p> <p><u>Important context:</u> Repeat reports are not inherently negative. They may reflect ongoing needs, help-seeking behavior, or protective actions. Rates can also be influenced by reporter type, access to supports, and systemic bias.</p> <p><u>What else to look at:</u> Services offered and accepted, investigation outcomes, time between reports, and reporter identity.</p> <p><u>Narrative context:</u> Emphasizes the need for a narrative shift that centers the lived experiences of individuals and families impacted by child welfare contact, particularly in cases where involvement may have been misguided or inappropriate. Pairing this metric with qualitative narratives helps illustrate the real-world impacts of decision-making.</p> <p><u>How it can be used:</u> Inform targeted reviews, strengthen service connections, and support equity-focused analysis. Findings can also be used to inform training for mandated reporters and decision-makers, building awareness of potential downstream harms and improving decision-making over time.</p> <p><u>Effectiveness:</u> Yes, with appropriate context. This metric can surface patterns in recurring reports, including potential gaps in follow-up, access to supports, and how reporting is used in practice. When disaggregated (e.g., by reporter type, race/ethnicity, and outcomes), it can</p>

help identify disparities and trends over time. Its effectiveness depends on pairing it with complementary measures and qualitative context to avoid misinterpretation.

## DECISIONS

- No formal decisions were made during this meeting.
- The Data & Accountability Workgroup confirmed that the purpose of the session was to socialize proposed core metrics, gather feedback, and continue iterative development rather than finalize a recommended set.

## ACTION ITEMS

- Data & Accountability Workgroup to revise and further develop proposed core metrics based on MRAC feedback and continue the socialization process
- Community Pathways Workgroup to continue collaboration with the Community Pathways Advisory Committee, refine language, and bring materials back to MRAC for input prior to submission to CDSS
- All Workgroups to coordinate with each other and the steering committee prior to engaging external entities to avoid redundant or uncoordinated outreach
- Tri-Chairs to develop and/or consolidate a tracking mechanism for workgroup activities, milestones, and coordination
- Narrative Shift Workgroup to share communications scope (Rally) with MRAC and engage members in contributing to the story bank
- All Workgroups to report out in MRAC meetings on progress, anticipated outreach, and coordination needs

## NEXT STEPS & CLOSING REMARKS (10 minutes)

- April is Child Abuse Prevention Month (CAPM) webinars will include a spotlight on AB 2085 and MRAC updates
- Upcoming MRAC meetings were announced and shared with participants
- Additional announcements were opened to participants

## UPCOMING MEETINGS

- All meetings are on the third Thursday of the month, 3 – 5 pm, on ZOOM, and are open to the public:
  - April 16 [REGISTER](#)
  - May 21 [REGISTER](#)
  - June 18 [REGISTER](#)