

GOVERNOR'S TASK FORCE ON JUSTICE FOR ABUSED CHILDREN

Quarterly Meeting

December 13 2017 – 2:00PM.
Klingberg, Hartford, CT

Present: S. Sedensky, T. Sneed, H. Bey-Coon, K. Butler-Kurth, E. Borecka, K. Clark, M. Doherty, A. Johnson, S. Mancini, N. Nesbitt, K. Rich, P. Schaeffer, J Levanthal, S. Hamilton, F. Vos Winkel, S. Zanker-Rivera

Guests: P. Pisano, Michelle Desjardis, Kim Ruzbarsky, Jill Fitzsimmons, Melissa Testa

Agenda Item	Discussion (<i>brief summary</i>)	Action (<i>and by whom</i>)
Meeting called to order		The meeting was called to order at 2:03PM
Approval of Minutes:	Approval of July 2017 minutes.	There was a motion to approve the July 2017 minutes. The motion passed. Mancini/Hamilton M/S/P
	<p>Retreat Recommendation #1: Use the next six months to develop a framework and plans for the next federal grant application which is due May 2018. Four ad-hoc groups will be established to replace all the existing workgroups and committees as follows:</p> <p>1. MDT/CAC Evaluation & Quality Assurance (volunteer lead: Paula Schaffer) This ad-hoc group will develop a plan for how the CT and NCA standards and the MDT evaluation process can be aligned and potentially streamlined and how data is collected and utilized.</p> <p>The MDT/CAC Evaluations work group has met 5 times over the last few months. At our first meeting we reviewed the charge of the group and decided that updating the current standards would be our first priority. Other topics that were discussed but will be addressed at a later time are creating a format for updating the standards in the future, creating CT protocols and updating the process and reports used for the MDT evaluations. At the second and third meeting the group reviewed the standards page by page and provided comments. This document will be sent to the MDT evaluation committee for review at their meeting on Nov 14th. After the MDT evaluation committee reviews the document it will be sent to key stakeholders for comment. These stakeholders were identified as the Appellate Unit – View for issues regarding case law, Team Coordinators who will send to team members, DCF Team Leads, Chairs of Executive Committee, GTFJAC and the MDT Evaluation Committee. The MDT Evaluation Committee will keep a checklist of persons who have received and reviewed the Standards to ensure all Key Stakeholders have reviewed the document. The final comments will be sent to the MDT evaluation committee for final product per state statute. At the fourth and fifth meeting, members focused on reviewing the Connecticut Universal Team Protocol that was developed by the MDT/CAC workgroup in 2016. This document was reviewed and updated to align with the Connecticut Standards, Team Contracts and the Connecticut Statutes. This document will allow for teams to describe their own policies and practices in key areas. Drafts of this document will be sent</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion (<i>brief summary</i>)	Action (<i>and by whom</i>)
	<p>to key stakeholders for review. Once both documents are finalized, the committee will develop a roll out training for the state.</p> <p>2. Training (volunteer lead: Margaret Doherty) This ad-hoc group will assess what training is provided both GTF and CCA including Finding Words, Minimal Facts, MDT training; explore sustainability options, and identify training needs and gaps. How would we sustain these trainings if we did not have the federal funds? The Combined Training Committee met twice (9/19/17 and 10/30/17). Discussed in detail was: Finding Words (2 trainings per year; 37 slots (2 per 17 MDTs and 3 additional), integrity of curriculum must be maintained, arduous & costly to continue despite being a terrific training. Discussion around exploring Connecticut-specific training less costly and arduous to operationalize. Group accepted Krystal Rich and Kristen Clark’s offer to explore grant seed money with Northeast Regional Children’s Advocacy Center. This was submitted and accepted awarded \$10,000. Also discussed and reviewed: Minimal Facts and in-state and out-of-state trainings available to MDT members. Future plans: survey MDT members on what they prefer and would like for trainings in effort to better utilize annual GTFJAC Training funds in accordance with annual budget. Next meeting is December 18, 2017.</p> <p>3. System Gaps & Barriers (volunteer lead: John Leventhal) This ad-hoc group looked at system/service gaps and barriers as well practice fidelity issues (e.g., forensic interviewers, medical interviews, etc.) that have been previously brought to GTF; develop a systemic process for GTF to discuss and track system gaps/barriers on a regular basis and; identify strategies for GTF to develop a common policy platform or agenda. – Some folks bring system gaps and issues to the GTFJAC. What are we doing to address these? Standing agenda item? A written report was submitted to GTFJAC and presented at the December 2017 meeting. This report was emailed out to the full GTFJAC. There are 8 areas that needed a further look. The following gaps and barriers were identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Forensic Interviewing (FI): 2. Forensic Medicals: 3. Victim Advocacy (VA): 4. Children with Problem Sexual Behaviors: 5. Mental Health: 6. Spanish Speaking Services: 7. Law Enforcement (LE) and Prosecution: 8. Data and Quality Assurance (importance of data to help define gaps and whether progress is being made at improving services and reducing gaps) <p>Clarifying the extent of the gaps and barriers in the domains outlined above:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Workgroup proposed the following strategy: that each major gap/barrier domain have a working committee or focus group of content experts (e.g., Forensic Interviewing Gaps/Barriers Working Committee or focus Group) who would identify and prioritize 1 to 3 gaps/barriers to be monitored and addressed. 2. These gaps/barriers would, in part, be based on the state and NCA standards, but also could be proposed by local teams. 3. Data would be collected, if necessary, to quantify the extent of the gap/barrier. These data would be collected by CCA (Connecticut Children’s Alliance) based on surveys and focus groups and by the data already being collected with NCA Track and through the MDT Evaluation Committee. The Village might assist in the task of collecting new data and collating the data into a useful format. 	

Agenda Item	Discussion (brief summary)	Action (and by whom)
	<p>4. Data would be collected periodically (perhaps quarterly) to monitor a change in the gap/barrier</p> <p>5. The Working Committee would propose an approach to address the gap/barrier</p> <p>Systematic approach for GTF to discuss, address, and track recommendations put forth by specific working committees regarding an approach to address the gap/barrier:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The working committee would present in writing and at a GTF meeting the proposed approach to address the gap/barrier. 2. GTF would vote on the proposal and if approved the proposal would be triaged to one of 3 Action Committees, which would work to move the proposal forward. 3. 3 Action Committees: Policy/Practice, Legislative, Funding: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. One committee (GTF Policy/Practice Committee) would focus on state policies/practice and would develop a plan to address the gap/barrier by changing the state’s policy or practice regarding the issue to be addressed. b. One committee (GTF Legislative Committee) would focus on state laws and would develop a plan to address the gap/barrier by changing the state law regarding the issue to be addressed. c. One committee (GTF Funding Committee) would focus on state (and perhaps grant and private) funding and would develop a plan to address the gap/barrier by identifying state or other funds regarding the issue to be addressed d. Each Action Committee would be developed by GTF to include professionals with expertise in the relevant area of policy/practice, legislative agenda, or funding and could include professionals not on GTF. e. These Action Committees are proposed as a way of helping GTF and the state to take concrete steps to move forward with an approved plan to reduce a gap or barrier. <p>Potential Gap: # of calls made to careline vs the # that get to teams. There are cases that occur that never make it to the teams. The fact that teams have different team protocols also contribute to why teams do not receive the cases. Getting a Police Chief on board may assist with some of these Action Committees. The current climate with the #MeToo campaign and that is focused on adults and how are children being effected by parents who may be triggered right now in this new climate. What are the next 6 months going to look like and we should be taking this account for what that will mean for families and children moving forward?</p> <p>Next Steps for this workgroup: Send it out to GTFJAC and the coordinators for review and comment.</p> <p>4. Child Fatality Response (volunteer lead: Faith Vos Winkel) This ad-hoc group will explore the potential of a developing a local pilot and a plan for implementation. There are no resources or capacity to do Child Fatality in a meaningful way. Will look to put a proposal together for February. Faith has visited one MDT and will look at visiting others(Manchester and Tolland). She will look to vet 2 cases at the MDT/CAC level and see how that process works as they are positioned in several communities around the state. Teams have been involved after the fact when there is a child who witnessed the death or were in the home and may need services. Need to look at child fatalities in the state and if they were ever part of the MDT process prior to the death per other points of contact re: abuse. Faith feels there is a need a community based process or review to push this forward. There was a need to ensure that the GTFJAC Child Fatality mandate is being met moving forward. There will be a recommendation submitted in February. It will include budget and possible legislative recommendations.</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion (brief summary)	Action (and by whom)
	<p><u>Next Steps:</u> All of the other GTFJAC committees have stopped and will get rolled into these workgroups. The new ad-hoc groups convened in September and each group will present a plan to the full GTF by February 2018 so that priorities and a budget can be voted on in March 2018.</p> <p>Recommendation #2: Discuss possible restructuring of the GTF meeting schedule and agenda. Retreat participants noted several issues: there never seems to be enough time on the agenda to have substantive discussion of issues; most of the substantive discussions occur at Executive Committee; the role of the Executive Committee; frequency of GTF meetings given that if a meeting gets cancelled GTF could go for six months without meeting; system barriers need to be a standing agenda item with action and accountability; meetings should include education on emerging issues and the membership and terms of membership need to be reviewed. Should the GTFJAC full meeting do more of the substantive work?</p> <p>Face to Face vs Phone meetings. Webinars, Interactions etc. Extra meetings between September and December and an extra meeting between December and March. Move the September GTFJAC meeting to Thursday, October 5, 2017. Use the November and February executive committee meetings for additional GTFJAC meetings.</p>	
Budget Update	<p>Village Update- Review of the Village budget. The year one budget includes \$6,000 for the Danbury colposcope and \$7,000 for Forensic Interview Equipment at Klingberg. This is only in year one budget.</p>	
GTF Coordinator Update:	<p>Discussed CJA application submission and CJA meeting. At the meeting there is a combination of peer to peer sharing, task force management, report and application submission tips. Peer to Peer sharing example: Discussed the Handle with Care program from one state. When a child has an incident at home that involves police or DCF, then a contact is made with the child's school to alert them to handle this child with care as there may have been some trauma experienced the night before.</p>	
CCA Director Update:	<p>Data was submitted to the GTFJAC for review. Prevent Child Abuse Connecticut Chapter is now part of CCA.</p>	
HART Coordinator	<p>January is Human Antit trafficking Awareness Month. January 11 is the awareness day and the schedule will be sent out to the GTFJAC. EMT – A training for EMS/EMT was completed with professionals around the state. 2018 Conference will be the 2nd week of May</p>	
Committee Reports:		
Executive Committee:	No report.	
Finding Words Committee:	The next course will be June 4-8, 2018.	
MDT Evaluation Committee:	<p>There are several reports that have been emailed out and there is a need to approve them. We will re-send out the reports for vote and approval electronically. We will need a quorum of number of votes to ensure approval. Medical Professionals and Forensic Interviewers have difficult times attending the</p>	
Training Committee:	3 requests have been submitted and approved.	
Membership Committee:	<p>Need to review current vacancies on the task force. This can be discussed at the retreat. Center for Children's Advocacy -- Stacey Violante Cotte</p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion (brief summary)	Action (and by whom)
	OPA would now be DDS Jordan Sheff or Disability Rights Connecticut.	
Other Business:	February meeting to start at 1:30PM. Agenda items Retreat recommendation # 2 Restructuring GTF Vacancies Workgroup Report Out Budget	
New Business:	30 th Anniversary of GTFJAC will occur in 2018. 50 Years at the Yale Child Abuse Center- Will have a pediatric college from Chicago come in and do a talk.	
Announcements:		There was a motion to adjourn which was moved and properly seconded. The motion passed. Vos Winkel/RichM/S/P

Respectfully Submitted,
Kristen M. Clark,
GTFJAC Coordinator