

Act 154 – November Stakeholder Meeting

November 5, 2025

Please be advised that these meeting notes do not constitute decisions formally made by the Division, although they may be implemented into the final Act 154 policies and procedures. The information included herein comprises input from multiple agencies, the Act 154 Core Team, and stakeholders.

First Hour:

- Introduction and walkthrough of website: [Child Protection Registry Reform | Department for Children and Families](#)
- Overview of our Act 154 Legislative Progress Report and key updates since the October meetings: [Act-154-Report-10.1.2025.pdf](#)

Second Hour: Introduction and discussion of the Child Protection Levels:

[Substantiation Levels Fillable.pdf](#)

- Regarding the substantiation levels, stakeholders agreed that it would be beneficial if there were a validated tool, but no such tool exists.
- Family Services is developing its own framework and assessment/decision form (not a validated tool)
- The designated levels impact the length of time until an individual is able to request expungement of their name from the registry entry (the current maximum is 15 years).

Questions, Comments, and Clarifications:

- How will individuals with developmental disabilities be assessed for registry placement? Is there a difference between their biological ages, or functional ages if these ages are not the same? Answer: There is no research that indicates that risk levels would be lower differently than other adults. There will potentially be no differentiation.
- How will the intersection between poverty and neglect be measured? Answer: It is written in statute that poverty cannot be the sole reason for substantiation. Although, there is overlap between poverty and neglect.
- A review should occur of cases that were substantiated at tier 4- does it make sense to keep the tier 4 designation?

- Who will get access to information on internal findings? Answer: Family Services has not yet determined if internal findings will be only internal to Family Services, or all DCF divisions. There will need to be due process conversations.
- The potential harm to children in regulated settings will need to be considered for both substantiations and internal findings. The accessibility of this information for other state agencies may mitigate some of these concerns.
- Concerns were noted about the capacity of the system to support such in-depth reviews.
- Questions were raised surrounding personal circumstances for individuals and cases. How does this process account for individuals with developmental disabilities, victims of violence, and younger populations?
- Discussion occurred surrounding risk of harm at the proposed levels of 1 and 2. A stakeholder noted that this continues to be a broad area, with a fair amount of nuance.
- Discussion surrounding the analysis of placing an individual on the registry for only a year.