



**Testimony before the House Judiciary Committee being heard on  
HB 762- CRIMINAL PROCEDURE – CHILD ADVOCACY CENTERS – CARE  
PROVIDERS**

**March 2, 2023**

**Testimony of Maryland Children's Alliance**

**Position: OPPOSE**

---

The Honorable Luke Clippinger  
Chair, House Judiciary Committee  
Room 101  
House Office Building  
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Dear Chairman Clippinger:

Thank you for taking the time to review and consider our position on HB 762 - Criminal Procedure - Child Advocacy Centers - Care Providers. Maryland Children's Alliance (MCA) is a private nonprofit State Chapter within the National Children's Alliance that serves as a convener of the 24 children's advocacy centers (CACs) across Maryland. There is a CAC in every jurisdiction in Maryland. For the reasons set forth below, we respectfully oppose HB 762 and urge the committee to submit an unfavorable report.

CACs facilitate the coordination of comprehensive investigation and intervention services by bringing together professionals and agencies as a multi-disciplinary team. The team is comprised of members from many disciplines, such as mental health providers, medical staff, victim advocates, law enforcement, child protective services, and prosecution, who work together in the investigation, treatment and prosecution of child abuse cases. The primary goals of the CAC are to keep the child's best interests at the center of care and ensure that children are not re-victimized by the very system designed to protect them.

The requirements set forth in HB 762 have a disparate effect on the 24 CACs in Maryland given the differences in their organizational structure and the specific communities they serve. 14 of the 24 CACs are operated by the Department of Human Services (DHS); five are non-profit entities; three are operated by counties; and two are operated by law enforcement. Additionally, 20 out of the 24 do not employ in-house healthcare providers. These CACs instead coordinate healthcare services through linkage agreements with external providers. HB 762 proposes a

one-size fits all approach to CACs that are of all different types with different professionals and entities at the helm.

HB 762 mandates that CACs notify the child victim and the child's parent or guardian when there is a change in the child's behavioral, mental, or other healthcare provider. This requires the majority of CACs who have a linkage agreement with an external healthcare provider to be immediately informed of any staffing changes of an external provider, and to report that staffing change to a child victim and the child's parent or guardian within 48 hours.

This requirement in practice is untenable for a variety of practical reasons. For example, an external provider may not report a staffing change to the CAC in a timely manner. Moreover, it may not be possible to assign a new provider within 48 hours. Given the shortage of qualified mental health and health providers with the necessary skills to work with the very vulnerable population served by CACs, it can take longer than 48 hours to secure a new provider when there is a change. As a result, it is impossible to guarantee the ability to provide the name of a new provider as required by HB 762 within the mandated time. This is especially true as a result of the pandemic. Providers have larger caseloads and the demand for services has steadily increased. Underserved populations in Maryland have fewer resources available to them as a result.

An additional complication HB 762 presents falls within the context of a CACs organizational structure. Given that some CACs are led by the DHS, counties or local law enforcement, this legislation would require state or county employees such as child protective services (CPS), prosecutors, and law enforcement professionals to report a change in healthcare provider. The mandate blurs the lines between the services those professionals are actually providing (CPS, legal and law enforcement) with healthcare services.

HB 762 does not ultimately protect vulnerable children. Instead, this bill seeks to codify an unrealistic operating policy on every CAC in Maryland without taking into account the implications of day to day management and coordination of services. This bill sets a dangerous precedent for youth-serving organizations by legislating internal health and regulatory policy rather than working with regulatory agencies such as the Department of Health and/or professional licensing boards. The practices this bill intends to codify is not an agreed upon continuity of care standard. It ultimately creates a harmful new standard without any meaningful input from the CAC community while also bypassing health and regulatory agencies as well as professional licensing boards altogether. Further, HB 762 has no clear or understandable enforcement mechanism.

The bill also codifies the Health Care Working Whistleblower Protection Act (Act) within the CAC statute; however, it expands upon the circumstances that the statute may apply. For example, the legislation "applies to behavioral, mental, and other health care providers working with child advocacy centers to ensure their protection if raising concerns about center operations, services, and standards of care." It is unclear what constitutes "concerns about center operations." This language is overly broad and can include a litany of circumstances. It is also unclear what "working with" would entail. Is this an employer/employee relationship? Is it a

contractor relationship? Is it a volunteer relationship? The Act was passed with great care by the Maryland General Assembly and any significant changes should be looked at carefully.

The majority of CACs in Maryland are accredited by the National Children's Alliance which institutes clear standards on continuity of care and requires whistleblower protection for all providers that work with CACs. CACs are held to federal, state, and local whistleblower standards by way of the rules and regulations that govern the competitive government grants that CACs depend on to operate. Additionally, all licensed healthcare workers who are employed by or contracted by CACs are bound by the professional ethics standards and licensure standards of their field.

We are not aware of any instance within the Health General Article for a mandated reporting requirement for any healthcare provider that is impacted by this piece of legislation. The 48 hour mandated notice window is not a standard that is documented in current law or in any common industry practice when "there is a change in the child's behavioral, mental, or other health care provider."

Youth serving agencies, including CACs, already have professional, legal, regulatory, and ethical duties to their patients and clients, and many have internal policies on continuity of care and staffing. This legislation would needlessly confuse or contradict many of those policies. For these reasons, we respectfully request an UNFAVORABLE report on HB 762.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Wendy Myers', is positioned above the typed name.

Wendy Myers, Executive Director  
Maryland Children's Alliance



HB762 Child Advocacy Centers- Providers

House Judiciary Committee – February 26, 2023

Position: **OPPOSE**

---

The Honorable Luke Clippinger Chair, House Judiciary Committee Room 101

House Office Building

Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Dear Chairman Clippinger:

Prince George's County Department of Social Services Child Advocacy Center (PGCCAC) opposes HB762. The bill would impose an unnecessary burden on child advocacy centers and any health care provider affiliated with them by trying to comply with legally flawed and unworkable statutory provisions. PGCCAC is a comprehensive violence intervention program that provides trauma-informed crisis intervention and prevention services to over 300 children and family members each year who have experienced child abuse in the Prince George's County. As a County government based, we are subject to rules and policies governing State and county agencies. As a child advocacy center, we are also subject to national accreditation standards from the National Children's Alliance, which are incorporated by reference in the law this bill seeks to change, Md. Code Criminal Procedure §11-928.

The bill mandates that "CHILD ADVOCACY CENTERS SHALL PROVIDE WRITTEN NOTIFICATION WITHIN 48 HOURS TO THE CHILD AND THE CHILD'S PARENT OR GUARDIAN WHEN THERE IS A CHANGE IN THE CHILD'S BEHAVIORAL, MENTAL, OR OTHER HEALTH CARE PROVIDER... [AND] THE NOTIFICATION... SHALL INCLUDE THE NAME AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF THE NEW AND PREVIOUS PROVIDERS." The bill includes medical personnel and other staff, including the physicians, nurse practitioners, and other medical staff, as well as forensic interviewers, family advocates and other staff who are licensed social workers or "health care providers" within the meaning of Health Occupations or Health General codes. Child advocacy centers are, by definition under Md Code, Crim. Proc. §11-928, multidisciplinary teams that include a variety of medical, mental health, and other disciplines.

The bill contradicts Maryland's current whistleblower provision. Healthcare providers

are already covered under Maryland's whistleblower provision MD Code, Health Occupations, § 1-502. This bill seeks to place new language in the Criminal Procedure Article that expands and contradicts this provision. Two different state standards would be unenforceable. Furthermore, staff at our child advocacy center are also covered under federal whistleblower protections that are part of grants received through VOCA and/or NCA.

48 hours is unrealistic for a new provider in some cases. The bill requires that child advocacy center provide the name of "the new provider" within 48 hours. This is not always feasible. We are not able to guarantee external continuity of care for a variety of reasons and cannot immediately provide the name of "the new provider" as that choice would be at the discretion of the client and availability of the provider. This is especially true after the pandemic, which has left a shortage of health care personnel. Given the highly skilled nature of the work of our trauma-informed mental health staff, there are simply not enough providers doing this work. We partner with and refer to several agencies, many of whom are also at or near capacity. We oppose this bill's efforts to expose our agency or staff to liability for provider shortages outside of our control.

Prince George's County Department of Social Services Child Advocacy Center asks for an UNFAVORABLE report.



Dr. Ruby B. Nelson

Prince George's County

Department of Social Services

Child Advocacy Center Director



HB762 Child Advocacy Centers- Providers

House Judiciary Committee – February 28, 2023

Position: **OPPOSE**

---

The Honorable Luke Clippinger Chair, House Judiciary Committee Room 101  
House Office Building  
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Dear Chairman Clippinger:

The CRICKET Center, Worcester County’s Child Advocacy Center, opposes HB762. The bill would impose an unnecessary burden on child advocacy centers and any health care provider affiliated with them by trying to comply with legally flawed and unworkable statutory provisions. The CRICKET Center is a comprehensive violence intervention program in Worcester County that provides trauma-informed crisis intervention and prevention services to children and their families who have experienced child abuse. The CRICKET Center is a nonprofit organization and is subject to rules and policies governing non-profit agencies. As a child advocacy center, we are also subject to national accreditation standards from the National Children’s Alliance, which are incorporated by reference in the law this bill seeks to change, Md. Code Criminal Procedure §11-928.

The bill mandates that “CHILD ADVOCACY CENTERS SHALL PROVIDE WRITTEN NOTIFICATION WITHIN 48 HOURS TO THE CHILD AND THE CHILD’S PARENT OR GUARDIAN WHEN THERE IS A CHANGE IN THE CHILD’S BEHAVIORAL, MENTAL, OR OTHER HEALTH CARE PROVIDER... [AND] THE NOTIFICATION...SHALL INCLUDE THE NAME AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF THE NEW AND PREVIOUS PROVIDERS.” The bill includes medical personnel and other staff, including the physicians, nurse practitioners, and other medical staff, as well as forensic interviewers, family advocates and other staff who are licensed social workers or “health care providers” within the meaning of Health Occupations or Health General codes. Child advocacy centers are, under Md Code, Crim. Proc. §11-928, multidisciplinary teams that include a variety of medical, mental health, and other disciplines.

The bill contradicts Maryland’s current whistleblower provision. Healthcare providers are already covered under Maryland’s whistleblower provision MD Code, Health Occupations, § 1-502. This bill seeks to place new language in the Criminal Procedure Article that expands and contradicts this provision. Two different state standards would be unenforceable. Furthermore, staff at our child advocacy center are also covered under federal whistleblower protections that are part of grants received through VOCA and/or NCA.

48 hours is unrealistic for a new provider in some cases. The bill requires that child advocacy center provide the name of “the new provider” within 48 hours. This is not always feasible. We are not able to guarantee external continuity of care for a variety of reasons and cannot immediately provide the name of “the new provider” as that choice would be at the discretion of the client and availability of the provider. This is especially true after the pandemic, which has left a shortage of health care personnel. Given the highly skilled nature of the work of our trauma-informed mental health staff, there are simply not enough providers doing this work. We partner with and refer to several agencies, many of whom are also at or near capacity. We oppose this bill’s efforts to expose our agency or staff to liability for provider shortages outside of our control.

The CRICKET Center asks for an UNFAVORABLE report.



Lauren Cooper, Executive Director  
The CRICKET Center