



Citizen Review Panel

District of Columbia

Tuesday, January 10, 2023
Meeting Minutes

Time: 6:30 PM to 8:30 PM
Day: Tuesday
Via: Zoom Meeting

Virtual attendance

CRP members: Shana Bartley (Interim Chairperson), Mattie Cheek, Emily Bloomfield, Dr. Wanda Thompson, Patrick Foley, Treasurer, Elizabeth Mohler, Theresa Gibson, Pierrea Wallace, Meghan Schott

CRP Facilitator Team: Margie Chalofsky, Toni Carr

Welcome/Introduction

Shana Bartley, Interim Chairperson began the meeting at 6:30 PM. She welcomed everyone to the meeting, and it was acknowledged that there was a quorum and met satisfaction of public notices. She added that in tonight's meeting that there will be a lot of discussion pertaining to our small group meetings and the bulk of the time will be spent looking at the work ahead for us. As part of this process, we will review updates and reports from our planning sessions and reflect as to whether we might have anything to add to our planning based upon the valuable presentation of the Life Cycle of A Neglect Case by Pierrea Wallace at our special December session.

Approval of Minutes

Shana Bartley asked panel members if they had any edits to the November meeting minutes. There were no changes, minutes were approved for the November 2022 meeting.

Approval and/or modification of tonight's agenda

Shana Bartley asked if there were any items that attendees would like to add or change to the agenda. The meeting was passed on to Margie Chalofsky.

Moving forward- next steps regarding workgroups

Reports from planning sub-committees

Margie Chalofsky shared the context of the two planning groups that took place looking at questions around strategic planning- specifically whether we thought we should stop in order to do a more complete strategic planning session or to incorporate strategic planning steps as we move forward. Both groups came from different places, but were in alignment that we incorporate strategic planning as we move forward, and ended up on the same next steps. Margie passed the meeting over to Pierrea Wallace and Wanda Thompson to report on what the groups concluded and then to talk about Pierrea Wallace's presentation "Life Cycle of A Neglect Case" to learn whether there was anything that came out of the presentation that impacts our moving forward and if there is anything from the presentation that we wanted to add.

Pierrera Wallace shared the report from Group 1 which included herself, Shana Bartley and Patrick Foley. She added the Margie sent really helpful questions to guide their discussion and began to share the takeaways and responding to those questions.

Report from Group 1

1. What more external information do members need before we are ready to proceed with the process to choose workgroups?
Did not need to collect information before working groups but can do as part of the process.
2. Do we need to set aside a designated time to do a strategic planning process? before we even look at potential workgroup topics or can we incorporate strategic steps into our ongoing work?
Need an internal process to help choose topics, and skills.
3. Can we incorporate an assessment of our collective strengths and weaknesses as we analyze what is needed to work on specific topics we may want to choose, or do we need a more formal assessment?
Want to make sure that the topics we are focused on having a recommendation at the end with the intentions to make recommendations in reports.
4. Do we need to bring on an outside strategic planning process/project management facilitator or do we have the collective skills of our panel members and facilitator team ourselves to move this forward?
Do not need to set aside a strategic planning process before choosing groups work time as it can happen within the group.
5. For the options you recommend, how would this look on a timeline?
Recommended issuing the survey of the topics we already came up with -

A survey to express interests on topics shared and giving people an opportunity if they wanted to add any topics that were picked and identify what they are interested in and if they wanted to add any.

Responding to the same questions as Group 1, Wanda Thompson shared the report for Group 2 which included herself, Mattie Cheek and Theresa Gibson, responses:

Report from Group 2

1. Did not need further external information as they felt they could answer the questions.
2. Need to revisit workgroups previously identified to give people time to add additional topics.
3. The group suggested that we see which groups panel members might be interested in and then look and see where there are clusters of at least three or four people interested. Once we had those clusters, we would then ask people to rank the groups that they would be interested in and then we would identify the top three to four groups.
4. Apply the mandates that we have to each group and establish timelines for what we need to do.

General Panel Discussion about workgroups

The floor was opened to the general discussion about workgroups. Members incorporated any take-aways from Pierrea Wallace's most valuable December presentation on "The Life Cycle of a Neglect Case" directly into their discussion points.

Margie Chalofsky added that the choosing of a topic has to overlay with people having the time and the energy for that topic, so that when you identify which topics are in your top group, it's not just that it sounds interesting, but this sounds interesting, and I can commit to working on it too.

Shana Bartley added that we are in need of at least two individuals who are willing to chair the committees and is an important role to keep members organized. She added that the chair is there to keep members on task and really serves as a project manager, and others in the group may serve in a different role. She invited members who have participated in a workgroup to share their experiences especially for our newer members who have not yet had the opportunity to participate in a working group. She also added that it is in the Bylaws that the chair does not typically sit on a working group and that since she has been the chair on and off, she could not speak on the experience on being on a working group. Thus, Patrick Foley and Elizabeth Mohler are the only two members that have worked on a group.

Patrick Foley shared his experience working on the Older Youth project. He also suggested that when listing a work group on the survey to also add if you would like to serve as chair of that group.

Elizabeth Mohler shared that she worked on the committee that put together the Town Hall. She added that it was a little bit of a different type of committee, as they were focused on a specific event, which came to mostly logistics. As a committee member, she supported the vision and had certain task assignments. She also added it was a lot of work but it was important to reach out to the community and hear input from community members. She felt it was successful in that way but added that the response from the CFSA was a little bit disappointing.

Peirrea Wallace asked whether we are seeing public outreach as its own working group or looking at public outreach as separate and apart from that. She added that it sounds like that in the past it worked out really well to have a working group for that specific initiative, but she is curious as to what other members thoughts are. Members weighed in on the question.

Meghan Schott replied that she thinks there are pros and cons to both. Having a public outreach group to find out what the public actually thinks is helpful but she could also envision that, depending on the work group, each one might have to do public outreach in itself and that it really depends on what the goal is of the public outreach.

Pierrea Wallace replied that she is basing it on what CAPTA is asking of CRP groups and that public outreach seems to be its own separate request. She added that it seems like we can define whether it's something that we are looking at separately or have wider conversations about it within each working group to determine if there is a component for public outreach depending upon the topic.

Wanda Thompson reminded the group of the presentation she gave on public outreach and how different states define and handle public outreach differently. She expressed that some of it is going to be up to us in terms of how we want to handle it because it has not been consistent in all states.

Shana Bartley added that as we add members to the panel, there will be more capacity to do different types of outreach and that she also feels that we would want to do the necessary public outreach based on our topics and also information sharing once the projects are in. She also added that she felt that the public forum was a really nice space to bring folks together. She also suggested that based upon the presentation with the Mayor's Advisory Committee (MACCAN), it sounds like there might be opportunities to think about doing something more like that, either jointly or in collaboration (since MACCAN stated that they try to do something annually).

Wanda Thompson shared that it would be interesting to have it as a separate work group but added that this targeted group could bring in the public outreach from each working group. For example, if there was a Town Hall where there was the opportunity for the public to weigh in on whatever that working group came up with, there could be a readout of what the different working groups have done. She feels that the working group does not have to do everything, but can pull in what has been done by the other working groups.

Patrick Foley suggested that in terms of public outreach, we can have a work group that focuses on social media, making sure that we're getting CRP out to the public letting them know what we

do and between Facebook, Instagram and Twitter, we can get the word out. He suggested having two or three people working on it, posting a couple of posts per week which would bring up our visibility and would make it easier for us to recruit people and make it easier for us to get projects done. Elizabeth Mohler agreed.

Margie Chalofsky added that having a Town Hall related to projects the work groups are working on might make it easier to get better outcomes from CFSA if looking for targeted information that's tied in with the work that CFSA is doing.

Meghan Schott added we could disseminate information that way also, so we actually create a product for something, or we find something we can share with the community on what's happening.

Wanda Thompson added that with the suggestions of a Town Hall and Social Media, we are now at ten potential groups. She suggested that members look at the existing list to see if there are any other things that we need to add/suggest, starting off with what we already have on the drawing board and seeing what can we eliminate based on people's interests and skills. Pierrea Wallace shared the list with members during the meeting via chat and the *facilitator team will send to panel members*.

Patrick Foley suggested instead of us working on our more traditional work group report, that we take things that we know are not working the way they should and see what we can do to actually change them and make it right. He added that we could look at what other jurisdictions are doing and felt it would be much better than just doing a report?

Pierera Wallace, responding to Patrick Foley's suggestion added that there is a lot of discretion that other jurisdictions have, and implement that DC doesn't do, specifically family visitation. She added that she would be interested in that work because she feels that there are holes in DC's system that can be very easily highlighted, and we can compare to what people are doing in other areas.

Wanda Thompson shared that we need to focus on what our workgroups are actually going to be working on as we could spend a lot of time talking about things that people are not interested in working on so they don't become our workgroups, and then we wasted time. She suggested that we really take a look at what the work groups are and see where people's interests are.

Pierera Wallace asked if we are looking at two separate surveys - one for looking at the topics for the working groups and then another survey to identify our resources and bandwidth?

Shana Bartley replied that she thinks it would be one survey where members can rank their choices and having a section with a few open-ended questions around capacity and availability and interest in sharing. She felt that we have a small enough group that we could compile the survey results and during our March meeting, review the results and get members into groups during that meeting and based on those topics, we might even uncover that these are broad, and we may want to go even deeper. She added that we can also see if there's any additional topics

that members have. She asked members to review the document that was shared by Pierrea Wallace in the chat and to see if there were other topics members would like to add. She stated that we should not remove choices but to note if one feels strongly that a topic should come off the list. Wanda Thompson suggested that members go through all the topics and by a show of hands what one would be interested in working on and let go the ones where there was no interest. Megan Schott felt it would be better to be anonymous which will also give members time to think about it before making their choices. Wanda Thompson agreed.

Elizabeth Mohler asked if there is an opportunity to consolidate a couple of the topics as a lot of them are related. Pierrea Wallace and Shana Bartley agreed on consolidating the topics as it would be useful when putting together the survey.

Elizabeth Mohler added that the broad question is how effective the prevention efforts are- i.e. what's working and what's not; where it may not be working, what are some of the reasons we think it may not be working; and what are some of the recommendations that would come out of this.

Pierrea Wallace asked if it was okay to work/make changes on our own as she has some specific broken-down questions that she thinks we can just remove and approach more broadly for the working group topic. Shana Bartley replied, Yes, absolutely.

Shana Bartley asked panel members if there were other topics that members have interest in that do not appear on the list.

Theresa Gibson asked what the purpose would be of a social media group - to improve our CRP and the opportunity to get exposure? She added that she felt it was public outreach. Shana Bartley replied that she will include it as a public outreach at the bottom of the list. There were no other additions at the time.

Pierrea Wallace shared that historically, she felt that working groups were limited purpose groups and it appears that public outreach would be more of a longer-term group. Shana Bartley replied that we have not done this before and that there's an opportunity to ask questions and pilot something. She shared that workgroups are supposed to change annually, but since being a CRP member, it hasn't quite worked out to be annually as some things take longer. She added that we may have to revisit the bylaws if we want to update. She felt it was a good question and something we may explore over the next year as we get started.

Emily Bloomfield asked if social media is a body of work for a working group, or is it a tactic for execution and dissemination and if social media informs how we would go about dividing up the work. Wanda Thompson replied that social media can be used to reach the public to provide outreach and to get input from the community and that there could be recommendations about how media is used. It would be more so to get input from the community and to make sure that the community's interests and questions are considered in our work. Shana Bartley added that she feels like it is a tactic and a means for us to do our work by becoming more known to attract potentially new members and build capacity. She added that she would be curious as to how other jurisdictions and CFSA are utilizing social media.

Patrick Foley stated that he would also like us to see if the CRP could shift away from workgroups that give recommendations to CFSA that they're not required to do anything with, and instead focus on the City Council to change laws or budgets that would provide funding for programs that actually work better. He added that in the five years that he has been on the panel, CFSA has not taken recommendations from the CRP and felt that we should not worry about making recommendations that aren't going to be followed through and that the panel should try a different tactic. Wanda Thompson replied that we could not leave out the recommendations.

Meghan Schott shared that it is really hard to introduce laws because it is very time consuming and could take years. She felt it was not a bad idea but is harder than one may think. Theresa Gibson added that if we're going take that route, it needs to be only one topic at a time.

Margie Chalofsky stated that looking at the legislation and advocating in different ways is an opportunity to make ourselves a player with some of the other advocacy groups out there as we might come up with something in one of our groups that can fit right into and that it doesn't just have to be us carrying this.

Shana Bartley added that there's a lot of opportunities with this new set of working groups to think about what the completion of the project looks like. She added historically what this has meant is that we would do a research project and then we produce a report with recommendations to include with our annual report. Then that report is disseminated both to CFSA, the Feds, DC Council and the Mayor's offices. She feels this continues be a good practice. She stated that everyone's raising really valid points. She added that we need to figure out what members have the most energy around, and then we have to do the work and see what it produces before we make decisions around recommending legislative changes. She asked the members to not lose this energy but to think about what success looks like in these projects based on the topics and what you are willing to do.

Margie Chalofsky stated that before leaving the meeting it would be great if we figure out how and who will put survey together and that she was willing to assist. Shana Bartley and Pierera Wallace agreed to work with Margie Chalofsky on the survey and asked members to commit to the next two days to take a look at the topics and make any other adjustments by Friday, January 13th. Shana Bartley passed the meeting over to Theresa Gibson for her presentation on Older Youth.

Theresa Gibson presented her valuable power point presentation on "*Youth Aging Out: The Shadow of Foster Care. So why should we care?*" She shared that the information is from the Rezvan Foundation blog that was done in May of 2022 that was called "Seven Issues Facing Teens in Foster Care". Shana Bartley thanked Theresa Gibson for the presentation and gave panel members an opportunity if to comments and questions. Margie Chalofsky, Pierrea Wallace Megan Schott, and Patrick Foley thanked her for the presentation and shared their thoughts/questions.

Margie Chalofsky asked Theresa Gibson if her recommendation is that we don't treat the older youth work as a "one and done" but rather as a continued work and that it should be one of the choices for a work group. Theresa Gibson replied her agreement. Meghan Schott added that we

may want to consider adding sex trafficking to the list. Margie Chalofsky suggested we can look at some of the questions that Theresa Gibson asked in her presentation and composite them into a work group. Shana Bartley asked Theresa Gibson to copy and paste from her presentation some of those questions into the document (or that we can add them later) and thanked her for sharing her presentation.

Facilitator Report and Updates

Margie Chalofsky gave an update on MOTA and Council. We now have a new contact at MOTA, James Bassett, and they are working out a time to talk. She reminded members that we have two people who are in our pipeline. She shared that in her six month report she identified the process for identifying members as a primary challenge, not how long it takes and that it gets stuck, but that it's very much top- down. Her goal is to meet with the new person from MOTA and the Council and try to see if there's any way we can really start shifting that process, utilizing Maddie's work on recruitment to start making recommendations up so we decide either people we need or skills we need.

She shared that she did not remember if the Ethics training link was shared with members and stated that Toni will put it in the chat. She stated that there is confusion around the information on whether panel members need to take the training but suggested to just do it. She also added that she would be happy to share the six-month report and that she gave lots of kudos to panel members. Shana thanked Margie for her report and turned the meeting over to Theresa Gibson for member sharing.

Member Sharing

Shana thanked Theresa for being the first member to share and Margie asked think about who wants to do it next.

Theresa Gibson shared and discussed with panel members, her book “Thorns of a Rose,” published in 2018. She shared that the book was about her journey growing up in foster care in the District of Columbia C foster care system. She stated that she decided to write the book because she needed to tell her story, as she never talked about growing up in foster care around anybody and she wanted to shine the light on the experiences. Panel members thanked Theresa for sharing her story. Patrick Foley volunteered to be the next member to share his story.

Fiscal Report

Patrick Foley reported on the current expenditures and shared to date we have spent \$20,272.29 and have a balance of \$29,727 left in our budget. Shana Bartley asked him to remind us of the dates of the contract reporting period. Patrick Foley responded July 1 – December 30. Margie Chalofsky shared that she and Toni are looking at redesigning the website and changing host of the current website as they feel it does not have the capacity to incorporate all that is needed to beef it up and that they will certainly get feedback from panel members. She said that there is money in the budget for website improvement. Shana Bartley asked that the facilitator team resend the budget to panel members.

New Business

- Member Recruitment

Mattie Cheek shared her screen to report on member recruitment. She stated that she sees marketing recruitment as how we get new members and how that integrates with what we do- From the perspective of where we are as citizens of a community, how we then use what we know, who we know and the resources that we have so that we can pull that together to make progress in thinking about what we're doing and how we make a difference. She then discussed the three phases: 1) Marketing, Recruitment, and Implementation. Listed below are her suggestions:

Marketing

- Digital brochure and promotional video (to share information with individuals and communities)

Recruitment

- Create a script (brief talking points regarding the CRP)
- Review the Application process (How do you become a member of the board – streamline the process)
- Member Appreciation

Engagement

- Survey & Focus Groups (What do you know about what's going on – Maintain a list of ideas and suggestions from members and constituents)

Shana Bartley gave appreciation to Mattie Cheek for putting this together and putting so much thought into the opportunities and the ways that we might approach recruitment. She invited members to give feedback,/suggestions.

Meghan Schott shared that we could also utilize some of these same suggestions to help with getting involved with other organization who may be able to support the CRP which may be slightly different, but also could be valuable and needed. Mattie Cheek felt that was a good point and added we can look at what overlaps we have and then when we do surveys or go out into the community it can be used to integrate all of the other projects and ideas and will be a way of enhancing what everyone is doing.

Mattie Cheek replied that getting the marketing pieces together, if the group agrees, would involve a promotional video, a promotional brochure and a script. We should look at how these items can be created and how we are going to disseminate this information. Theresa Gibson added that materials should uniformity. Mattie Cheek agreed that branding is important and asked if there was a logo. Patrick Foley responded that there is. The facilitator team will share the logo with members.

Shana Bartley stated that based on the conversation, that it looks like there is a need to make marketing and public outreach a working group as there is quite a bit of work to do but wanted buy in from members of what they thought. Mattie Cheek responded that she would love to work in this group.

Shana Bartley asked members that when completing their survey identify if this is one of your top choices. She added that there's a lot of immediate work to do on the range of things we've discussed in this meeting.

Mattie Cheek asked if anyone knew where she could 2022/23 state plan for CFSA's response to CAPTA. Margie will send the most recent update.

Shana Bartley asked if we were meeting next month for an Information Session. Margie Chalofsky replied that she was planning on reaching out to representatives from some of the Family Success Centers to present on their programs.

Concluding Comments

Shana Bartley stated that this has been a very productive meeting and to look out for a range of emails in the coming weeks. She asked members to take a look the list of suggested topics by Friday. She added that she, Peirrea Wallace and Margie Chalofsky will gather at some point in the next week to design the survey and for members to look out for it. She thanked Margie and Toni for keeping members focused and on task. She thanked members for all of their leadership and participation and added that we're making our way and it's feeling really good.

The meeting adjourned at 8:30.

Next CRP Meeting: March 14, 2023

Respectfully Submitted

Margie Chalofsky, CRP
Toni Carr, CRP Administrative Support