



Citizen Review Panel

District of Columbia

CITIZEN REVIEW PANEL

Tuesday, November 4, 2025

7:00 to 8:30 PM

MINUTES

Present members: Pierrea Wallace (Chair), Dr. Wanda Thompson, Elizabeth Mohler (Vice Chair), Theresa Gibson, Andrew Miller (Treasurer), Dr. Tyra Moore, Carolyn Woods, Amanda Quiroz-Guajardo, Deborah Kale,

Absent members: Whitney Miller, Shana Bartley, Emily Bloomfield, Meg Marcelli,

CFSA: Roni Seabrook

Facilitation team: Toni Carr (Margie Chalofsky absent due to family emergency)

Welcome and Introductions:

Pierrea Wallace, Chair, welcomed members and asked members if they were comfortable with not moving forward with full introductions as there were no public observers. There were no objections from panel members. She mentioned that she had not had the opportunity to meet Amanda and introduced herself. She thanked Margie Chalofsky for standing in the gap for her while she was dealing with some family and health issues and that she really missed holding space with members for the last two sessions.

We determined that public notice requirement was satisfied on BEGA, but the deadline for the DC Registry was not met. The determination of quorum was held off until Dr. Tyra Moore's arrival at 7:20 pm. No business requiring quorum was conducted until that time and quorum was then determined and the September 2025 minutes were voted on with a show of hands and were approved. There were no modifications to the agenda.

Workgroup Updates and Needs

Pierrea W. shared that Family Time and the Youth Aging Out groups have received a vote, and that the Prevention group has not yet. She stated that Margie C. shared that the final proposal was re-submitted and should be ready for a vote at this meeting.

Family Time

Pierrea W. shared the following and asked Dr. Wanda Thompson to jump in with any additional information

- Due to some health and personal challenges, there have been some delays, and therefore, it has been a bit of a slower buildup.
- Towards achieving some of our goals for the Family Time work group, Family Time is now drafting and developing focus group questions. The focus group will be for judges,

guardian ad litem(s), parents and parents' counsel. They are also looking at CCAM panel attorneys, and social workers. They will be talking about their experiences with family time, supervising family time, and what does family time look like for children and families in the child welfare system.

- Pierrea W. shared that when they gave the initial proposal, they talked about the case file review and were looking at a much larger sample based. However, they learned that It's not going to be as helpful for them to go through a large quantity of cases, and it makes more sense for them to look at a smaller sample size and use it more as context, rather than doing more of a quantitative study. They are going to do a smaller case study, looking at case files, and also looking at focus groups for the four demographics that were identified. They are in the process now of revamping their research plan.
- There were no additional items added by Dr. Wanda T. She stated that what Pierrea W. presented was right on point.
- There were no questions from panel members.

Youth Aging Out

Theresa Gibson reported the following updates:

- Primary Focus is the survey - surveying youth aging out between the ages of 18 and 21 and foster parents
- Questions for the survey have been completed. They did some editing and tweaking very recently to keep it focused on homelessness and that the data they collected kind of focus on homelessness, housing specifically.
- A meeting was held with Anna Reilly at CFSA and she's willing to help us out with getting the survey out to the foster parents. Ms. Reilly requested a one-pager (blurb) to state who we are and what we're doing. The one pager was sent to her this week.
- Surveys are pretty ready to go out to both the foster parents as well as the youth aging out, and the group just needs to come up with a system to implement.

Questions/Comments

- Pierrea W. asked how the surveys were being sent and how are they planning to get in contact with the youth?

Theresa G. responded that CFSA will be assisting with this.

- a. CFSA gave a list of different locations where the youth are, organizations that they attend, so they plan to reach out that way.
- b. The surveys will be done directly with the youth and as **they are** giving gift cards to them. The goal is to go where they are because it might be the easiest way to do it for them.

Pierrea W. added that if it ever comes up, or you think it could be helpful, CLC guardian ad-litem(s) would be a good source. Also, some of the group homes where a lot of our girls age out from, like Caitlin's Place, or drop-in centers like Courtney's House could be helpful for just connecting with them, as they usually have community events every week. She added that If it's helpful at all, feel free to let her know, and she will be happy to share it.

- Theresa G. asked Andy Miller if there were additional items he wanted to speak about. Andy M. replied that Theresa G summed it up really well. Theresa G. shared that she was excited to get the process moving and hopefully get some good data.

Prevention Workgroup

Elizabeth Mohler shared that she and Amanda Quiroz-Guajardo are both in the prevention group, and that she was not clear on what Margie C. said about the panel voting on the proposal. (Roni S. asked if the rest of the panel members had an opportunity to view the proposal – Elizabeth M. responded that she did not believe that it had been shared with the panel and reported the following updates:

- The work group has submitted the proposal to CFSA, and Roni S. is working on setting up a meeting with Dr. Brooks later in November.
- She was not sure if the workgroup skipped a beat or skipped a step in terms of approval by the panel.

Pierrea W. stated that she thinks for context, and what had been done with the other work groups is they did have more of a formal presentation of the work groups, and there was a collective vote that happened. She added that she is trying to think about how we should handle it and added that she thinks it would be fine for us to revisit this matter at the next CRP meeting and then get the formal vote on the record. She added that if the workgroup feels comfortable proceeding today and can give us an update on where the group is and a little background, we can vote on it today as we have quorum.

Elizabeth M. asked Amanda G. if she felt comfortable and they both proceeded to share the following:

- Amanda is working on developing a survey for mandated reporters. They have landed on focusing on the experience of mandated reporters when they make a report to CFSA but there is not a case opened.
- They want to review the policy regarding reports to the hotline that are screened out, so that they understand what the current policy is.
- They are looking at doing a survey with mandated reporters and choosing from representative groups that often make mandated reports, like schools emergency rooms, etc., and that Amanda was leading the development of the survey.

- They are hoping to collaborate with the Ombudsperson's Office because they are doing their own research into calls that are screened out.

Amanda G. explained the survey and presented the following:

- The questions are designed to capture both quantitative and qualitative insights.
- The goal is to better understand mandated reporters' experiences, not just through the reporting process, but especially when their calls are screened out and to identify where there may be some opportunities for prevention or system improvement.
- Questions were submitted to Ombudsperson where they received some feedback which was then used to revise the survey. At this stage, they are still refining a sampling approach, but their goal is to reach a broad and diverse representation of mandated reporters across various sectors.
- They anticipate distributing between 200 and 300 surveys and to begin using some professional associations, some training networks, and community partners as channels.
- The intent, obviously, is not to reach every mandated reporter in DC, but to obtain a really good representative sample that reflects different disciplines, and really different levels of experience.
- They also added a question asking *if respondents would like to be interviewed*. They plan to add a final question to the survey, inviting participants to indicate whether they would be open to a brief follow-up interview, which allows us to identify a small group of stakeholders for that qualitative - a deeper understanding of survey findings.
- The third thing that was asked was to amend the original draft was how stakeholders for the interviews will be identified.
- They want to ensure that they get a good representation, and the goal is to conduct somewhere between 6 and 10 qualitative interviews, focusing on maybe some patterns, trends, challenges, and recommendations related to the screening process.

Elizabeth M. thanked Amanda G. for the information provided.

Questions/Comments

Roni S. asked if the panel members, particularly those on this work group, have taken the CFSA-mandated reported training. She said that she thinks it might be helpful to inform their research, and after their findings, they might be able to provide valuable information about how CFSA can improve the training.

Amanda G. thanked Roni for sharing that and shared her experience on this topic while presenting last week at an Early Childhood Education Conference.

Roni S. stated that she would love for us to look at it and give feedback. She put the [link](#) in the chat for members to review.

Elizabeth M. replied that that's a great suggestion and added that part of the problem is that there are so many different people who are mandated reporters with different responsibilities, and time constraints, and it's hard to make the training kind of uniform and comprehensive. She asked if panel members had any questions about what their workgroup is aiming towards or the proposal.

Pierrea W. shared that she was excited to see where the group would go with it. She asked if their thinking was related to pre- or post-hotline calls, or is the workgroup looking at both? Is it prevention in the sense of opportunities for prevention around mandated reporting, giving training on how do we identify better resources in the city to avoid hotline calls, or is it prevention as it relates to, now a hotline call was made, how do we make sure removal doesn't happen, and we're putting resources in that way?

Amanda G replied, "Absolutely, I think it can be both." She added that this may be a really great opportunity for us to revisit what it is, why we do it, how we're going to do it, and what kind of accountability there is for mandated reporter trainings. When families get screened out, we would like to see if there are any trends of who's making that decision; how they're making that decision; if there's more than one screener that's getting reports on the same families, and if there's any communication happening with connecting them to community resources, and why are they continuing to get calls and screened out? The warm line's fine, but that's voluntary, and it might identify some community resources that maybe we need to have. She added that she can see opportunities for professional development and opportunities for some campaigns, just to raise some knowledge, raise awareness of things happening.

Elizabeth M. added that they are trying to focus their work and landed on the latter of the two brought up by Pierrea W. She stated that the feedback that they had received from mandated reporters was that they'd made reports and (from their perspective) nothing happened. The workgroup would like to understand what resources are being provided to families when reports are being made to prevent removal - Entry points into this investigation or research. The workgroup imagines it will broaden out as we conduct the surveys.

Pierrea W. responded that that answered her question and that it seems like at least the initial thinking is that it's post-hotline prevention. Carolyn Woods agreed.

Pierrea W. asked if there were other questions for the group and announced that we can move forward with a vote if members were comfortable with that based on the discussion. She asked members to raise their hand and members voted to move forward.

Workgroup Needs

Pierrea W. added that now we have gone over all the workgroup updates, does anyone have explicit needs and would it be helpful for anyone to get additional support?

- Theresa G. responded that when the Aging Out group gets a list of activities, if someone from the YAO group is not able to attend, it would be very helpful if panel members from other workgroups will be able to attend in their place. They will be able to provide a link to the survey to provide at events as well as gift cards.

Pierrea W. added as they're scheduling, as these things come up, you can all let members know which events you think you wouldn't be able to attend. We are also always looking for volunteers that may not be a part of the group who can step in and help with some of these tasks. She added that she thinks they are in the place where CLC is hiring some clerks and CLC has said that they would be generous to allow clerks to give us some time as well.

Dr. Tyra M. suggested that we take a few minutes in one of our meetings to discuss how to share this information, more like training us on how to do it. She stated that she does not know that she would feel comfortable and would want to make sure that she is sharing it correctly and keeping fidelity in the process.

Theresa G. responded that we could go through the survey itself so that panel members can see what the questions are. She added that we do not want them to think that we are influencing them. We want to let them know, here's all the questions we have and if you don't understand the question, we can read it to you. Andrew M. stated that as he's making these last few changes, we can also develop a little script. It will include, here's what this is, here's why we're doing it, here's what you'll get once you complete it before the survey is taken.

Pierrea W. asked if the group anticipate having the survey ready to be shared before January. Andrew M. and Theresa G. replied yes. Andrew M. shared that the surveys for both youth and foster parents are practically ready now, but there's still one revision he has to make and that it shouldn't take long. Theresa G. added that there will be a QR code as well as link to the survey. Pierrea W. added that it doesn't sound like we'll have a full panel meeting before actually sharing it, but another option is after YAO get the script together and finalizes the survey, we can have a meeting that we just schedule one-off when you're ready to share out, and anyone that has the availability can participate. She said she will send to Theresa G the different organizations and their drop-in dates and contact information. Theresa G. agreed.

Public Outreach

Pierrea W. shared that before she went on leave, there was a discussion about public outreach and some ideas we had. She said that she would like to circle back on some of those ideas, what is happening with public outreach, and how members can get involved. She asked members if they had any thoughts and if there were conversations that were had in the last session that she missed and that need to be followed up on or is this something that we haven't really discussed as a group in some time?

- Theresa G. responded that she thought we talked about doing a town hall.
- Dr. Wanda T. added that she thinks we did talk about doing a town hall to have an opportunity for the public to weigh in on some of their sentiments about how the process works and to get their feedback.

- Theresa G. stated that she thinks that's a great idea to do and it's just about setting a date in the near future.

Pierrea W. shared that this was definitely a discussion she had participated in before she went away and that we were talking about the importance of knowing what our specific goal was, and if we were to do that, thinking about logistics. She asked if the last time the CRP had a town hall meeting which predates her time with the group, was there childcare? in-person versus virtual? how do we get the word out? what would be the goal? She added the other thing we talked about is wanting to make sure that we are clear that we are a separate organization from CFSA, we're not an extension, but two, this is not a venue for people to share their specific case grievances for resolution. We don't want to set people up to think this is a place where we'll be able to do advocacy on your particular child welfare case. She stated that thinking through all of those pieces, she thinks it requires a public outreach committee and feels like this is the most efficient way to tackle this. She opened the floor for comments, and asked if there are members who feel strongly with "I want to be on the public outreach Committee?"

Theresa G, Dr. Wanda T, and Amanda G. stated that they would like to be on the committee. Pierrea W. also stated that she would like to be on the committee, and that she will send an email to all members and if anyone else is interested they should let us know, and they can be included in scheduling.

Pierrea W. asked if there is anyone who has thoughts, sentiments around public outreach? She added that first meeting is to set out what the federal mandate is for our group, so we'll start off with what the CRP is federally mandated to do as it relates to public outreach, and then we can break down what our interests are, what our capacity is, and figure out how we orient ourselves from there.

Dr. Wanda T. added that she feels that community education is important and that we share with people what our mandate is, what we're there for, the committees that we have, and to let them know who we are and how they can feed into us when they have concerns and issues.

Elizabeth M. added that she was around when we did the town hall event way back when, and it was a really exciting event, but it took a lot of work. It was in-person with childcare. It was labor-intensive and wanted to share that in terms of what the group considers going forward.

Pierrea W. stated that we had talked about potentially collaborating with other organizations to make it a little easier, so if there are events that are already happening in the community, if there are organizations that are already embedded into the folks we're trying to reach, we can piggyback with them and say, can we have maybe an hour of the time on this day – this is something we can consider as time is limited for everyone. She added that we can discuss this with the full group. There were no other comments.

Facilitator Report and Updates

In the absence of Margie Chalofsky, Pierrea W. presented the facilitator's report. She presented the following:

Membership Recruitment

- We currently have two openings. We have two strong applicants, one from DC Educational Sector, and one from a local nonprofit. Both were referred by Emily.
- Recapping the Process: The applicant is to apply directly to MOTA or the Council, depending on which side has the opening. In the situation of MOTA, the applicant then has to interview with a MOTA representative and Margie C, at which their application is discussed, evaluated for a match with the panel. Currently, Margie has not yet been contacted for this step, and she's reached out to MOTA repeatedly without any success.
- Another one of these slots is being held for a birth parent, which we've talked about extensively, that we want to make sure we have a birth parent on the CRP, so we're trying to hold off on that. At this time, Margie C. is holding off a little bit on the recruitment of this position. The hesitation is for someone with lived experience, particularly a birth parent, as she wants to be reassured that their application is going to be treated respectfully and in a timely manner and right now, this process has been so complicated and not clear that she doesn't want to kind of set that up and then leave that person lingering or in limbo.
- Pierrea W. added that the group also discussed trying to recruit another member who likes data and research and she's asking that anyone who has recommendations send them over to Margie C.
- Pierrea W. shared that Margie C. is very aware of career and personal challenges and changes that are impacting our panel involvement of some of our current members, so she also wants us to explore volunteers, which will be a great recruit for us. She asked members to consider if they know anyone in the community who may not have the capacity to be a panel member, but who might be able to volunteer some help by joining a work group or doing some specific tasks such as research.

Team Building

Pierrea W. stated that a question was brought up to her as it related to continued team-building activities, and it would be helpful to understand how panel members feel about it -Would we like more of these or are we in a space of we're kind of busy, we have some overwhelming days, and this could just be a potential another obligation that we have to do? She asked panel members about their thoughts on team building events. She also stated since we were in the holiday season, if it is something we want to continue, we should wait until January.

- Elizabeth M. I think waiting until the new year would be a very good idea. It's a great idea to have these opportunities to get together off Zoom and just to socialize.
- Andrew M. agreed with Elizabeth M. and stated he also really enjoyed the in-person interaction we had at one of the team-building events, so he would definitely welcome more of that among this group.
- Dr. Wanda T. agreed we should wait until the new year.

- Amanda G. asked how has not necessarily team building, but just member engagement, how has that been addressed in the past? She said she would be interested to know if there's ongoing plans to strengthen the team's cohesion or participation across the panel and think it would be such an important foundation to just keep the momentum going but she did not know what's been done previously.
- Theresa G. replied that since she has been on the panel we've had a couple of outings. It hasn't been anything on a regular schedule. We haven't been able to have everybody come, but we've had most people come at some point. She said it sounds like everyone wants to wait until the new year to do something.
- Dr. Tyra M. added that she supports what everyone has shared, and her suggestion might be that we consider maybe in the first meeting of the year we think about tentative dates for 2 or 3 across the year, or something where we calendar it a little bit earlier, just kind of lock in those dates, and then folks can do their best to make themselves available.
- Pierrea W. asked Amanda G. if she felt that her questions were answered. Amanda G. replied yes, and that she is trying to figure out where she can serve the best. She thanked the members for clarification.
- Pierrea W. added that CRP members are passionate about their work and that we all have caregiving responsibilities, full-time jobs, etc., and then there also is the fact that we only meet 6 times a year, but within our individual work groups, there's more contact. She suggested that maybe there's a way for us to think through 2026, if there's a possibility for more opportunities like that. For example, is it possibilities to do drop-ins to someone else's work group, and get an idea of what they're doing, and what skills you can offer for them, and vice versa and maybe that could also help with **team** building. She added that It's nice to have more opportunities to cross-pollinate around the work group.
- Pierrea W. shared that she appreciated Dr. Tyra M. idea of getting these dates on the calendar early in the year. If we can get **down** one each quarter on these alternating months, this is what we'd be needing.
- There was some confusion about the consistency of CRP meeting times because this meeting was the first Tuesday in November instead of the second. Toni C. clarified that our meetings are always on the second Tuesday every other month except in unusual circumstances (like this month) when a specific change is voted on due to a holiday or other significant conflict.

Fiscal Report & Updates

Andrew M. shared his screen and presented the fiscal report for the months of September and October 2025. He stated that on October 8th, we received a new modification for FY26 for the period of October 1st, 2025, to June 30th, 2026, and the draw amount of \$37,192.65. According to CRP's financial records, the amount of \$37,192.65 was incorrect, and should have been in the

amount of \$12,807.35. The issue was presented to the CFSA team. After a meeting with one of CFSA's team members, and other communication via email and phone with CFSA team members, the issue was resolved and noted the correct draw was \$12,807.35. Finally, on October 22nd, we received a revisited PO with a draw amount of \$12,807.35, and October 28th, 2025, the invoice for this amount was uploaded to the DIFS. After presentation of the full report, he reminded panel members that they could see the full report on the CRP members portal.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Panel Member Comments

Members shared holiday and happy new year wishes amongst each other as this was the last meeting of the year.

Elizabeth M. thanked everyone for their commitment.

Dr. Wanda T. suggested that as a group with say something to Margie as we sign off. Members sent their love, well wishes, and thank you messages to Margie.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:03 pm