



# Citizen Review Panel

## District of Columbia

### CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES AGENCY

#### CITIZEN REVIEW PANEL

Tuesday, September 9, 2025

7:00 to 8:30 PM

#### MINUTES

**Present members:** Dr. Wanda Thompson, Elizabeth Mohler, Theresa Gibson, Andrew Miller, Dr. Tyra Moore, Carolyn Woods, Amanda Quiroz-Guajardo, Deborah Kale, Meg Marcelli, Whitney Miller, Shana Bartley, Emily Bloomfield

**Absent members:** Pierrea Wallace

**Former CRP Members serving on workgroups:** Patrick Foley, Rick Bardach

**Guests:** Christian Gineste, CFSA

**CFSA:** Roni Seabrook

**Facilitation team:** Margie Chalofsky and Toni Carr

---

#### **Welcome and Introductions:**

Elizabeth Mohler, Vice-Chair led introductions and shared that CFSA will be joining us to present their response to the CRP annual report and asked members to confirm that they were all in receipt of the report and CFSA responses. She announced that public notice requirement was satisfied. Margie Chalofsky added that we will move minutes and discuss after CFSA's presentation.

#### **CFSA response to CRP Annual report**

Margie C. suggested that we go through them point by point. She shared that often the annual report is recommendations from work groups, but since the work groups are just really getting into the meat of their work, that some of them were general recommendations, and some were preliminary recommendations coming from the work groups.

Margie C. read the first recommendation/response :

#### **Family Time Workgroup**

##### **Recommendation 1:**

Based upon national data showing a correlation between family time and successful reunification, we recommend that for families in out-of-home care—especially those with a goal of reunification - the length and frequency of family time be frequently tracked throughout the case, from the beginning to the end. Additionally, any barriers to increasing family time or transitioning to unsupervised family time should be consistently evaluated and documented.

### **CFSA's Response to Recommendation 1:**

Recommendation is already in place with the implementation and launch of STAND and the Family Time Plan.

### **Questions/Responses from Panel Members:**

Dr. Wanda Thompson: Shared that she is excited about the STAND training scheduled for later in the week and curious about how the Family Time Plan is defined by CFSA and what it refers to and how it is tracked in STAND.

Christian G. responded that he does not have the exact definition to share at this time, but he will make sure to get it and share it by the end of the week. He shared that with regard to the time; his understanding is that they are going to implement the recommendation that the CRP shared with them and that all the data is being tracked right now in the system. He suggested that it would be best to perhaps wait until the STAND training to get a better sense of how exactly CFSA is going to measure family time.

Dr. Wanda T. asked if Christian W. could clarify the definition of the Family Time Plan and its meaning even if not exact.

Christian G. responded that he was not the best qualified to answer her question at this time but will make sure to respond the be end of next week.

Dr. Tyra Moore shared that the categories they were tracking in FACES were not clear in regards to what constitutes decision making, or how decisions are being made between moving from supervised to unsupervised family time. She added that she is hoping that as they learn more about STAND, that they get to see more of how the data is tracked and is more consistent across cases. She also stated that they found when going through the cases that the information they wanted to know about was really hard to suss out. She was also curious about whether the STAAND training is focused on moving from one data capturing system to another data capturing system, or whether there was also some training around family time, and how social workers should be navigating that.

Roni Seabrook apologized for not having the response at this time and shared that Christian W. is new to joining the CFSA team and in the past, they have had program staff at these meetings and that she and Christian W. do not work in programs. She encouraged members that during their STAAND training, to ask them to specifically to look at the family time plan. She added that whatever questions they can't answer that they will speak to staff and get back to the CRP.

Dr. Tyra M. asked if it would be appropriate and would the staff be open to them bringing to the training some of the categories they were looking to track before, so that they are able to see where there are correlations, or where there is information still may be missing.

Margie C. added that she understands that this is the first time that we are doing the feedback this way and asked what would be appropriate.

Christian G. responded that the best way to proceed would be for the team to share the detailed recommendations of what you would like CFSA to track and perhaps could work together to design to make sure that everybody's on board. He asked that the team provide a list of all the data elements that they would like us to track, and that they will do their best to capture that in a dashboard.

Dr. Wanda T. added that one of the things that she is trying to do is to research a lot of the national data and is curious to know what sources CFSA use to compare them. She stated that some of the states have some really good ideas, data and points that they make.

Theresa Gibson asked if there will be another opportunity to go through the recommendations/responses.

Christian G. responded because everyone from CFSA is not at the table this evening, that they will not be able to address all of the questions and if we think we should have another meeting with others present, we can do that.

Margie C. suggested asked if it was okay to go through the recommendations and see which ones still need work/deeper responses and then if it's specific to one work group, then we can work with that work group to put in those recommendations. If it's more general and we need more people, then we can deal with that and see how that goes and get through as many as we can address tonight and go forward in that way.

Dr. Tyra M. asked if the Child and Parent Visits and Supervised Visits Policy was going to be updated at some point. She stated that they did not get clarity on when the administrative policy would be updated.

Christian G. responded that it is in process and that the targeted date for finalizing those updates is the end of this month and that they would make sure to keep the CRP involved in that update.

Dr. Tyra M. asked if a draft could be shared during the STAAND training to get a sense of where it's headed. Christian G. responded that he would inquire as this would require an internal conversation because it has not been fully reviewed by their legal team, but he will do his best.

Margie C. stated that back in the day there were often external people at the table when policies were being redone and that she sat through many of them when working at FAPAC. She asked if the policy is still in draft form and if there may even be a chance to incorporate some of the things that members who are working on that project might give input and asked Christian G. and Ronnie S. if they could get back to the CRP on whether there's still any opening for input in the draft form currently being worked on.

Christian G. responded most definitely, and that he will make sure to get everyone involved in this.

Elizabeth M. read the second recommendation/response :

### **Family Time Workgroup Recommendation 2:**

We recommend that CFSA begin designing a pre-test and then implement periodic post-test measures to assess the factors they want to see present in families prior to reunification, based on the qualities and traits they have observed in successful reunifications.

### **CFSA's Response to Recommendation 2:**

Recommendation under consideration. CFSA is committed to gaining feedback from biological parents to inform practice and will determine the best clinical approach to obtain this information.

### **Questions/Responses from Panel Members:**

Margie C. shared that this was a preliminary recommendation before we really got into the projects and was open to hearing other approaches and asked Dr. Thompson and Dr. Moore to take the lead on any questions they may have.

Dr. Tyra M. stated that they are just looking to hear more about what kind of feedback loop there is, and what ways CFSA may be considering gathering that kind of information. The group is moving from a quantitative to a more qualitative approach, because of some of the struggles they have had in getting finite data and that they would like to be able to access any of that information. and would be happy to make some recommendations and build off the recommendation already made, going forward. She asked if that's something that could also happen in the STAAND training or is this a separate meeting with program staff.

Dr. Wanda T. added that it might be helpful at some point to have a focus group with social workers to talk about the things they have seen in successful reunifications and how they go about measuring is qualitatively.

Christian G. responded that he thought that this would be an amazing opportunity to partner and that they would love to participate in those conversations with social workers and gather qualitative feedback with the workgroup. He also said if the group preferred to have those conversations separately, that that is also fine and that they would be happy to help facilitate those meetings.

Margie C. added that the possibility of partnership sounds really good and that the work group can talk about that amongst themselves and decide.

Roni S. stated that when considering the meeting again, CFSA should invite Ann Reilly as this is her area, and she will have all the expert content knowledge and background information and current status of practice.

Elizabeth M. read the third recommendation/response :

### **Youth Aging Out Recommendation 3:**

To our knowledge, the only housing data CFSA has for youth aging out of care is on the actual date they leave care. We recommend that youth be followed for a year to better understand outcomes regarding housing.

### **CFSA's Response to Recommendation 3:**

CFSA agrees with this recommendation and recognizes the value in collecting post transition data. We will do so for youth who opt-in to Youth Aftercare Services post involvement with CFSA. We also commit to continuing collaboration with DHS for youth who may require additional support and services.

### **Questions/Responses from Panel Members:**

Theresa Gibson asked if CFSA would consider reaching out to youth to find out how they are doing

Christian G. responded that the concern was that they want to be cognizant that there could be government overreach and if youth are not participating in those services, they might have an expectation that CFSA will not reach out to them continuously in order to gather data on them. He added that if she still thinks that CFSA should engage youth that do not participate in those services, to let them know and they can try to have this conversation internally.

Roni S. asked Christian G. if they collected (NYTD) National Youth in Transition database on housing as the Bureau requires that all jurisdictions collect data on youth that have aged out up to 21?" She shared that part of the challenge is that after they leave care, for some youth, they don't want to be contacted but suggested that we see what's out there.

Christian G. responded that he could commit to discuss sharing the (NYTD) and that they are building a dashboard at this time and the information is shared with the federal government, but he does think that this could be an opportunity to be more transparent about the services received by youth and could share that with panel.

Margie C. added that our recommendation was that CFSA learn that information itself (more than it was that we/ the panel learned that information). So, in other words, since we are told no youth is homeless on the day that they age out, that's not really knowing what happens six months down the road. She added that we were recommending that CFSA tracked that which is the most important part of the recommendation, not necessarily that we have it, because our project is very specific at this point to 18- to 21-year-olds, and who are in care.

Roni S. commented that she wants to be very clear that the legislation requires that CFSA share data with the Citizens Review Panel. She added that the legislation is clear about the agency, and not just their agency, but the states across the country sharing information and data with the CRP. Christian G. added that one of the next steps could be to share information about the NYTD with the panel.

Roni S. shared that she asked Andrea to come and speak to the panel about NYTD, knowing that they are doing this project, and she agreed to do that. She can give an overview and some of the challenges she has had, and that the panel might have some recommendations that might help them to be able to secure information from these teens who age out, because sometimes we're just kind of spinning our wheels and just trying many ways. She said she thinks it'd be great if the Youth Aging Out group could meet with her, and then anybody else from the panel who wanted to join. Margie C. added that that would be great.

Elizabeth M. read the fourth recommendation/response :

#### **Youth Aging Out Recommendation 4:**

To our knowledge, although CFSA may offer older youth many resources, none are required and all are voluntary. Although we understand wanting to build youth autonomy and empowerment, as most parents know, older youth often don't know yet what they will need in their future, so parents need to place some requirements. As CFSA holds parental authority regarding what is required of youth and what cannot be, we recommend that there be ongoing decision making on this issue that balances the interest in giving youth choice with preparing them for the future.

#### **CFSA's Response to Recommendation 4:**

Recommendation under consideration. CFSA will work with the Citizens Review Panel's Youth Aging Out Workgroup in consultation with the Office of the General Counsel to determine the most appropriate legal approach to addressing lack of youth engagement. The youth's voice and choice must remain at the forefront when planning their transition from care.

#### **Questions/Responses from Panel Members:**

Margie C. stated that she thinks there's the tension between the youth choice and preparing and said we have been hearing about for years and years, especially from the foster parents of older youth who, kids return back saying, how come I was never made to go to therapy? How come I was never made to take my medicine? She said she understands the fact that these are not young children, that they are teenagers, but most of us who are parents of children who are not in care know that there are certain things that we need to require of our older children. She added that it's not necessarily just the CRP that has concerns; she has heard this from foster parents over the years, that the youth often age out unprepared. She shared that the survey is going to be figuring out whether youth really know what resources are available. That workgroup will not be going to the next step at this point as to looking at why they're not participating if they're not, but she thinks that this conversation about the fact that youth don't participate in a lot of things is sort of like an elephant in the room when you're talking about services for older youth. She asked if anyone else had any comments about that, and what it means when CFSA states it will work with the panel to look at this... who would that be? And how would that happen?

Theresa G. added she felt to resolve this issue that it needs to be with a multitude of people in different areas, such as; CRP, CFSA, foster parents, and organizations that work with youth aging out, possibly a roundtable, to come up with a solution as to why? She asked to clarify if it was because before they age out that they're not required to attend these things or after they age out?

Margie C. responded that nothing is required. and stated that foster parents on this panel who have had older youth, can probably speak to that better than she could. She said that she does not know that there is a simple answer because on one hand acknowledging the youth's voice and choice, and also acknowledging that it is a youth's right to be parented, and what does that also mean? She said that foster parents don't necessarily have the right to mandate things, but the agency does. She agreed with Theresea G. adding that if CFSA wanted to really address this, they would need to pull together a lot of voices.

Dr. Wanda T. commented that it also sounds like some legal assistance would be helpful in that group to understand what can be done, and also what can be legislated.

Margie C. added she isn't sure if it would need to involve legislation. She also stated being in the situation of representing foster parents for so many years, and knowing that even the allowance couldn't be tied chores, or tied to going to classes, so it's hard to figure out, because then you have youth coming back and saying, I was not prepared, and now I want to live on your couch, and I don't know how to do anything. So, it's not an easy thing. She added that she was wondering if the Youth Aging Out group, as they are moving forward with the survey, finds that there is a number of youth who are not taking part in things, that we could make another recommendation when we write our next report back to CFSA as to how they might pull people together to deal with this.

Theresa G. responded that there are opportunities between the time they age out for youth to be in the room with people for example, like they go to OYE and that she was wondering if the time spent with them is time well spent and if there are times when the young people are getting together, they're all coming to something for whatever reason they're there what is it ... is it meat and potatoes like steak given to them or just bologna? She added the opportunity you have to catch them; it's like when you can't put a lot of information to their head at one time, but you can try to make each opportunity that you have with them more productive.

Margie C. reminded the panel that these recommendations were in our report (as preliminary) before YAO had necessarily focused on which part they were going to focus on. She suggested we take this back to the committee, and as we're working through our first stage, we can come back with a recommendation to CFSA and maybe we can help host some sort of a roundtable around this topic. She asked if everyone were okay with this and that we could move on.

Andy Miller asked if there is a jurisdiction that has best practices that does it well and if CFSA looking into best practices for youth aging out?

Christian G. responded that he thought that the CFSR could help the panel out. He stated that there are federal metrics that allow them to assess how well we are doing for youth aging out and that maybe he can gather the data from CFSR from the last round of CFSR and let the panel know which jurisdiction is doing well in that area.

Margie C. thanked Christian G. and stated that YAO group plans to look at some national best practices, so that would help us a lot. She added that the workgroup does want to compare what CFSA is doing with national best practices, specifically on housing, because that's what we were taking on that time and that would be helpful.

Roni S asked Christian G. if he would share with the panel what CFSR is. Christian G. responded that it is a federal review of our performance as a jurisdiction, and that there are many areas that are assessed. He explained that when there are areas where a jurisdiction is not doing well, the federal government asks them to produce a PIP ( Program Improvement Plan), in order to demonstrate that they are making efforts in order to achieve better performances in the future and that the CFSR is the (Child and Family Services Review.)

Dr. Tyra M. asked if it ever got published for community consumption. Christian G. responded that it is published on and that one can actually go to their website to see what their performance has been over the past 20 years, he shared the link in the chat. <https://acf.gov/cb/monitoring/child-family-services-reviews> and <https://cfsa.dc.gov/publication/child-and-family-services-reviews-district-columbia-final-report#gsc.tab=0> Roni S. Added that one could look for other jurisdictions as well because it is required across all states.

Elizabeth M. read the fourth recommendation/response :

### **Youth Aging Out Recommendation 5:**

Youth aging out of care require a full District effort. We recommend that CFSA lead a process to ensure that all other District agencies- DBH, DCHA, DHS, etc.- share responsibility for our vulnerable youth as they face adulthood on their own and work together to ensure positive outcomes in housing, vocational opportunities, etc.

### **CFSA's Response to Recommendation 5:**

CFSA agrees with the concept of this recommendation, and recommends this be elevated by the Citizens Review Panel to the Deputy Mayor of Health and Human Services as CFSA remains an Agency that is a part of the system that supports the District's residents.

### **Questions/Responses from Panel Members:**

Margie C. responded that the panel could certainly elevate it but stated that the panel is recommending that CFSA also elevate the need to pull in outside agencies to support youth. Once youth leave CFSA's care, that it falls on the other agencies. She added/asked that this response sounds like CFSA itself doesn't see it as its role to bring the other agencies involved?

Christian C. responded that they have strong partnerships with those other agencies and that they communicate on a very frequent basis. He added he will make sure to elevate the panel's concern internally, and that he will have to circle back with the panel on this.

Margie C. stated that due to time that we will discuss Recommendation number 6 but hold the last one (Appointment Process) for another time because it was more of a systemic subject matter between CRP and MOTA and was not sure that this was the right platform for this topic.

### **Prevention**

#### **Recommendation 6:**

We recommend that CFSA track recidivism on cases that were not opened as investigations (i.e., if a family has received multiple reports but none rise to the level of CPS involvement), we recommend tracking data on whether the resources being offered actually decrease future foster care involvement.

### **CFSA's Response to Recommendation 6:**

Recommendation already in place with the implementation of the District-wide 211 Warmline. Data related to resources and support will be made District-wide.

### **Questions/Responses from Panel Members:**

Elizabeth M. stated that she was not clear if the response related to the warm line connects with the recommendation that CFSA tracks recidivism and what they are interested in is when family services are offered if there is a way of tracking whether those have been useful to the family or whether CFSA continues to see reports on the same family. She added that it doesn't seem like the warm line would really be doing that tracking. Margie C. commented that she didn't see the response as really answering the recommendation.

Christian C. responded that some referrals that are made to CFSA are eventually redirected to the 211 warm line, because there is not a need for investigation and in those instances, they will know what services the family received and that they will be able to track whether that family came back to the attention of CFSA. He added that they do have that information internally. He stated that he did not think the recommendation was to share that information, but he can definitely assure the panel that they are tracking that data internally.

Margie C. stated that she thinks that this really overlaps with what the prevention work group is going to be looking at, which is the screening-out process and what happens to those families. She

thinks that since the warm line is a voluntary service, it's not CFSA tracking data on those services, (such as 7 calls have come in on Family X, and what has happened to... how does that relate to services that were offered to family that Family X actually took?) She expressed that from the perspective of what we've been discussing in our work group, the warm line is only a piece of what addresses this place in the continuum. She asked anyone in the Prevention group to add their thoughts to help clarify.

Whitney Miller responded that he thought what Margie C stated was about right in terms of, at least from his perspective, he is seeing it the same way as well.

Emily Bloomfield, added she thinks that the root question had to do with entities or organizations like schools that may call several times about a family and they don't see anything happen; do they understand what the process is? As well as for families who come in where there's not anything mandated, but they're sort of at that level of being recommended supports and services, how does CFSA know what was accessed or not, or track whether they eventually had some kind of mandated involvement in CFSA.

Margie C. stated that the second part of what the recommendation meant was to look into those screened-out calls, how does CFSA know whether people are actually taking advantage of prevention opportunities. She added that this is a preliminary recommendation prior to doing the study.

Emily B. added that it's not just whether they took advantage of it, but whether it was possible to access it, for example with mental health services where there is a shortage of supply it can be strongly urged, but if a family can't get access, is anybody noticing how is it being tracked.

Dr. Wanda T. added that in some ways it's almost analogous to what we were discussing before with youth aging out; that if a case has not been opened, then it almost seems like tracking it is almost a level of opening and how does one then justify tracking. If, in fact it's not opened and it would be up to the family to determine whether or not they're going to accept the resources, it's analogous to the young person who comes back and says, "nobody ever told me that." The family could say the same thing, but if you essentially closed the case, or not opened it, rather, then it seems like one can't really track, but when it starts to be recidivism, for example, if in terms of the question being asked, "if you've ever been in the system, if you've ever been contacted before, in reference to your child", then it seems like that might elevate it to another level. She added that if it's not recidivism, she didn't see how the family is obligated to give up any information or how CFSA can really justify tracking if they haven't opened the case.

Christian C. responded that Dr. Wanda T. was definitely right about this and added that they try to engage families who are receiving referrals from them, even though the investigation hasn't started and it is very difficult to get that information from them, unfortunately, and for legitimate reasons. He added that they do not want the government to be involved in their lives, and we have to respect that decision, but they are still doing our best to track that data. He stated that he knows exactly which databases they are using in order to track that data and in some cases, they are using *QuickBase* and in other cases, we they using *FindHelp* in order to really understand whether the family engaged in services or not, but he recognizes that the quality of that data is not at the level where they would like it to be because it's very difficult to get that information from the providers and from families. He added that they can assess whether a referral was recommended, whether a referral was made, and whether it had any kind of impact on recidivism. He stated that if the goal is to assess whether the family participated in services, that it is very difficult and that they have tried to

do this for the past 5 years, and it's been a challenge. He said they have tried to engage all of their partners in order to use the same system to better track participation in services, and those efforts have not been successful so far.

Margie C stated that due to time that we will go back to the prevention group and clarify this question, and after we do our study, that the group will be clear on what we're looking at, and reminded everyone that this was preliminary, and the first time that we're really delving into this process. She added that group will pull notes together and do some work between CFSA and the individual work groups on some of these topics. She thanked Christian G. and Roni S.

### **Fiscal report**

Andrew M. shared that the financial report was accessible on the portal and proceeded with presenting the fiscal report for the months June and July 2025. There were no questions from the panel.

### **Workgroup Announcements:**

#### **Family Time Workgroup:**

Dr. Tyra M. shared that she and Dr. Wanda T. will be doing the STAAND training. She asked if any members of other workgroups had questions that they would be happy to ask those questions to the CFSA team to see if we could get some feedback. Note: STAAND is the portal replacing FACES.

#### **Youth Aging Out Group:**

Theresa G. announced that they recently met with Ann Reilly from CFSA and that it was very helpful. They presented their survey and shared that the survey will be completed by foster parents and youth, ages 18-21. She added that they came up some ideas for getting it done. She also shared that they were writing a letter to the foster parents and attaching the link for the survey. Ms. Reilly agreed to help get it out to the foster parents. She added that they discussed an event that is coming up in October and talked about ideas recruiting foster parents and youth to take part in the survey. She added that they might need help when attending events to assist with getting the surveys completed. She also shared that they would provide gift cards to everyone who participates.

Andy M. added that during the meeting with Ms. Reilly, she provided a list of group homes for us to reach out to, and felt that it would probably be their quickest, most efficient implementation, by going to the group home and simply having the QR code on display and youth taking the survey on site. They will then show us confirmation that they took it without having to give their names, and we just give them the gift card right then and there.

Margie C shared that she was impressed and proud of this group and how far they had come. She stated that surveys were ready to go, but the group has been discussing whether it will be done electronically or in person, and how they are going to keep the confidentiality. They landed on trying doing them in person as much as possible but inputting them electronically so that they would all be put into the data system. She shared that Anne Riley said, if we did it electronically, without the group being there in person, that it would add another step and the youth would be sitting on the backs of the social workers to get their stipends. She added that the group could really use volunteers who may not be on the Youth Aging Out group, but who are interested in helping by going to a group home to administer the survey because there probably will be a number of sites. She asked that

anyone is interested to reach out to Theresa or let her know and that the best way is to go in twos, with one being a YAO workgroup member.

### **Prevention Group:**

Elizabeth M. gave a big kudos to Amanda Quiroz-Guajardo for pulling their discussion together into a draft project plan and asked Amanda to share the project overview, purpose, and research questions.

Amanda G. shared that the group is exploring a project focus related to those screened-out hotline calls, given the volume, particularly the prevention opportunities that this area represents. She added that the purpose was to examine CFSA's screened-out policies and practices, but at the same time capture some of the perspectives of the mandated reporters, of those that are making those phone calls. She shared that it was kind of a dual approach - the policy review and that stakeholder input and feels it will provide some insight into both system-level decision-making and the experiences of those interacting directly with the hotline. She stated that some of the key elements of their draft is policy review, and that we will look at their policies and any related administrative issuances that come out and at the same time doing some surveys of mandated reporters. She added that they were currently developing a brief mixed-method survey to capture some of the mandated reporters perceptions, their confidence level in reporting, and even their frustrations with some optional interviews to deepen the understanding. She added that this is going to also include some data requests and that they are anticipating requesting some of the aggregated information that Christian mentioned earlier on screened-out calls, and the clarity on how new tools, like STAAND and understand how they function in this practice.

Margie C. also thanked Amanda G. for the tremendous amount she has added to the group and shared that the other thing that has made the group move forward is that they met with the Ombudsperson's Office which is also looking at the screened-in calls. As the Ombuds Office is not specifically looking at the mandated reporters themselves, that was the piece that the group felt it could do that could correlate with their work and be most helpful. It also allows them to address the issues that Emily B. has been focused on regarding the mandated reporting from the schools as well as the issues Dr. Meghan S. has been raising from the hospital perspective. Margie C thanked and applauded everyone working on all the groups despite the fact that everybody is dealing with so many other things in their life, in the world, and in the District.

### **Facilitator Report:**

Margie C. presented her report:

- **Social Team Building Events:** Margie C. shared that the events were really successful and that most members were able to come to at least one. She shared that she would like to continue having these gatherings occasionally.
- **Membership Updates.**
  1. Elizabeth M. is now our Vice Chair. As shared before, this was decided sometime in the summer, but we were not informed.
  2. There are still a few openings. Initially we had five new people on the mayor's side, but two of them did not work out – we now have these two openings, and we have one opening that we have held for a birth parent with lived experience. Margie C. has taken

on the task of reaching out to some of the organizations that work with birth families to see if we can get some recommendations and then move those forward through that open spot. Emily has referred two potential members! If anyone has any ideas of people that you think might be interested, let Margie C. know and she will be happy to meet with them, give them information, and work them through the application process.

3. Margie C. is continuing to try to meet with MOTA about the cumbersome process and has been reaching out and will not let it go.
- **National Conference:** The conference will be held in San Diego at a resort hotel on 44-acre Island in San Diego's Mission Bay, June 1 to 3rd. Elizabeth M. attended last time, which was the year before last. If there is anyone who might be interested, please, let Margie C. know. There are definitely finances to send one person fully. If two people are interested, we could try to move something from another budget item. So, if you're interested, please do let us know.

### **Minutes**

Margie C. asked members if they had a chance to review the minutes. She added that they are typed from recordings and usually accurate other than a couple of grammar mistakes. Dr. Wanda T. suggested that we accept them or if members have not had a chance that we can do it by email. Elizabeth M. moved that we accept the minutes as they stand. There was no opposition from panel members, and the minutes were approved.

### **Public comment**

There was no public comment

### **Final Comments from Members**

Margie C. asked if members had any final comments and asked if there were comments about CFSA's part.

- Theresa G: stated she was disappointed that they really couldn't answer a lot of questions, especially the first group.
- Amanda G: stated she didn't feel like they answered any of the questions and asked if this is the typical dynamic between our group and CFSA. A few members responded that yes, this seems typical, or that CFSA says they are "already doing it"- or they are "looking into it."
- Elizabeth M: suggested continuing this topic at our next meeting and added that it will not be specifically related to these responses but believe it to be an ongoing concern.
- Margie C: shared that this was actually the first time that they came to a general meeting to talk through final report recommendations (in the past they came to talk about work group report recommendations) and that Roni's chain of command is not the program staff, so maybe we should have a meeting where we address that. Margie C. added that she felt that Christian G was not resistant, he just didn't have the information.
- Roni S: agreed that he just didn't have the information. She confirmed that in the past there's always been a written response from CFSA that's required to our final report but that they previously didn't come in person for that. She shared that when they came to discuss

recommendations on prior work group reports, she thought the conversations were really productive because there were program staff in the room and even upper-level management.

Elizabeth M. thanked Roni and stated that the CRP appreciated her support and that it was critical.

**Closing and Adjournment:**

Elizabeth M. announced that our next meeting will be November 11<sup>th</sup>. It was noted by Dr. Wanda T. that November 11<sup>th</sup> was Veterans Day. Margie C. informed members that an email will be sent out regarding change of date. She also stated that in regard to CFSA’s recommendations, she and Elizabeth will set up a meeting to discuss how we move forward and if any panel members would like to join them to let her know.

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 pm

Future CRP Meetings	
Date	*Location
November 4, 2025	Zoom
January 13, 2026	Zoom
March 10, 2026	Zoom

\*Location subject to change

TASKS	PERSON RESPONSILBE	DUE DATE
<b>Family Time:</b> How is Family Time Described	Christian G.	By end of Week
<b>Family Time:</b> Provide a list of all the data elements that they would like us to track and send to Christian G.	Family Time Team	N/A
<b>Family Time:</b> Update child and parent visits and supervised visits policy. When is it to be updated: Christian G. stated it would be end of month and that they would make sure to keep the CRP involved in that update.	Christian G.	End of Month
<b>Future Meetings on Report and Recommendations:</b> Roni suggested the panel Invite Ann Reilly. Panel will decide whether to ask for redo of this meeting or to move forward with more inclusion of program staff for future meetings.	Facillitator Team	N/A
<b>Youth Aging Out -NYTD –</b> Christian G. to discuss sharing the NYTD with members	Christian G	N/A
<b>Youth Aging Out:</b> Gather the data from CFSR from the last round of CFSR and let the panel know which jurisdiction is doing well in that area.	Christian G.	N/A
<b>Youth Aging Out: Recommendation 5:</b> Christian G. will make sure to elevate the panel’s concern internally, and that he will have to circle back with the panel on this.	Christian G.	N/A
<b>Prevention Group: Recommendation 6:</b> <u>Go</u> back to the prevention group and clarify this question as the group gets more into its specific study.	Margie/Prevention Group	N/A

<b>Next Meeting</b> – Email members to change date of next meeting	Facilitator Team	N/A