

STATE OF COLORADO



Restorative Justice Council 2013

Spiro Koinis, Division of Youth Corrections Victim and Restorative Justice Services Coordinator (Chair)—present
Perrie McMillen, Restorative Justice Services Program Director, City of Ft. Collins— present
Greg Brown, Chief Probation Officer, Twentieth Judicial District (Executive Committee)—not present
Meg Williams, Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Justice, Manager (Executive Committee)—present
Matt Riede, 1st Judicial District Victim Advocate-- present
Stan Garnett, District Attorney, Twentieth Judicial District-not present
Nancy Lewis, Colorado Executive Director, Colorado Organization for Victim Assistance—not present
Candace Hawkins, Colorado Department of Education-- not present
Esther Cho, Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Council—present
Rebecca Oakes, Adult Parole Board—present
Paula Mattas, Juvenile Parole Board—not present
Monica Crocker, Department of Corrections—present
Gabrielle Frey, Practitioner/RJ Directors—present
Alice Price, Practitioner, Center for Restorative Programs—present
Lynn Lee, Practitioner, Pikes Peak Restorative Justice Council—present
Peggy Evans, Practitioner, 1st and 18th Judicial—present

(Pete Lee-by phone)

(Kerri Schmidt-by phone and driving to meeting)

Deb is present

Guests: Jean Denious from Omni Institute

Minutes taken by: Jack Hubbard

RJ COUNCIL AGENDA

May 16th, 2014 9am-4pm
COVA at 90 Galapago Street Denver, CO 80223

Regular Meeting

Meeting called to order at 9:15 a.m. by Spiro, quorum is present

CALL IN INFO at COVA: 303.996.2788 Long Distance- 1-800-261-2682 and ask to be put into 2788

The agenda was updated to include a discussion of the training policy in the education and engagement segment of the discussion.

A brief update was provided from the planning of the 2016 Pikes Peak symposium. The symposium is scheduled for the last week in September in 2016. Mark Umbreit is the planned keynote, and will also be presenting a one day training as part of the symposium on one of two proposed topics.

The following action and follow up items were identified during the meeting:

*Legislative clarification will be requested regarding the populations that data will be collected on at the pre- and post- restorative process satisfaction surveys. Main issue is PRE language for anyone other than offender. Also wonder if a post should be done with ALL participants.

*The pilot project data collection instrument will be amended to include information about the number of offenders who did not qualify because they could not be contacted. Clarification from the legislature or Representative Lee will be obtained regarding the victim impact statement.

*Legislative subcommittee will continue to develop procedures for responding to proposed legislation and legislative changes on both a fast/short turn around and a longer term turn around.

*Pursue a determination of the Board Classification of the Council.

*Continue to develop a Council policy and process regarding RJ Council sponsored trainings/trainers.

*Continue to pursue more FTE for staff support of the RJ Council.

*Legislative committee to consider asking for legislative changes to enable the Council to have a grants, gifts and donations allowance creating spending authority and access to additional funds and making it possible to do a conference. This would also allow working with other non-governmental funds and validate the creation of a treasurer position.

*FY15 and FY16 budget planning.

*RJ Appreciation Event for former members of the Council.

*The Education and Engagement Committee will be assessing training needs and develop ways to meet them is an ongoing agenda item. They have heard that the pilots would like training and technical assistance on grant writing, reporting and management.

*Develop protocols for removal of entities from the directory and from the Council.

*Develop the grievance and complaint process.

*Alice volunteered to be the contact point and coordinator for suggestions about addressing confidentiality and protections for RJ Facilitators with respect to restorative justice practices. Look into ADR and mediation protections in statute.

1. Approval of March. Minutes: Spiro and Deb:

There was some confusion about the names of the committees and the individuals assigned to those committees. Those assignments and names were clarified and Deb will send the Council a list of who is on each committee. A motion was made and seconded to approve and adopt the minutes, which passed with no objections.

2. STRATEGIC PLAN-2014 Action Plan -Committee Reports

a. **Pilot Projects- Meg** (Gabrielle, Alice, Esther) **and Research- Perrie** (Candie, Rebecca, Greg, Alice, Meg) volunteer Kerri Schmidt.

i. Omni Update- (Jean)

1. Pre/Post Uniform Satisfaction Survey: Jean from Omni sent the final version of the satisfaction survey to the Council this morning. The Council was asked to review and approve this document so the pilots can begin to collect this information as they start their projects. Omni developed a pre and post satisfaction survey for the offenders who are participating in the processes in order to show the changes that result from participation and a post satisfaction survey for the victim and other participants to measure how they felt participating in and being a part of the particular RJ process. The surveys were drafted in a manner that used similar questions in order to be able to measure and demonstrate change, though the post satisfaction survey does include some questions that are only asked at the end of the process. In addition, the

questions on the various surveys are similar so that comparisons and evaluations can be made across the responding groups (offender, victim, and participants).

At the previous Council meeting, there was a lengthy discussion about if there was any value in collecting pre-process data from victims. Omni's feedback at that time was that there are some problems that arise when attempting to measure satisfaction about a particular process before the process. In addition, getting this request for information to the victim prior to the process beginning could be problematic. Finally, the surveys are measuring somewhat different information—the offender survey is intended to assess attitude pre- and post- restorative process and to demonstrate a shift. The post process survey for victims and participants is intended to measure the satisfaction they had with the process. Based on these factors, Omni recommended that attempting to collect victim information at the start of the process should not be done at this time. Because the legislation indicated that pre and post surveys were to be done for all of the participants, Representative Lee was contacted regarding these considerations. He was understanding about the challenges and indicated that his intent was primarily to be able to measure a change in the offender and the offender's attitudes. The Council did agree that there is value in measuring victim satisfaction as well, especially since restorative processes are both victim and offender oriented. Developing ways to measure or assess victim satisfaction and change in satisfaction will be something that the Council will work on in the future, but given the time frames and the early stage of the pilot doing so at this time is impractical. In addition to victim measures, the Council added a future intent to look at measures for parents of juvenile participants in restorative justice processes. After discussion, the Council concluded that these surveys capture the data that will meet the needs of the practitioners.

The Council agreed to request further legislative clarification on which populations data will be collected on at the pre- and post- restorative process stages.

A motion was made and seconded to adopt the draft satisfaction surveys, which was passed by the Council.

2. Data collection and Database Discussion (including compiling information on research, program evaluation, confidentiality agreements, etc.)

Meg emailed the draft data collection form to the Council for review. At this point, there is no online process for data collection, and some method needs to be developed in order to allow the pilots to compile this data after they collect it. This work group reviewed the legislation and utilized that framework to develop the data collection form. Some of the information requested seems simple to report, but things like the type of process and cost of the process are more complicated to describe and report than they appear. She reviewed the form for the Council:

*Is the section on the victim impact statement (#15) specifically that the official victim statement has been collected or that it was used in lieu of participation? The language is straight out of the legislation, and it is not clear if this has to be something official or can be a general statement or later statement the victim provides. Since it is straight out of the legislation, the clarification may need to come from Representative Lee. One possible reason to collect this information is to assess the number of victims contacted and how many of those victims in turn completed a statement of some sort or chose to submit a statement rather than participate.

*Again, related to victim impact statements, should the Council request further clarification on who this could include? In particular, are statements made by victim surrogates considered to be victim impact statements for the legislation's purposes?

*Should there be an attempt to measure the number of referrals in which the victim(s) could not be reached or otherwise contacted? Many local programs currently also collect the number of program referrals in which the offender cannot be contacted. If the offender cannot be contacted, then the question of eligibility for participation in an RJ program cannot be assessed. It could be very relevant to compare the number of offenders who do not participate in a process because they cannot be reached relative to the number who are ineligible because of program criteria. Developing the process of exchanging this information in localities would also possibly strengthen the relationship between justice system agencies and community partners. A concern was raised in this discussion that asking for this information might be putting too much on programs, but the feedback from the practitioners on the Council is that this information is already being collected. With respect to the survey, a suggestion was made that the question be changed to the number of juveniles reached or contacted and found to be suitable for participation. While phrasing the question that way might not capture the number of offenders who cannot be actually reached, it seems to be a good point to start to work from.

*What about petty offenses, are they included as part of this information gathering? Some of the pilots will be including this level of offense.

*For data that the programs are unable to collect for some reason, the instrument is designed to provide them the flexibility to explain why they cannot provide that data or report on it.

*Question 18 was clarified to be within one year as previously defined under the Council's definition of recidivism.

Meg proposed that the draft data collection form be adopted for the purposes of FY14 reporting, since that data is due from the pilots on 6/30/14 and the pilots need a tool in order to be able to meet that expectation. Meg will make changes to the instrument based on the discussion with the Council for the FY15 pilot reporting requirements. A motion was made and seconded that the draft data collection instrument be amended to change the title to RJ and Diversion and to include the option, but not the requirement, for pilots to also include petty offenses as part of their data reporting. As amended, the draft data collection instrument was adopted by the Council for use in the last quarter of fiscal year 2014 and will be amended for data collection in fiscal year 2015.

3. Pilot plans/proposals (Meg, Spiro, Greg, and Gabrielle) .

After reviewing the proposals and plans, there appear to be a number of issues with some of the responses, most notably the definition of individual project goals and objectives. There appears to be a need for some technical assistance or training with the pilots to help them develop clear and measurable goals and objectives that work for evaluation purposes.

In addition to the goals and objectives, the budgets appear to be high or problematic in some ways. A discussion followed among the Council: On one hand, new programs or programs that are expanding in a significant way would logically have higher costs because of the upfront financial obligations that are present when you need to hire staff and develop programming to build capacity and get a program in place. That leads to the possibility that the Council should fund the requests in full and as requested for this year given that these are newer by virtue of being pilots. Then, in the long run, there can be an ongoing discussion about what kind of funding is available, what a sustainable model for the allocation of funds would be, and what the expectation is for sustainability plans and the replacement of funding from the Council with funding from community and local sources. With an objective of expanding restorative justice throughout the state, there will come a point at which the requests for funding will exceed the amount of funding available, and the Council will need to develop expectations and policies around the awarding of funds. In the near term, one of the points of confusion is that there is an incredibly large variation in the level of funding that the pilot projects are each requesting. In particular, the Council attempted to determine if there is a way to evaluate if these budget projections are reasonable in light of the program referral numbers. In addition, the Council wanted to make a clear statement that it recognizes that the programs that volunteered to be pilots have undertaken a huge burden and responsibility by being willing to come to the table, that commonly accepted implementation science acknowledges that there is a 2-5 year implementation and program development window at the inception of new programs, and that funding decisions will be made with those understandings in place. As a result, any shift in support from state funding to local funding would probably be more appropriately placed at the 3-4 year mark instead of being an expectation early in the process.

The total RJ Council spending authority available for the July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015 time frame is currently \$780,000. At this time, the requests from the pilots total approximately \$500,000. The Council discussed how the funding should be distributed as the pilots continue to work. Deb reported that she has requested that Judicial's staff attend the July meeting to discuss their approaches to allocation and how those approaches would be able to incorporate or involve the recommendations made by the Council. She also reported that, while Judicial has the budget decision making authority, that these staff have indicated that the Council has the knowledge and expertise about RJ and the needs of the field to best make these recommendations. So a partnership should be able to be developed and the knowledge exchange could inform these decisions for the future. Because of these issues, the subcommittee responsible for the pilot projects will meet after the regular Council meeting today. After that meeting, the Council will return to session to review those recommendations and make funding determinations.

Update

The Council returned to session to review the recommendations for funding from the pilot project subcommittee. At this time, the Council adopts and approves the subcommittee's recommendations that the pilot projects receive the full allocations

that they requested in their Fiscal Year 2015 budget requests once the corrections and responses to the committee feedback are made.

- ii. Suitability assessment: The suitability assessment was reviewed by the Council, and amended to change the language in the top section to clarify the use of the word “harm”. As amended, a motion was made and seconded to adopt the suitability assessment. The motion passed.
 - iii. Fee Waiver: Fee waivers used by local programs are essentially checklists. While the pilots appreciate the scaling and percentages that the Council initially developed, they are not going to turn away individuals who want to access their services. In addition, this is an area where they do not feel a need or desire for a lot of complexity or documentation, so the subcommittee developed a very simplified fee waiver form, which was presented to the Council. A motion was made and seconded to adopt this fee waiver form, which was passed by the Council.
 - iv. Discussion on if the Training Needs of the Pilots Are Being Met. The Council has put in place some training opportunities this year and, as part of that process, attempted to provide resources that address specific concerns raised by the pilot projects. At this time, the feedback that has been received is that the pilots feel like their training needs are being addressed and met generally. However, one area that they would like future training or technical assistance with would be training on reporting and grant writing/management. Assessing training needs and developing ways to meet them is an ongoing agenda item for the Council’s education and engagement subcommittee.
 - v. Other Updates: the Council opened the floor for questions and other information sharing from the pilots. Pueblo reported that their pilot is up and running, but is struggling with some systemic issues and figuring out ways to navigate and streamline the relationship between the DA and the County. The County DA funding stream is a challenge in other pilots as well.
- b. Legislative/Public Policy- Lynn (Spiro, Nancy, Greg, Matt, Monica, volunteer Eileen Hyatt)**
- i. Pete Lee attended the Council meeting and provided a review of developments related to restorative justice in the previous legislative session. In this last session, there were no substantive changes made in the area of restorative justice, and his work was centered around facilitating ways in which the funding could start to flow and begin to be made available to the field through the supplemental appropriations process. The other area of focus has been on the Department of Corrections. There a \$70,000 allocation for RJ was assigned from the DOC budget. Monica will report back on how these funds will be utilized. He reported that his approach to this legislative session and restorative justice issues was to allow the pilot projects to get up and running so that they could then report on the issues that they are encountering. He then planned to return in the 2015 session and attempt to address those issues. Representative Lee asked for the Council’s feedback about if there would be a way to encourage the District Attorneys’ offices to increase their numbers and referrals. The Council’s feedback was that there are things that would probably encourage that increase, but the important number to focus on now is the number of restorative justice cases that a DA’s office has and effectively screens and serves. New programs will encounter a number of on the ground issues that need to be addressed and solved, they need to develop experience which in turn allows

them to develop realistic expectations, and they need to develop an understanding of which of their approaches and programs are the most effective. The sum total of that process, if supported well and done correctly, will enable RJ to build credibility, particularly in areas where RJ is a new option, and that credibility will naturally result in the increase of referrals.

Additional feedback for Representative Lee included:

*A discussion regarding the flow of funding in each pilot location, and how underfunded requests or unanticipated costs might need to have a procedure in place to access a reserve or emergency fund.

*Is there a way to involve public defenders with the Council?

*Feedback from the field indicates that there is a need to address concerns about confidentiality and protecting restorative justice processes. One option might be to discuss having the Alternative Dispute Resolution Act amended to include restorative justice practices. Alice volunteered to be the contact point and coordinator for suggestions about addressing confidentiality with respect to restorative justice.

ii. Legislative Sub-Committee: Development of a Plan of action for 2015 Legislation

1. Strategies for Addressing legislative issues and concerns 2015—The committee is meeting on 5/22/14 and had initially identified the following issues that could possibly arrive in 2015.

- a. Funding for restorative justice on DOC cases
- b. Funding for restorative justice with high risk cases
- c. Initial planning for the 2017 sunset of the Restorative Justice Council

2. There are currently 13 people on this subcommittee, and a number of them are not members of the RJ Council. Thus, it appears that there is a good level of participation and interest from the field on these issues. In addition, a number of these individuals are also members of the RJ Directors' group, which means there is the opportunity for good communication and joint work between that group and the Council. Currently, they are working to set up a meeting sometime this summer with the committee members and the various stakeholder groups to get a sense of where the concerns are, what issues need to be addressed, and what should be on the radar screen.

Representative Lee indicated that he will also be a part of that meeting with the stakeholders, as he wants to include them in the process of developing solutions to the problems identified by the experience of the pilot projects. In addition, Deb is willing to organize focus groups that run through the summer. If the stakeholders can be identified, the needed focus groups defined, and the questions we need answers to can be agreed upon at meeting on the 22nd, she can get those groups organized and the questions communicated. An example of the kinds of information she would need to be able to do this would be as follows for a group of judges: an outline of what RJ practices are, and a question of what do you need or what would you like to have in order to be able to support the use of RJ practices from the bench as part of the court process? Possible focus groups would include judges, public defenders/defense attorneys, and RJ practitioners. It was mentioned that the Council should follow up on restorative justice being authorized as part of the advisement from the bench in new cases and the legislation mandates that language in the most recent bill. However, it is something that needs some follow up and education in order for it to happen

consistently. A further discussion was had with regards to the focus groups and including a public defender as part of the Council, which was an issue also previously raised with Representative Lee. If that does happen, the Council needs to be sensitive to not creating a perception of RJ as a bargaining chip or lever. In addition, maybe guardians ad litem would be an interested group that should be included in these discussions. At the conclusion of the discussion, the Council determined that the focus groups will be judges, practitioners, DA's, defense attorneys/guardians ad litem, victim services, corrections, law enforcements, schools, social services and CASAs. From that next subcommittee meeting, Deb and Lynn will get together and coordinate an initial meeting and begin the focus group process.

3. Strategies for Anticipating and Responding to Proposed Legislation. The experience from the previous legislative session is that it can be very difficult when Council members are caught off guard or unaware of legislative developments that need some form of response. This has highlighted a need to develop some communications strategies in order to enable the Council to be more responsive and able to respond to Representative Lee and the legislature on issues that are coming and things that are in the process but which have questions come up. One idea to avoid the Council being caught off guard would be to designate a single point of contact for that communication.

Representative Lee indicated that he typically is expected to submit information and pre-bill write ups in December, so any ideas or proposals need to be formalized and ready to go with some structure by the end of November. In terms of communication with him, he is open to direct phone calls and interaction with the Council, and he is willing to communicate information about legislation that is being drafted regarding restorative justice to the Council. Representative Lee's position is that he wants the RJ Council's support for legislation which he brings up for consideration, but he also is a realist and aware that the process can move quickly and compromises made that sometimes come seemingly from left field.

For legislation that is developed over a longer term, it seems like the Council is able to consider proposals and provide feedback. The issue is what happens when there needs to be a quick decision. The Council discussed those situations, and determined that one of the functions of the legislative subcommittee is to provide an access point for these issues to be looked at. This committee does have some RJ Directors Group membership, so there's a better possibility to get broad feedback a little quicker than a regular Council meeting. The model is that, for these quicker turnarounds, the legislative chair would get what feedback they can from the subcommittee then forward the issue to the available Council members for discussion and vote via either email or phone conference as is possible.

4. This subcommittee asked to raise the issue of opening up pilot project funding for programs that did not apply initially. The Council discussed the parameters of the pilot projects and how this might work. The Council concluded from that discussion that additional issues surrounding the pilot projects need to have more consideration, in particular:

*What happens when the pilot program funding sunsets in 2015?

*What if a pilot determines that they do not want to, or are unable to continue to be, a pilot?

*What happens if the Council determines a pilot should no longer be able to be part of these activities?

*Does the period for the pilot projects need to be extended since there has not been really any data collected yet and things are still in the ramp up stage?

*With limited funding, how does the Council fund continuing pilots and open up funding for new programs or pilots as they come on-board? At three years, is there a ramp down for the ongoing pilots since they should have developed the sense of where the program funding is and workload? What is the expectation of the pilot programs with respect to their own strategic and sustainability plans?

*How does the Council develop more avenues for funds to be accessed and how does the Council expand the resources available across restorative justice statewide?

In terms of the legislation, the Council needs to obtain some clarification or a determination about what classification of Board it has. Given the relationship of the Council to Judicial, that determination is important in the case of disagreements about funding allocations, Council policy and practice statements, and other Council activities and the Council's role.

c. Education and Engagement-Greg (Paula, Matt, Perrie, Spiro, volunteer Kerri Schmidt). Greg is absent from this meeting.

- i. Spiro presented a set of proposed guidelines/clarifications to the Council regarding how the Council's public voice should be communicated. In summary, individual Council members can speak for themselves but need to make sure they do not mention they are a RJ Council member or if asked to declare such, make a clear statement that they are operating on an individual and in a personal capacity not as a RJ Council member.
- ii. Statements that are made that represent the Council may only be made if they have been adopted by the Council after a vote with a quorum present. In order to provide contact points for those official Council statements to be made or otherwise communicated, the Council has designated members who are part of the media committee. Since Council members who are employed in public sector positions are limited in their ability to make statements regarding policy, that committee will designate appropriate individuals to make statements or respond to inquiries as appropriate.

With respect to official responses to legislation, this subcommittee worked with the legislative subcommittee to develop the following recommendations:

*The subcommittee will attempt to gather as much information about new legislative initiatives as possible and will compile feedback, recommendations, and other information from outside agencies and system players as possible. That information will be compiled and form the basis of discussion at the subcommittee level. The subcommittee chair will then compile a prioritized list of recommendations for the full Council to consider, with a focus on collaborative development of the Council's response. Additional information or other recommendations that do not have the full subcommittee's support will be provided under separate cover. All of the forwarded

recommendations will then be reviewed by the Council and adopted or rejected in a formal vote.

- iii. Report from CCJ Conference Presentation. This conference happened last Tuesday through Thursday. Greg and Deb presented at the conference.
- iv. APAI Conference. Matt has been unable to follow through with organizing this session. Deb is now handling the presentation at this event, which was supposed to be a panel and will be held at the Omni-Interlocken in Broomfield. Deb asked for Council members to be a part of that presentation, and will work with Matt to develop the resources the Council provided her for the panel. They would like to have a victim voice and a reintegration program represented as well as Council systems voices.
- v. 2014 Trainings Update. The MI training is now listed for registration on the website. There are currently 8 seats remaining for this training, and they are first come, first served. The next announcement will go up soon for the September training on Cultural Responsiveness, and there are around 11 seats left for that session.
- vi. Training Registration Page on Website. The form for individuals who want to provide training to get added to the website has been developed. It has some issues and is currently being reviewed and put in a final format. Once it has been finished, all of the members who are registered will get an email blast to let them know this is available and asking them to get their information put on the system and updated.
- vii. Training Policy. A draft of the training policy was provided to the Council. This was developed because there is a prestige to being one of the trainers for the Council and questions were raised about the process for selecting the trainers for the coming year's sessions. This policy is intended for review and further discussion in order to finalize answers to the following concerns:
 - *How does the Council source training?
 - *How does the Council determine which trainings are needed and which will be provided?
 - *How does the Council become inclusive of needs and those who want to provide training and are qualified to provide it?
 - *How does the Council track the training needs, how does the Council then source for the training after the needs are identified? Are RFP's for specific training needs something the Council should pursue on a specialized or on a regular basis?
 - *Should the Council endorse trainers and training needs? If it does, will it, and how will it, subsidize trainings since there are no funds allocated for this role? One possible approach is that used by the SOMB. There was also a discussion about the possibility of partnering with Pikes Peak to meet some of these needs.

A final point was discussed that the Council has to ensure that, through this process; it does not endorse or appear to endorse an individual or their particular training, someone or their

particular training. The Council provided the feedback to this subcommittee that it seems to be on the right track and addressing the important issues.

- viii. Meg announced that she will be providing a training/presentation on Restorative Justice to a group of Bulgarian criminal justice professionals. It is an interesting exercise because the concept of RJ does not exist in their lexicon.

d. Internal Capacity- Spiro (Lynn, Gabrielle)

- i. Policy for Blogs and Other Public Voice for RJ Council. This discussion is tied to the previous about Council members' statements, Deb's role, and the later conversation about the website. At this point, the Council believes that it would be appropriate to attempt to find funding to provide part-time staff to help maintain the website. Currently, managing the blogs is Deb's responsibility, but she is also handling other issues and is not assigned solely to the Council. It seems that there should be additional monitoring of the blogs and the website, in order to identifying if issues seem to be arising and responding to any issues or concerns that might come up. In addition, this subcommittee developed a disclaimer for review, which is intended to be posted at the beginning of the blogs to clarify that the blogs are not necessarily the position of the Council.
- ii. Clarifying Deb's Role: Deb is a part time staff assigned to the RJ Council through the Judicial Department. Given that she is part time and has other responsibilities, the Council discussed what functions can be reassigned to Council members in order to free up her time to support Council activities. The Council will raise the issue of changing Deb's .50 RJ / .50 adult diversion; FTE split to a 1.00 RJ position utilizing funds in the cash fund account at the next meeting when SCAO budget staff are in attendance. The Council acknowledges that changes for FY15 will be difficult to accomplish, but the discussion needs to start so this can possibly happen in the future.
- iii. The bylaws were amended at the last meeting to include a treasurer position, relative to the funds in the account from the Summit. These changes are present and ready for Spiro to sign, however, Judicial has stated that the Council should divest itself of any auxiliary accounts and that there is not statutory or other authority for the Council to have access or spending authority for funds aside from the legislatively allocated cash fund. Greg is not present to give an update on the Summit account. Consequently there is no need for a treasurer because there are no funds outside of the cash fund. The issue of requesting spending authority for auxiliary accounts through the legislative process is forwarded to the legislative subcommittee for review and consideration. Until this issue is cleared up relative to the relationship with Judicial and the type of board the RJ Council actually is, the treasurer amendment to the bylaws will be on hold.

3. Website:

At the last executive special session, the Council has instructed Deb to continue performing the necessary activities with respect to the website in order to make sure those training announcements, materials, and guidelines were posted. A claim has since been made by LCJP that LCJP has ownership of the website. The RJ

Directors' group has questioned that assertion as the website was created using federal grant funds(JAG), and thus LCJP cannot claim ownership. There is a great deal of confusion and discussion regarding the website and its status as a result. Meg volunteered to follow up regarding the grant funding and ownership issues and report back to the Council. Until these issues are further resolved, the Council has given Deb permission to keep doing necessary activities with the website. There are a number of issues from LCJP and the JAG grant which previously funded the Council's activities which will continue to be worked on outside of a Council business meeting.

4. Budget and Funds update- (Greg)

a. Current RJ Cash Fund account status: the RJ Cash fund has continued to grow at a steady rate, it grew by \$64,000 in March and \$67,000 in April. A supplemental spending authority request was approved and an additional \$199,000 in spending authority was granted for the Council's activities, which has been allocated and will be spent in full to funding for the pilots, pay Omni for their work, and line up training. The budget request for FY15 was also approved.

b. Update on RJ Summit account (Greg)—tabled as Greg is not present.

c. Planning for FY '15 and FY'16: A sub-committee is needed to begin planning around budget issues for fiscal year 2015 and 2016. In particular, this subcommittee needs to address how to spend the funding being allocated by the legislature in order to cover the costs from OMNI, to fund the pilots, and to provide the trainings the Council has committed to provide among other operational needs. This sub-committee, or someone individually, needs to break down the budget for FY15 and put together a plan for FY16. Since the July Council agenda is full, this is something that will need to be addressed in a subcommittee, in a special session of the full Council, or by rescheduling part of next meeting's agenda. In order to accomplish this, the Council decided to change the date of the appreciation event from 7/18 to September 9/19/14. The preliminary budget outline for FY 15 will be emailed to the Council for review prior to that meeting with a target of having allocation decision decisions voted on by email by the Council. Pilot funding will be finalized in subcommittee today, the response to the budget emails will be by set for the first week of June.

5. Definitions and Requirements-discussion /decisions—tabled.

a. Practitioners and Programs definitions for website- Deb has done some work done with these at the implementation team meeting, and has created a google document to start to compile these. The pilots are going to review the document and provide their feedback.

b. Models for Pilots reporting- Meg & Jean-tabled.

c. Legislative pieces-tabled.

6. Victims' Rights and Restorative Justice (Nancy)-tabled

7. Appreciation Event for former RJ Council Members-is rescheduled for 9/19/14 at COVA, new organizers are needed.