

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)—Present
Meg Williams, Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Justice, Manager (Executive Committee)—Present
Matt Riede, 1st Judicial District Victim Advocate—not present
Stan Garnett, District Attorney, Twentieth Judicial District—not present
Nancy Lewis, Colorado Executive Director, Colorado Organization for Victim Assistance--Present
Candace Hawkins, Colorado Department of Education-- Present
Esther Cho, Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Council—Not Present
Rebecca Oakes, Adult Parole Board—Present
Paula Mattas, Juvenile Parole Board—Present by phone
Monica Crocker, Department of Corrections—not present
Gabrielle Frey, Practitioner/RJ Directors—not present
Alice Price, Practitioner, Center for Restorative Programs—Present by phone
Lynn Lee, Practitioner, Pikes Peak Restorative Justice Council—Present
Peggy Evans, Practitioner, 1st and 18th Judicial—Present
Deb Witzel, SCAO part-time staff to RJ Council- present

Guests: Rebecca Tucker MSW student DU present, Kerri Schmidt, RJ practitioner volunteering on Council Committees present, Jean Denious from Omni Institute present, Holly Panetta, SCAO

Minutes taken by: Jack Hubbard, 20th Judicial District Probation

Meeting called to order at 9:11 a.m. by Spiro Koinis.

Restorative Justice Council Minutes

March 21st, 2014 9am-4pm

COVA at 90 Galapago Street Denver, CO 80223

CALL IN INFO at COVA: 303.996.2788

***Welcome and introductions—Spiro:**

Training development added as an agenda item under the education and engagement section of the agenda. Issues regarding collaboration and access to the information collected by the Council are also added to the agenda. Toronto, Independent Learning Center, an online learning company wants to use the RJ Council videos.

***Review and approval of the January Minutes—Spiro:**

The January minutes were reviewed by the Council. A motion was made and seconded to adopt the minutes, which passed.

***Strategic Plan 2014 Action Planning Committee Reports:**

--Pilot Projects- Meg (Gabrielle, Alice, Esther): Omni was selected as the evaluation/research consultant for the Council's work with the pilot projects under the legislation. The Council received 10 applications for this role, which were then reviewed and scored by a committee on a wide variety of factors which were then compiled by Deb. There were two large sections of the review, budget and content. Omni was selected as they scored in the

top 3 on both sides and seemed to address the critical issues in their application. Omni is already on board with the Council and in the process of providing feedback on things related to the pilot projects.

1. Jean Denious from the Omni Institute was present and introduced herself to the Council.
2. The latest draft pre and post uniform satisfaction surveys for program participants required by the legislation were provided to the Council for discussion and review. These surveys are required for the community participants, offender, and victim on RJ processes conducted by the pilots. Jean presented some feedback from Omni's research team to the Council and made some suggestions relative to how to effectively conduct this process. These comments and survey feedback documents were provided to the Council members for further review and consideration and will be discussed and considered for adoption at the next Council meeting. In summary, those suggestions included:

--Edits to how some items were phrased.

--Edits intended to make the information requested from each of the three groups consistent.

--A programmatic/process suggestion that victims not be given a pre-survey and only receive a post -survey. Omni's experience in the field is that satisfaction is not typically a criterion on which an effective change analysis can be conducted. The first issue is that it is extremely difficult to measure satisfaction prior to a process. The only way that this kind of information can be collected is the way the Council's drafts are written, which is to ask about expectations. However, by measuring expectations at the beginning of the process, it is not a very accurate comparison to satisfaction at the end of the processes and thus not very possible to measure or show change. Secondly, there are the logistical issues regarding obtaining victim measurements/feedback at the start of the process for the pilot programs. Given that the objective of the legislation appears to be that there is a measure of reporting about how satisfied victims are with their experience and the results of restorative processes. In addition, Omni has experience which indicates there are valid ways to measure satisfaction and experience information at the end of a process.

A discussion regarding this suggestion followed Omni's feedback. Council members believe that it is important to measure the feeling that people have about the system, the process, and how they have been treated when they are first coming into an RJ process. Omni agreed that that is potentially valuable information to have. However, it is not really something upon which an effective analysis can be done on in a traditional pre- and post-evaluation of change over time. One possibility is to attempt to collect responses to a minimal survey at the beginning of the process, one which contains only one or two questions. The Council considered the possibility of developing a question that victims can be asked about having a voice and being heard, since one of the primary system and process claims RJ makes is that it gives the victim a voice. Perhaps this comes back to the fundamental principles laid down in the Victim Rights Act, which suggests that the Council should attempt to measure the extent to which victim participants in RJ processes feel that they have been heard, been able to

be present, and been informed about what is happening. There should also be some attempt to measure the individual's experience, to what extent this particular RJ practice that they participated in enhanced or improved their experience with the criminal justice system. Being specific to the particular practice that this individual engaged in is also going to be important with respect to the community members who might participate in a number of these processes. Lynn offered to communicate this feedback to Pete Lee and detail the preceding discussion and ask for his impressions. There have been other suggestions made regarding adjustments to the legislation, and given the information that Omni has provided, is it legitimate to take that information to Representative Lee and wait for that process to play out? While not collecting the pre-satisfaction data for pilots is outside the requirements of the statute, there is the consideration that these are pilot programs and part of the reason for the creation of pilots is to have on the ground testing of what is and is not possible or effective to collect, research, and/or implement. In other words, this is a process by which we are attempting as an RJ community to develop best practices about what makes sense to collect, what can we evaluate, and what information leads to the best program development and implementation. Finally, a concern was raised about not creating a research process or data collection requirements which would be too burdensome. Rebecca Oakes asked for clarification on the intake process and was provided background information by the other Council members regarding the intake process and how the pilots were structured in the legislation. While this discussion was initially started in response to the legislative requirements, and the survey seems to be intended to develop the information for the development of best practices, the Council did contract with a research consultant for the expertise needed to achieve the objective. At the conclusion of the discussion, Nancy Lewis made a motion that the Council will develop a post satisfaction survey for victim and community member participants in RJ processes, a pre- and post- survey for offender participants in RJ processes addressing satisfaction and attitudes/change, and the concerns raised in this discussion will be referred to the Council's legislative subcommittee for further discussion and follow up with Representative Lee. This motion was seconded and adopted, with a specific note made that the questions in the survey should be clear that they are in relation to the criminal justice system. Following this discussion,

Omni's review of their general feedback continued:

--Some information in the surveys was removed as it is collected in other places and is duplicative.

--Omni asked for clarification regarding the language about feeling a sense of safety being described in clear language and concept, the Council reviewed that language and determined the survey language was sufficient.

--With respect to the question about if someone would recommend RJ to others, Omni asked if the question being more general than specific was acceptable and the Council determined that this was okay.

--The language regarding being informed and/or empowered in the victim survey will be reviewed and worked on by Omni for review at the next meeting.

-- Jean and Nancy Lewis will work together to ensure the victim survey and language are appropriate.

--There was a discussion regarding the use of the word offense instead of crime due to considerations about the different entry points into the process. Offense as a term is more RJ appropriate than crime. In addition, there was discussion regarding the word "hurt". At the end of that discussion, Omni indicated that they were hesitant to change the word hurt because the questions were developed base on a validated instrument and use of the term.

--After the meeting, Deb and Jean will meet to work on these changes and address the concerns raised in the Council's discussions.

3. The draft suitability assessment was considered and discussed. The intent of this document is to provide the foundation for developing a tool that can be used to assess the suitability of an offender for participation in an RJ process. This is a first draft that is being provided to the Council; the intent of the document is to use the language of responsibility and get a sense of the offender's capacity for remorse, empathy, and willingness to repair the harm that they caused. A change was made to the initial draft to replace "defendant" with "offender". The Council had a discussion about when the assessment is being conducted if the willingness of the offender to participate in the process is a prerequisite to the process happening. A decision was made that, while the pilots are expected to assess every juvenile offender for suitability, the unwillingness of an offender to participate does not preclude a process for the victim and community. A decision was made that Omni and Deb would work together and rework the top part of the document and remove item B, while developing a way to incorporate a question about who the offender feels was harmed (instead of using language like impacted).
4. Pilot Project Trainings. Lynn and Deb provided a pro-bono training for Weld County as that pilot district had asked for assistance and did not have funding available to provide these services. Lynn used her training curriculum. 11 participants completed the facilitator training and some community members were present in addition at the Friday session. 6 participants were trained in the previous week, and at this point there are a total of 20-23 trained individuals available in Weld. This raised an ongoing discussion item for future discussion about making sure that the other projects are getting their training needs met and ensuring that the Council is addressing those needs. In addition, having individuals trained and having individuals trained **and** ready to facilitate are different things.
5. Database and Data Collection Issues. There is a need to continue to develop/create a data base to enable the necessary data collection and reporting by the pilots. At this point, Deb is working with Omni to develop and implement a cloud based database and data collections system as that seems to provide the pilots with better access and gives Omni access to the data in a way that will enable them to meet their obligations without creating any additional workload for the pilots or Omni. Currently, there are some

security concerns that have been raised regarding the cloud based system, and a phone conference is scheduled for next Tuesday (3/25/14) at 9:00 a.m. If those concerns can be addressed, the tool will then be sent to the relevant administrators for feedback. One factor in support of migrating to this technology is that the data collection system becomes scalable and can be used to provide a foundation for other reporting, the addition of new pilot programs, and expanded research projects. At this point in time, the pilots are being asked to collect and report 21 data points. These are largely statutorily prescribed.

--The data collection and reporting requirement has resulted in some concerns being raised by the pilots. Specifically, one pilot has raised questions about the instrument being used for the database and the higher level involvement of the state, and, without the provision of funding; these requirements may become more burdensome than anticipated. One potential explanation is that these pilots hit the ground running with anticipation that funding to support these activities would be made available earlier than it has ended up being possible. Without additional staff time, the currently employed and assigned staff are taking on these functions and becoming overwhelmed, as well as there being concerns about the currently available staff taking on these duties in addition to other functions and RJ/data integrity/data collection skills may not have been as needed in their current positions. The fact that these concerns have been raised does suggest that the Council may want to consider if the requests for data, training, and other responses from the pilots is currently overly burdensome. On one hand, part of agreeing to be a pilot in any area is an understanding that the process might be bumpy at the beginning and that there will be challenges—the pilot project process is intended to figure out what is workable in the real world and where compromises have to be made based on what currently exists. The Council determined that it will respond to the concerns raised by these pilots via email.

6. Funding Discussion: As the availability of funding for the hiring of staff at the pilot level is part of the concern raised in the previous discussion, there was a brief discussion regarding the current budgetary situation.

--For Fiscal Year 2014, there is currently spending authority that will be made available. There is a process involved with getting this access and it is underway. Access should happen at some point in the near future. At this point, \$187,000 in spending authority is available, that number is based on a projection that Deb put together on a very fast turn-around soon after being hired. Due to the fast turn around and the point we are currently in in FY14, the pilots will be receiving lump sum amounts matching their requests once the process is worked through. Other expenses will have to be adjusted according to the remaining spending authority.

-- Some questions about the funding levels were raised. How should Council determine what budgets should be, and what levels of funding the pilots should receive through the RJ Cash Fund via the Council and judicial? This relates directly to the need to develop a budget for FY 16 as that process will start

relatively soon. But at least with the revised budgets from the pilots there is a better sense of actual costs to run these programs for FY '15. In addition, there will not be funding in the future to fund everything that is requested, and the Council needs to develop a protocol for these requests that balances program needs against the expectations programs have about their funding levels.

--A related funding concern was raised with respect to the Council's expenses and the support position housed at SCAO. This position is currently set at .5 FTE. Greg offered to sit down with SCAO and HR to represent the Council's position that a full time position is necessary to support the Council's activities.

--Alice suggested investigating alternative funding sources, such as grants, in order to help provide support.

--Motions made:

*Greg, representing the Council, will approach SCAO and inquire about the process for increasing the assigned staff position to 1.00 FTE.

Seconded and adopted.

*Spiro, as the Chair, will respond to the pilot projects' data collection and fiscal issues via an email, which will be reviewed by the Council as a whole before issuance. Seconded and adopted.

*The applications for fiscal year 2015 funding/the information sheets will be gathered from the pilots and sent to this subcommittee for review and modification or approval. Seconded and adopted.

--Research-Perrie (Candace, Rebecca, Spiro, Alice, Meg) volunteer Kerri Schmidt: Most of this work group's activity has already been covered in the other discussions, and the surveys and data were discussed prior to this meeting. Currently, Perrie is working on collecting and organizing the information on the items that were discussed at the last Council meeting. There is a lot of work currently in progress but nothing new to report at this time.

--Legislative/Public Policy- Lynn (Spiro, Nancy, Greg, Matt, Monica) volunteer Eileen Hyatt: This work group has discovered that it might make sense to work with the issues regarding media response given the overlap in how information seems to get requested by the Council. If the Council would like anything to be added to the '15 legislative agenda, it needs to be developed soon so that it can be communicated to Representative Lee to communicate to his legislative staff and get on the calendar. This group asked the Council if it believed that it was still reasonable to ask the membership of the RJ Director's group about changes or items that they would like to see addressed at the legislative level. The discussion determined that it might be more effective to ask broader questions about areas that they would like to see addressed, with some indication of what the Council is intending to address, instead of getting bogged down in minutiae. The current concerns that are on the radar are a desire to clarify and clean up some of the language that is currently in the legislation and to develop some legislative language around confidentiality issues that are specific to RJ and facilitators, using the current confidentiality provisions that cover mediators as a foundation. How does the RJ community get to have some input into these objectives/what is the process for getting that feedback? The victim services professionals and COVA seem to have developed a very effective protocol for getting this kind of feedback, they have a process in which they invite and get input which seems to work. Nancy asked to take this issue into committee this afternoon and work on it there. On a related note, Nancy suggested that it would be a good idea for the Council

to think longer range and target what it would like to see happening 5 to 10 years out. What will RJ look like at that point and how does the Council get from here to there.

Deb reports that she has heard from some individuals on the western slope, some victims groups, and has gotten some DOC access questions that she is not in a position to answer given her role, and needs to have some way to communicate responses to these inquiries. She asked this subcommittee to develop a response protocol to address this issue.

--Education and Engagement-Greg (Paula, Matt, Perrie, Spiro) volunteer Kerri Schmidt:

1. There are upcoming presentations at upcoming conferences. At the Colorado Collaboration Conference Matt and Greg will be doing an RJ 101 presentation and attempt to address the issues of how drug and problem solving courts can use RJ to reintegrate clients. In addition, there will be a presentation at APAI which will include RJ Council members and CCRJD members on reentry and RJ. Additionally a conversation has begun with COVA to do a pre-conference session for community members and victim services professionals during the COVA Conference.

2. 2014 RJ Quadvent. The Council decided that, instead of doing a conference or larger event this year, that with the creation of the pilots it would instead provide 4 focused trainings to help get RJ staff educated and ready to go. Once that decision had been made, there was an email asking for what training the community wanted and the existing subjects were the top four topics. At this point, one of these has already been completed on the Western Slope in Grand Junction and was attended by 8-9 people. The feedback was very positive. One concern has arisen which is the cost for providing these trainings and what attendance fees to set. This discussion requires a further revisiting of the budget discussion from earlier.

--Budget Considerations: The Council had initially determined that the fees set for the training sessions would be set so that it would break even on these costs, with the fee for each specific training set to cover the cost of that training. However, because of the agreement to provide free slots to the pilots, this might not be as practical or realistic as initially thought. For example, 14 out of the 24 maximum seats at the MI training are free slots, which means a maximum of 10 people will be paying the training fee. At the quoted budget cost, those ten individuals would pay \$250 each. This training is often offered for free or very low cost to state employees and others. This assumes that the 10 slots will all be filled and paid, for the costs that are not covered by the training fees of the attendees the Council had agreed to cover the shortfall and had set aside \$8,000 of the funding from the previous nonprofit account to meet these needs. A suggestion was made that the Council should just allocate the \$8,000 to reduce all of the training costs for attendees by 50%; however, doing so will fully expend the existing account. And there are currently complications with the RJ Summit Account held by LCJP. Thus, there was further discussion regarding making this expenditure and the budget status with respect to training.

--Budget walkthrough—Deb walked the Council through the FY14 budget proposal. A proposal was made that the Council obtain a detailed accounting of what has already been spent by the May 16th meeting and hard cost estimates through the end of the fiscal year, so there is a better sense of what is available overall from the RJ Cash Fund.

In terms of the specific trainings:

*The first training on the western slope will be paid for in full by the RJ Council Summit Fund.

*The MI training will be paid for by the 20th JD Probation, with an expansion in the available space and 20th Probation guaranteed attendance slots. All seats at this training will be at no cost.

*Cultural responsiveness is slated to happen during FY 2015. The costs for this training are \$2,900 for trainers, \$600 for food. At the current registration rates, the fee would be \$235 per slot to attend this one. The Council agreed to commit \$1,450 to subsidize the training without food, which will set the attendance cost/registration fee lower. This will be supported from the RJ cash funds allocated through the state budget.

*High Risk Victim Offender Dialogue is scheduled as a week long, 40 hour training in Colorado Springs. Originally Lynn volunteered to provide this training; the total cost is \$4,320 for the maximum number of 24 paying attendees and the minimum number of trainers. The cost for the additional trainers being fully available for the same attendees would be ~ \$6,300. The market rate for this training ranges between \$900 to \$2000 per person when there are no subsidies. Anne Rogers was suggested as a resource to potentially help defray these costs or at least to co-train if she is well enough to do so. A motion was made for the Council to subsidize the cost of \$4,320 for the trainers from RJ cash funds with a registration fee set at \$500. This motion was seconded and passed. Deb also noted there would be additional expenses for this training relative to space and food. Those have not yet been determined. Council wants to keep food costs as low as possible.

*The Pikes Peak Conference is in 2015. The Council will consider sponsoring the conference and will also consider purchasing scholarships for individuals working with the pilots.

*One additional suggestion was made that there be a facilitator/or low risk dialogue type training put together and provided on the western slope.

--These trainings will be advertised with a notation where the trainers are donating the training time, there are subsidies being provided by the Council, and highlighting the value of the training being provided. This approach to publicity is approved by the Council. Once the issues with the funding available through the RJ Summit Fund and

state cash funds are resolved, there will be a very clear statement provided to the Council about which funding is coming from where.

--Given the interplay of the budget issues, non-profit funds, and other fiscal management concerns with the training plan issues, at this point the Council noted that it needs to formally discuss the idea of a treasurer position. One issue—if a non-profit becomes a partner to the Council and has a member/employee as a member of the Council, should that individual be restricted from accepting this role? This is an issue that will need to be clarified at future meetings, but is tabled for now due to who accepts the position. The Council finds that an appropriate quorum has been established for amendment of the bylaws. A motion was made and seconded to establish the position of treasurer on the executive committee to fulfill the budget monitoring and reporting responsibilities. This motion was passed. Greg has been appointed as the treasurer but does not have signing authority on any related accounts. Esther is nominated as the signing authority on said accounts outside of Judicial. However, Esther was not present to accept the nomination.

3. A concern was raised concerning the Council's approach to the selection of trainers, especially for Council sponsored events. An issue was raised of if the Council should develop a policy or procedure for the selection of these trainers as there is a certain prestige in being designated a Council trainer, and there is likewise a concern about ensuring the training complies with the established standards and code of conduct. In addition, there is a need for a policy or guidelines which can be used to determine which trainings get announced through the Council's official channels.

-- Peggy and Perrie agreed to meet and put together a draft policy to address these concerns.

4. Kerri raised a question she had developed and wanted the Council's thoughts on: when discussing restorative dialogue in the context of training, how do you as a provider effectively change the dialogue to encourage remorse and address the victim's needs? This seems to underlie some concerns she has had about creating sustainable programs. It is her belief that those programs that do not achieve that end will not be very sustainable. There was a detailed discourse among the Council members about the answer to this question, and a conclusion was reached that this question highlighted a concern that the Council needs to address in terms of training planning: there needs to be an evaluation of the training that is being offered, who it is being targeted to, and how it is being built upon and developed at more advanced levels to achieve a level of sustainability and competence in the community with respect to restorative practices. We can learn from the process of working with the pilots how this might look and where the gaps and needs are; and one advantage that they have is that they are housed in DA's offices so there is already a level of credibility present to work from while establishing this groundwork. She made a twofold proposal to the Council that it consider sustainability in the development of a state restorative culture and that it do so by thinking strategically about how to best support the implementation and integration of restorative programs in communities. An academy might be a good way to do this and tool for embedding the culture, the standards, and the code of conduct in the community of practitioners that you need to establish to effectively implement a change according to implementation science.

--**Internal Capacity- Spiro (Lynn, Gabrielle):** These issues were previously mentioned as part of the discussion on media outreach and response. The Council needs to develop some practices and define the roles that Deb will take when she is approached to make statements or speak on behalf of the Council. In some ways, Deb does serve as an easy access point for individuals to contact the Council, but the Council needs to provide her some assistance in having an outline of what issues need to be directed to the Council for resolution/response and what kinds of things can be responded to at that initial contact point. Essentially, this distinction seems to be appropriately described as policy inquiries (Deb should be able to answer questions about the Council's internal policies and practices and how it runs business) and position inquiries (which are statements that the Council should be officially making as a body). SCAO/Judicial and the Council are also in a relationship which requires that inquiries be handled in an appropriate manner—Deb as a Judicial employee is not in a position to make statements from a Judicial or Council perspective on political positions, legislation, or other viewpoints/opinions. If the Council might as a whole speak officially she can share those documented positions. A recent example of this kind of issue is the budget process: Deb needs to have the authority to take the information being provided to the Council and their decisions to utilize and to put together funding requests and access the budget process within SCAO internally. However, her connection to that process could give the impression she has decision making authority on items like the levels of funding for pilot projects, which are made by the Council as a body. The Council asked that Deb provide a list of the kinds of things that she needs permission to speak to on a day to day basis and the kinds of authority she needs on a regular basis to effectively fill her role. Once those needs are set out, the Council can then discuss what other things she has authority to speak and which things are to be routed to the Council as decision items. In addition, in terms of media interactions, the Council has asked that the SCAO attendees contact the public information officer staff at SCAO and obtain some guidelines for those contacts. The Council determined that Deb's role should be that described by her position title: court services analyst.

--Deb, Perrie, and Spiro will develop an outline of a clearer scope for her role for review at the next meeting.

--**Media Response Committee- Meg Williams (Alice Price, Nancy Lewis):** This group is meeting in an attempt to identify and develop a protocol for how the Council receives and responds to requests for information from the media. This is a critical area, and very important for the Council to be sensitive to as a public body. As a body, the Council will likely not be able to respond to an inquiry very quickly unless there is definite and set/clear policy. Nonetheless, there should be some chains of expertise or response developed that enables the Council to refer a question to an individual with expertise in a particular area. A suggestion was made that the Council pursue the resources developed by Boards and Commissions to help develop these protocols.

--Meg, Alice, Nancy, Spiro, and Greg will meet and develop some kind of protocol for the development of media response guidelines for the next meeting.

-- Holly will check with Judicial about the authority of the Council to make statements and what limitations might exist on that ability.

-- Nancy will share the COVA protocols

***Definitions and Requirements Discussion:**

--**Definition of Recidivism (Meg):** From the January minutes, recidivism was going to be defined as follows: "Recidivism will be based on a review of all offenders participating in RJ who receive any subsequent summons, filing/petition, or arrest in a County or District court within one year and three years from completion of restorative program. This will be checked on an annual basis for three years through the individual's transition into the adult system."

In addition, the report that will be provided to the legislature from DCJ will include the type of crime that resulted in the system contact, probation and parole will provide data on technical violations, and the pilot projects and reporting programs may provide municipal data if they able to do so.

Council feels that data might have programmatic or other value. However, it is not information that the Council will require for the pilots as part of the data collection and reporting process for determining recidivism.

Another clarification was discussed regarding whether or not convictions, which is the filed standard for recidivism measures, should be measured as well as system contacts. That raises the issue that this would then require pilots to collect data from their diversion programs about completions (which are being collected by some programs now, but not all of them necessarily). This might be language that the legislative work group should look at and consider; and in fact is already on their agenda for further consideration. Finally, the Council noted that the recidivism definition that it is using captures a lot of the information from the criminal justice system, it does not capture information about the restorative work that is being done in communities, schools, faith based programs etc. that do not interact with those formal systems.

--Deb will investigate and report to the Council about what would be required in order to obtain and evaluate adjudication and conviction data.

--Defining RJ Processes for the Database: For purposes of the database and the data collection requirements, a succinct list of practices with definitions needs to be developed. There are so many variations on the themes of what RJ practices are from the previous research the Council has conducted that a clear need is present for a reduction of those many practices into some defined, uniform approaches that are used for RJ processes.

--A subcommittee is appointed (Greg, Paula, Lynn, Deb and Kerri) that will develop these definitions, Kerri, Paula and the Education & Engagement committee are designated. In addition,

--Deb will see if she can get the self-reported list of practices from Amanda Mahan and will gather that info from the pilots

--Peggy also agreed to create definitions of RJ programs and practitioners for the RJ Directory

***Appreciation Event for Former RJ Council Members:** This is scheduled for 7/18/14 at COVA. The event may be planned by Gabrielle and Matt, (who are not present but Deb will ask if they are willing) who will develop the structure of the event and a guest list. It was suggested that doing a reception at the end of the day may be best. Also suggested was a luncheon although this would interrupt regular council session work. Budget for this TBD.

***HB13-1254- Update and Budget Provided to Council:**

--The RJ Cash Fund at this time appears to be growing at a rate of \$30 to \$50, 000 per month. For Fiscal Year 2014, the Council was granted spending authority in an amount of \$187,000. Those funds have already been allocated as previously discussed in the meeting. The required spending authority for Fiscal Year 2015 was significantly underestimated since the request needed to be submitted prior to any baseline needs data being available. At this time, Judicial is not willing to request any additional spending authority through their budget processes. However, Representative Lee is working with the JBC to obtain the necessary spending authority.

--Use of the RJ Directory. Council members are reminded and asked to make sure their programmatic information is included in the repository. This is currently the only tool available to the Council to determine where programs are in the state and where there are needs for RJ outreach or programming. Council members are asked to advocate that programs they encounter submit and/or update their information. While there currently is no definition for what constitutes a practitioner or a program,

-- Council will develop a definition in order to provide clarity about how responses to this request for information should be documented and categorized.

***CCRJD and other RJ Community Matters:**

--Dates were set to open and close a comment and feedback period regarding the code of ethics and standard of practice. As these were intended to be living documents, the community is invited to comment during the time period September 1st through September 15th. Notice will be issued prior to the comment period through normal channels in order to obtain feedback.

--The Ontario Ministry of Education has requested permission to use one of the videos from the website for one of their courses. They would like permission to use this information for five years. The Council agrees to this request and will ask that they provide the Council with feedback from their students about the website and their response to it. They may use the video from the RJ Council website.

--CRP (non-profit) is willing to serve as a fiscal agent and open an account in Alamosa for the Council's use. The CRP would like a brief written memorandum of understanding that details the responsibilities of each side and \$50 per month for managing the account. They do not want to have signing authority on the account. That should be the RJ Council members.

--Nancy provided an announcement regarding National Victims' Rights Day.

-Peggy and Nancy provided feedback about the information that was provided to the Crime Victims' Caucus in Colorado. Nancy emphasized from that experience that presenters and Council members need to be very sensitive not to focus at the start, in the middle, and at the end on the offender side of the RJ equation when speaking to victim advocates or town meetings. There needs to be a balance and help people understand the total concept of what RJ is and how it works. Nancy also mentioned that the use of the word "magic" in relationship to RJ does not serve the legitimizing of the field for most people.

--Nancy announced a golf fundraiser.

The Restorative Justice Council adjourned at 3:25 p.m. Committees met in groups after the adjournment to address issues raised during the meeting and to set schedules for further committee work.

FUTURE TOPICS

RUNNING LIST:

Council Authority/Process- removing people from listing in Directory if harmful

Practitioner Grievance Process