

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/RJ Directors— 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-- 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
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

Minutes taken by: Jack Hubbard, 20th Judicial Probation
Staff: Deb Witzel, Facilitated the Meeting

RJ COUNCIL MINUTES

January 17th, 2014 9am-4pm
COVA at 90 Galapago Street Denver, CO 80223

Meeting called to order at 9:02 a.m. by Spiro.

***Welcome to new members and introductions:**

- *Nancy Lewis welcomed the attendees to COVA and gave a brief overview of COVA's activities.
- *The following agenda items were added to today's meeting at the request of Council members:
 - Review of the Annual Report
 - Response to an inquiry from pilot projects regarding the \$125 fee, who collects it, and where that money goes when collected
 - An update on Beverly Title's status
- *Deb provided an update on Bev Title's status to the Council.
- *The newly appointed Council members were welcomed.
 - A sign-in sheet was distributed for the collection of contact and attendance information. Deb highlighted the emailed log that was sent to the new council members and introductions were made. Following the introductions, Deb led an exercise in which the Council members met each other and detailed the answers to some questions, which were used later in the day as part of the strategic planning process: what is your number one goal, what do you want to give, and what do you want to get from your work on the Council this year?

***Approval of November minutes:**

The November minutes were provided and reviewed by the Council. A motion was made and seconded to approve and adopt the minutes, which was passed after a clarification of the meeting schedule. The regular full Council meeting used to be held on the second Friday of the month, but was changed due to member scheduling conflicts to the third Friday and thus the dates in the minutes are correct.

***Annual Report:**

--The annual report was emailed to the members of the Council prior to the meeting this week. Information about the Council's and Pikes Peak's mutual support, including the Council's support of the Pike's Peak conference, was added. Graphs, pictures, and other visual aids will be put together to be added; once completed they will be sent to Jack Hubbard and he and Gail Erker will place them into the document. A message from the chair will be included which will include Spiro's picture. Finally, the report will be finalized in a .pdf format and will include live links to the website. Once that information is added, and the final document is approved by the Council, the report will be posted to the website and will be included as part of the Council's report to the legislature.

--The section of the bylaws regarding new membership (article 2.1) was brought to the floor for a vote on amending the seats to include the legislative positions that were recently authorized. A motion was moved and seconded to: 1. include these positions in sections I through L of article 2.1, and 2. to change the signor from Greg Brown to Spiro Koinis. The motion for these amendments to the bylaws was passed unanimously.

--Position Appointments for Calendar Year 2014:

- a. Vice Chair: Historically, the Council has attempted to split the Chair and Vice Chair positions between a government and a community representative. One reason for this split has been, in the past, the need to make sure those government employees who are on the Council are not in a position of making public statements contrary to their agency policies. With the creation of the legislative sub-committee, the public statement duties will be assigned to an individual in that group to address this concern. Perrie, Matt, Rebecca, Monica and Esther expressed a willingness to fill the vice chair position. A motion was made and seconded for Perrie to be appointed vice chair, which was unanimously approved.
- b. Parliamentarian: This role had previously been filled by Perrie. Monica volunteered to be the parliamentarian and was appointed upon a unanimous vote.
- c. Council Public Information Officer/Spokesperson: This discussion started with the Council revisiting the 9 News video on an RJ process that was aired in December. A related issue to that kind of media communication is how government agency employed Council members can participate or communicate in the blog given their public comment limitations. The Council determined that the issue that needed to be addressed was how the Council can most appropriately speak to the public, how the Council's public voice should be presented, and how the Council can respond to information, legislation, and other issues that arise in the media. In particular, in anticipation of next year's legislative cycle, the Council needs to determine how it can Council effectively and quickly respond to inquiries about issues that have not been discussed that come up between meetings. From previous experience with the issue of releasing summit funds for training, it seems that email voting could be an effective answer to these concerns.
 - a. With the Council's current status as being located under the umbrella of the Colorado Judicial Department, should Judicial Public Information Officers be consulted and asked for their thoughts on what and how the Council can communicate publicly? Since the Council is part of Judicial, there could be concerns if an issue is brought to court that requires Judges to make decisions regarding issues on which the Council takes a position. Meg indicated that the Council should obtain a determination of what kind of

board it is considered under the legislation, the hope is that it would be considered a Type I board and thus independent. If that is the case, there would not be a need to link it to Judicial's PIO staff. Finally, there are related issues of Deb's role with the Council given her status as a Judicial Department employee and the difficulty of how to respond to media requests for information and legislative issues on which the Council could be expected to adopt a position. Nancy suggested that one way to mitigate the legislative concern is to continue to develop contacts and linkages with the legislature so that there is an opportunity to discuss and anticipate issues prior to bills being introduced in a session.

- b. The Council has a subcommittee for addressing legislative issues and concerns, and perhaps that group should be where the conversations about anticipating and responding to proposed legislation should originate. A decision was made that this group should have a detailed conversation about developing strategies for communicating about legislative issues internally and, after internal discussions, to external stakeholders. Those strategies will then be brought back to the Council in general for a larger discussion at the March meeting. Currently, the subcommittee does not have any practitioners in its membership; which was addressed by Lynn volunteering to join this subcommittee, making this body's membership Spiro, Nancy, Greg, Matt, and Lynn. In addition, there will be a discussion with the Colorado Council of Restorative Justice Directors to have this subcommittee function as a joint body between the two groups at the CCRJD meeting in February.
- d. Media response: Currently, the Council has not designated a subcommittee to respond to issues related to the media. In response to the 9 News story, there was a discussion about the position a Council member can be put in when stories are investigated or broadcast in the media. The Council decided that it does not have a role to play in terms of taking positions on general interest type media stories and that it should not be in a position of limiting any member's work as an individual practitioner (provided there is compliance with the standards). However, the notice provided by the Council member about the upcoming story was appreciated and it was helpful to know that something was coming. There is an expectation that a Council member acting in their private capacity would not attach the work they are doing in that capacity to the Council. A valuable question for discussion was raised by the 9 News story in that it may be worth the Council's time to consider if there are any broader systemic implications and potential for damage to the Council's objectives and position in the RJ community when stories and other non-policy information is present in the media. How should the Council address the damage or concerns raised by the actions of entities that might have a different perspective or objective than the Council? The Council determined that it would develop a set of talking points for media interaction and make those available to anyone on the Council for the purpose of answering inquiries; this shouldn't take too much effort as most of the information seems to already exist in documents already created by the Council. Nancy pointed out that the best way to keep your role clear when speaking with the media is to clearly identify which voice you are speaking with, e.g. "I am speaking as a practitioner" versus "I am not speaking on behalf of the RJ Council" and to refer Council type questions to the designated spokespersons for the council. There was a motion that Meg Williams, Alice Price, and Nancy Lewis would work together as a group to provide the public Council response and make sure that the individual selected to respond to inquiries and speak on behalf of the Council does so in a way that does not raise issues of government employees inappropriately making public statements. This motion was passed unanimously.

- e. Internal Communications: There was discussion about a suggestion that the Council utilize email for these discussions because it provides a natural documentation. Meg, Alice, and Nancy are where these discussions would be directed and, in the event of conflict or disagreement, the issue would be brought to the Council in a special session. The initial objective would be to get in a position where the Council is identifying and working through issues in a proactive instead of reactive manner. Spiro agreed to consider the potential issues involved with this process and bring information back to the Council at the next meeting.

***Nonprofit Partnership/Fiscal Management of Summit Funds:**

--The Council has accumulated funds from events such as the Summit and funding support from certain government agencies and a balance remains of approximately \$13,000. LCJP currently continues to hold these funds. The Council voted at the November 2013 meeting to move the fund balance to be held by a nonprofit more easily accessed and managed by Council staff and Executive Committee members. Funds generated for the Council by activities and events need to be held apart from the RJ Fund state account as their purposes are distinctive. The Council discussed possible non-profit partners, including Anne Rogers' organization where Greg is on the board, Center for Restorative Practices of which Alice is the founder and Pike's Peak RJ Council (PPRJC) where Lynn Lee serves as chair. PPRJC uses a foundation that provides fiscal nonprofit management services for many organizations. Lynn will speak with the Pike's Peak group and see what the details are for getting set up with the umbrella or if the Council's funds could be managed jointly with Pike's Peak's funds. Lynn, Greg, and Alice will complete this conversation and report back to the council in March.

***Travel Reimbursement Policy:**

--The Council currently does not have spending authority for the RJ Fund state account. Deb has asked and will be asking for that spending authority through Judicial as part of next year's budget process. As discussed in the November minutes, the council has voted to reimburse those members who do not have an organization or agency that currently reimburses for travel. Judicial's travel reimbursement policy and the forms and rates used by Judicial were provided to the Council members and those policies and practices adopted.

***Pilots Updates: (Sub-Committee = Meg, Greg, Esther)**

--Site Visits: Deb and Council members have conducted some site visits to provide support and other related technical assistance. These visits are going very well, and the calendar for future visits was provided to the Council. It is very interesting that each location is bringing an individual personality and perspective to how they are approaching their project. The final site visit will be done on 2/3/14 in the 12th Judicial District (Alice's district). The 19th Judicial District is expending significant effort in getting their systems and processes in place and established. They also seem to have developed good relationships with their partner nonprofits, but are reporting that they are experiencing barriers in the area of training volunteers since no funds are available to pay trainers. The 20th Judicial District has spent considerable effort on the paperwork, forms, MOU's, and documentation protocols in place and has also revised their procedures and practices as a result of the legislation to offer pre-filing restorative justice practices with the support of the DA. The 10th Judicial District has had a municipal restorative justice program in place since March 2013, and right now is waiting for funding to be able to shift that program up to the DA and district level for referrals. They have a solid referral source already in place and one trained volunteer who support Michelle Randall-Garcia the RJ Coordinator. The 19th and 20th have both requested training as part of their technical assistance support. Without spending authority to pay for trainers, the Council cannot provide them with funding. However, a possibility would be to utilize the expertise present on the Council to start providing this support.

--Pre/Post Uniform Satisfaction Survey: The most recent draft of the survey was provided to the Council for discussion. At the last meeting, there was a great deal of discussion about how to accomplish the legislative mandate that this satisfaction data be collected. After that discussion, Deb followed up with the researchers and they were very strong about the need for specific stakeholder interests to be reflected in the questions. The basis of the draft provided to the Council today was developed by Tom Cavanaugh, who used it for his campus program at CSU; as a result of being used there it is validated and he provided it to the Council as a basis to work from. The version that Deb provided today has been modified based on the previous discussion and for the pilot project context. It was provided for further review. Since the pilot projects are asking for something that they can use for this data collection, she asks if the Council would like to adopt the document or if it would rather use it as a working draft for further modification by the research sub-committee. The practitioners on the Council expressed a concern that, while a great survey, it just seems to be asking too much and be too long to actually ask program participants to complete and some of the questions seem like they may not be appropriate. The language was too complex in some instances for many of the people the pilots will serve. In light of the legislative requirement that qualitative and quantitative research be conducted to support the efficacy of restorative justice, one of the future funding considerations for the Council might be support for collecting this data. At the current time, the Council has 12 different drafts of satisfaction surveys available to it for review or consideration. However, the researchers expressed a number of concerns about the contents of those draft surveys. As a result of this discussion, the Council determined that it would start this process by identifying and selecting the researcher. A subcommittee consisting of the researcher, Peggy, Meg, Perrie, Spiro, Alice, and Rebecca will meet and develop a final draft survey for the Council's review that will then be forwarded to the selected research team.

--Research Teams RDQ: Related to the previous discussion, The RDQ for the research team closes Jan 31st. The subcommittee of Greg, Meg, and Esther will be reviewing the applications in response to the posted RDQ for the researcher. Additionally Deb and other judicial staff will review the RDQs. (Jessica Johnson, Nancy Allen, and possibly Eileen Kinney or her support staff will be invited to review and support selection process.) Together this group will select the research team. The FAQ and response to questions is currently being maintained on both RJ Colorado online and Judicial's website under Court Services. The timeline for this review is: 1/31/14 deadline for responses, RDQs sent to review team by Feb 7th, scores will be returned to Deb by 2/14/14, and any follow up meeting would be scheduled for the following week. A decision will be issued the week of 2/24/14.

***Appreciation Event for Past RJ Council Members:**

--Something of this nature has been suggested by multiple Council members. The Council decided that it will host an appreciation luncheon on 7/18/14 at COVA.

***Definitions and Requirements:**

--Recidivism (carried forward from November 8th meeting): According to the legislation, determination of recidivism is defined-

- based on all offenders participating in process
- tracked for 1 year from arrest
- any subsequent arrest

As used by multiple state agencies:

- Pre-Discharge Recidivism: A filing for a new felony or misdemeanor offense that occurred prior to discharge from (diversion, probation, DYC commitment, etc).- This could also affect the completion rates if referred back due to re-offense

- Post-Discharge Recidivism: A filing for a new felony or misdemeanor offense that occurred within one year following discharge from (diversion, probation, NYC commitment, etc).

At the Nov 8th meeting the Council agreed that recidivism would be based on all offenders participating in RJ who have any subsequent summons or arrests filed in county or district court within one year from completion of restorative program to be checked annually for 3 years.

This definition is somewhat problematic in that the state agencies in the room operate with a different definition. The Council engaged in a conversation in an attempt to put some parameters about how it should be defined or established so the data is useful for comparison purposes with information already being collected. One positive development is that Kim English has agreed to run recidivism checks on whatever the Council determines will be needed, all the Council needs to provide is the first name, last name, date of birth, and SID number. The discussion covered the following issues:

- a. Pre-discharge vs. Post-discharge recidivism. In the November minutes, there is reflection of a discussion about checking for filings of a new felony or misdemeanor cases one year after the RJ process starts but prior to discharge from the RJ program. In addition, it seems appropriate to check for filings of new felony or misdemeanors one year after discharge from the RJ program. This is similar to measures of recidivism pre- and post-discharge from NYC, DOC, probation, or parole.
- b. If we're expanding this discussion and the analysis to schools, municipal level, or other community based and non-system programs, it would probably be best to keep the definition simpler. For one thing, it is impossible to measure and track municipal issues statewide as systems are not in place that can capture the data. In the end, measuring based on filings might be the most accurate measure as it captures the idea of contact with the system. Arrest will not capture that at the same level, as a majority of law enforcement contacts do not result in arrest, the result in summonses. In addition, if the discussion is about juvenile filings, it won't capture anyone who turns 18 while in the process because the capture point is adjudication. Perrie referenced her program as one example of the potential concerns, her program measures recidivism based on the juvenile receiving any citation or summons because most participants in her program are there on a pre-file basis. This raises the issue that the data might not be capturing those clients who stay at a diversion level either as new cases or as recidivating clients. This begs the question of how common this situation is with the pilot projects given from where they receive referrals.
- c. There was further discussion about tracking petty offenses or status offenses as causes of recidivism. A decision was made that this will be collected if available, but it might not be very useful information since jurisdictions vary in whether or not they file on things like MIPs or curfew.
- d. Do we track the recidivism of those who did not complete the RJ process? At this point in time, the Council determined that it will track this information as a control group as it can, but the additional volume is not something that can be addressed with the current resources and legislative obligations.
- e. A suggestion was made that the Council operates with a definition that measures recidivism as being the point of filing. This has the advantage that it is uniform, all stakeholders understand it, and it can be tracked in currently existing state systems. The Council will ask for the one year window of time and will also ask for a three year period if Kim is willing to collect that data as well. While, for the pilots, the data collection is focused on juveniles, it will also be a usable data collection measure that can be used for comparisons for adult programs. Deb also reports that she is currently in communication with Representative Lee about fixing the definitions in the legislation.

F. The current RJ field standard for recidivism is to look at convictions as cited in Sherman and Strang.

G. Decision: The Council determined that the definition in the legislation will be the definition used by the Council for data collection purposes. 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 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 will be asked to provide municipal data if they able to do so. The information that the Council intends to collect will go beyond that requested by the legislation, and will enable a comparison with NYC and other state program recidivism rates which might provide some insight into what could be proposed as a new state definition.

***HB13-1254 Update:**

--Fiscal Update: The fund appears to be growing at an average of \$30,000 - \$50,000 per month at this time. At this time, there is no spending authority of funding allocation for these funds other than the \$12,000 which supports the part time position provided to support the Council. A request for spending authority has been submitted in order to obtain the ability to expend some of this money. A draft of the budget plan is included with these minutes. There is currently a vote scheduled in February on a request the Council has submitted for supplemental spending authority, if approved funding is projected to be available no earlier than April 1st, 2014.

--Mandates/Timelines --

- a. Rep Pete Lee was informed that the Sept 1st deadline for the Pre/Post Satisfaction Survey was not met but progress is being made toward its development.
- b. The Practitioner Council Seats have been filled.
- c. Database development is being discussed and problem-solved. Without funding pilot sites are not able to take on new responsibilities/additional work. Budget proposals have been received from all of the pilots, and range between \$75,000 and \$90,000 to fund for a full fiscal year.
- d. The Council needs to develop a process for reviewing budget requests and allocating funding, which should include a review and approval of project plans. The Council appoints a subcommittee of Spiro, Greg, and Gabrielle to develop this process; Meg will provide them information on the process utilized by diversion. Deb will explore samples in judicial.
- e. Related to funding issues, the Council had a discussion about how to structure the allocation of funds and these processes to support and facilitate the growth and restorative justice programs and process across the state. The legislation indicates that funding from the fee can be allocated to districts which have RJ programs and to the RJ Council for administrative expenses. Judicial was given responsibility for establishing guidelines about distribution of these funds to defray the costs of RJ programs. From a longer term perspective, the Council needs to be strategic given that these funds are limited and not over-fund the pilots as well as including discussions about sustainability plans when assisting with putting programs into place. Options programs can use may include sliding fee scales or access to the \$40 assessment fee and the \$125 program fee authorized in the legislation. One recurring question from the pilots is if those fees are designated to go to the DA or to programs or to somewhere else and who collects the fee, this is an issue that will need to be worked out locally between the programs and their DA's offices as the language in the statute appears to indicate that the \$125 should be collected by whichever entity facilitates the RJ process. It seems like this would be a relevant question to ask as part of a funding protocol: how will you implement collection of these fees, how will you distribute them, how will you use sliding scales,

- and how do you intend to address the possible minority representation issues associated with fee collection? There was agreement that the \$125 facilitation fee was intended for service providers. The answers to those questions will help address the Council's interest in upholding the stated values of the RJ Council. One of the purposes of having pilot projects and programs is to help identify these kinds of systemic issues and to give a laboratory in which the players can learn how to work through the issues. This will be an agenda item/concern that the Council will keep on its radar in order to ensure that programs and potential participants have an even playing field for access, identify and learn how the Council facilitates that environment, and ensure that services are appropriately matched to client populations. The Council determined that the current response to the providers will be as follows: *The Council understands that you have to create a system that works for your community and processes. The basic expectations are that whoever completes the assessment would be entitled to and collect the statutory \$40 assessment fee and that, whoever provides the service and has the liability collects and receives the \$125 fee. Sliding scales and other approaches are to be utilized to ensure that no one is turned away from participation in restorative processes based on financial inability to pay. The Council encourages programs to plan for the future when funding is available to be able to address financial issues and fiscal management, as well as related potential issues of minority over-representation as part of their ongoing funding requests.*
- f. In addition to this conversation, the pilot projects need to have a uniform assessment tool for determination of suitability for an RJ process—everyone is currently using something different and that will cause problems in the future in attempting to compare programs and results.

CCRJD Coordination:

- The next meeting is Friday, February 21st in Boulder, and is designated as a joint meeting with the Council. In addition, the pilot project meeting is scheduled for the same date in Boulder. Deb will be required to attend the meeting on the pilots, and asked for Council attendance at the joint meeting. Gabrielle, Perrie, Greg, Spiro, Nancy, and Lynn will be in attendance at the joint meeting, as the RJ Directors are going to be addressing some legislative work and preparing for potential events in that arena.
- The Council designates a subcommittee to serve as a joint group with the CCRJD on legislative issues. That committee will be tasked with preparing for potential 2015 legislation and beginning to develop a process by which the Council can prepare and position itself on legislation. This committee is currently Spiro, Nancy, Greg, and Matt.

2014 RJ Event:

- There is no single planned event for this year; instead the Council has determined that it would be more effective in support of the legislation and pilots to provide multiple trainings throughout the state. At this point, Deb needs the Council members assigned to get her dates and times/locations so that this information can be publicized. Logistics will be finalized and the information sent to Deb by January 24th, 2014.
- The training topics are:

- a. **Restorative Justice in Colorado** (Building relationship; Victims' Rights, Talking with Stakeholders, What's Happening in our State) Nancy and Deb
- b. **Restorative Justice and Equity**, Our Cultural Responsibilities, Research on RJ and Equity and more) Have spoken with Larry Davis from Judicial; Kappy Hall RJ Practitioner, Trainer and Equity trainer; Tom Cavanagh from CSU, Ethnic Researcher & RJ Practitioner/Researcher; Bonnie Martinez an Equity trainer from Hinckley HS. Deb.
- c. **Motivational Interviewing**, Anjali Nandi has been contacted and is available, Spiro has an additional contact, and Greg is also working in this area.

- d. **High Risk Victim/Offender Dialogue** (Advance facilitator practice training) Lynn and Peggy are experienced. Lynn has trained on this and is willing.
-

Afternoon Session

Strategic Planning and Action Items Updates from 2013:

--Internal Capacity Building (Meg)

- 1: An information packet was developed and the new members were provided with copies of this document. Please let Meg know if you think something should be added.
- 2: Annual Report has been completed.
- 3: Elevator speech. An elevator speech has been attempted, but this is a hard document to develop with RJ. This will continue to be developed, and it might be easier to focus now that an annual report has been completed.
- 4: Vacancies have been filled.
- 5: Parliamentarian has been appointed.

--Internal Procedures and Communication (Spiro)

1. Done

--Education and Engagement (Matt)

1. A general power point presentation was completed, RJ101 trainings are planned, and interaction with the pilot projects continues
2. A presentation for CDAC presentation was done by Matt and Greg
3. A COVA conference presentation was done.
4. A presentation and Q & A session was done with the DA victim-witness unit directors group. There is hope to continue meeting with these stakeholders and develop these relationships. An APAI conference presentation has been scheduled in May. A private presentation of that material will also be arranged for and delivered to the juvenile parole board.
5. There are plans to submit a proposal for presentation to the Colorado Collaborative Justice Conference on Return on Human Investment.
6. Nancy suggested a presentation at the law enforcement coordinators' meeting with presentations by law enforcement officers who currently utilize RJ.

--External Research (Greg)

1. Amanda Mahan's doctoral project was focused on research and information, and provides the basis of a lot of what was accomplished in this past year. This included completion of a database of RJ programs in the state and a catalog of the services which they offer.
2. A literature review was completed.
3. Sample surveys were sent out, and collection of those surveys and distillation of the data is an ongoing process. Programs were surveyed to get a picture of what programs they offer and which practices are being utilized. At the time, the objective was to figure out what information the Council would want to collect about RJ programs, but the legislation's requirements defined that for the Council when it was passed.
4. A COSA literature review was conducted, and we were attending the meetings of the statewide group working in this area. However, they lost their executive director a few weeks ago, and that has slowed

things down a bit. In addition, there were some significant concerns about the way this group was approaching the process and what was in their training. Greg wants to continue to revisit COSAs as a potential RJ process in the future.

5. RJ research gaps are being addressed by some of the work that Nancy is currently doing. In addition, the RDQ for researchers should help address these concerns and a lot of the missing information will be filled in by meeting the requirements of the legislation.

--External Capacity Building (Perrie)

1. Standards for facilitators were worked on, reviewed, and put in place with the intent that they function as a living, organic document. Council will attempt to get feedback on the standards again this year.

2. Currently, this group is beginning to look at developing a standards document for higher risk cases, and is starting the process by seeing if anything currently exists internationally for higher risk cases and RJ.

Calendar Year 2014 Strategic Planning and Goal Setting-

Action Plan will be shared as a Google Doc and updated there by the Chairs

--The Council conducted a facilitated review of the previous year's goals from the strategic plan and identified which of those action groups continued to match the Council's objectives. After that discussion, the Council identified the following action goal areas for 2014 and appointed interested individuals to work on the indicated action plans.

--Public policy and Legislative Action Group:

Members: Lynn (chair), Nancy, Monica, Matt, Spiro, Meg, Greg, Eileen Hyatt (volunteer)

Action Areas:

- *Clean up/clarify the language in the legislation
- *Identify which aspects of the bill need to be updated and provide that information to Representative Lee. In addition, meet with Representative Lee to consider expansion of the bill.
- *Increase support for an expansion of high risk conferencing in DYC and DOC and obtain funding to support those practices.
- *Develop plans for financial stability and sustainability.
- *Develop and provide education to defense attorneys.

--Pilot Projects Action Group:

Members: Meg (chair), Gabrielle, Alice, Peggy, Stan

- *Develop an application for funding for the pilot projects which includes requests for information about the population serviced, demographics and case types, fines/fees and assessments, distribution of funds, what kind of service by whom, data collection and by who, and budgetary information about local funds that are available and will be utilized. Modification of the DCJ template for use as a reporting instrument and a draft sent to the pilots before the February pilot meeting.
- *Develop an assessment for determining the suitability of an individual for restorative justice.
- *Developing an MOU template for use of the pilots. Utilize this process to identify problem areas and best practice areas for outreach/education.

Development of these instruments and processes may be done through a community learning process which will hopefully reveal information about what needs exist in the field or where gaps exist that might need to be addressed at a legislative level.

--Internal Capacity Action Group:

Members: Spiro (chair), Lynn, Esther, Gabrielle

- *Clarify and document internal Council processes, such as how membership is considered and how the Council responds to legislation. Document these practices for future reference.
- *Develop a Council fiscal vision and scope.
- *Address communication issues and develop a way to have a broad, quick update (maybe some kind of dashboard?). Develop a process that enables the Council to make statements, address legislative processes, and vote on a quick turnaround.
- *Council membership issues, develop ways to help new members figure out where they fit and what is going on.
- *Define Council members' roles and engagement.
- *Accountability and parliamentarian concerns, in particular holding the Council accountable for attendance, responsiveness, and working within the agreements to which the Council commits.
- *Maintain and update historical documents.
- *Clarifying restorative justice language and what is and is not considered restorative and defining the continuum. Ensure that the Council is working from a shared definition in order to communicate a shared, consistent vision to the state RJ community.

--Education/Engagement/Conference/External Capacity Action Group:

Members: Greg (chair), Paula, Matt, Perrie, Spiro, Nancy

- *Address High Risk Victim-Offender Dialogue and develop standards for this practice.
- *Communicate the definitions from the legislature and this meeting to the pilots and the RJ field.
- *Create a structure for 2015 conference.

--Research Action Group:

Members: Perrie (chair), Rebecca, Candace, Meg, Spiro, Peggy, Alice, Esther, Kerri Schmidt (volunteer)

- *Develop a draft data collection instrument for satisfaction from a review of the available proposed surveys. Redraft a document and provide it for consideration at the meeting on February 11.
- *After those surveys have been returned, conduct a recidivism review and develop a method for the presentation of this information in an effective manner.
- *Work with the research team and reporting from the pilot projects to compile and review/present data.

***DA Victim-Witness Meeting Debrief**

--The Council had a discussion about the responses from and the issues raised by the attendees at the DA victim-witness meeting. From that meeting, the Council is sensitive to concerns that arise from this group that stem from previous breaches of trust and the resultant harm. In addition, there are concerns about the victim-centeredness of this legislation and the processes, highlighted by the legislative purpose not mentioning victims. The meeting highlighted the reality that there is still a division between the segments of the system in some places in the state. Out of this meeting, an issue was raised that it might be worth the Council's consideration to refine and hone the language that it utilizes when approaching specific stake-holder groups, especially in light of the historic issues with communication against structures, systems, and system cultures. This discussion is added as an action item in the Internal Capacity Action Group.

***The meeting concluded with a liberating structures exercise in which the Council developed a deeper appreciation of the challenges, diverse experiences, perspectives, and objectives of the Council members and why each individual Council member is working on the Council.**

***Announcements:**

*Lynn asked Council members to let her know if there's anything they would like to present or have presented at the Pikes Peak conference. If so, please bring that information to her at the next meeting.

*Nancy announced that COVA is providing training on Emotional Intelligence at Gateway in Granby on 6/9.

The Council Meeting was Adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

FUTURE TOPICS

RUNNING LIST:

Directory- Uses

- Are you and yours listed?

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

Practitioner Grievance Process