

STATE OF COLORADO



Restorative Justice Council 2013

Greg Brown, Chief Probation Officer, Twentieth Judicial District (Co-Chair)--Present
Stan Garnett, District Attorney, Twentieth Judicial District—Present
Spiro Koinis, Division of Youth Corrections Victim and Restorative Justice Services Coordinator (Co-Chair)--Present
Matt Riede, 1st Judicial District Victim Advocate--Present
Beverly Title, Ph.D., Teaching Peace Founder and CEO ReSolutionaries--Present
Meg Williams, Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Justice, Manager--Present
Nancy Lewis, Colorado Executive Director, Colorado Organization for Victim Assistance--Present
Candace Hawkins, Colorado Department of Education--Present
Perrie McMillen, Restorative Justice Services Program Director, City of Ft. Collins—Present
Esther Cho, JJDP Council—Present
Rebecca Oakes, Adult Parole Board—Not Present
Paula Mattas, Juvenile Parole Board—Not Present
Monica Crocker, Department of Corrections—Not Present

Deb Witzel—Consultant/Coordinator--Present

Guests: Molly Rowan Leach- The Peace alliance and Restorative Justice on the Rise host--Present
Amanda Mahan, Graduate Student --Present
Pete Lee Representative 18th Colorado Springs—Present via phone

Minutes taken by Jack Hubbard, Administrative Specialist, 20th Judicial District Probation

RJ COUNCIL MINUTES

7/12/13 Boulder Justice Center 9am -3pm

The meeting was formally called to order at 9:32 a.m. by Greg Brown.

1.) Approval of the May minutes

The following names in the minutes from the May meeting are corrected: Kelly Kissell, Sterling Harris, Kerri Schmidt, Sarah Park. With those corrections, a motion was made to approve and adopt the minutes, which was seconded and passed.

2.) New Business

Nancy Lewis reported that she had a meeting with the new director and assistant for the Department of Corrections and requested that they incorporate restorative justice in their agency.

3.) Budget update

The Council's activities are currently funded through two separate sources. One of these sources is a JAG grant that is in the final three months of the available award period. These funds are utilized to maintain and support the website and will be completely utilized by 9/30/13. In addition, \$17,000 is available from funds raised by the Summit and an additional \$8,000 provided by the SCAO to total \$25,000. Two funding items were discussed by the RJ Council:

- a. Deb attended the National RJ Conference in the month of June. This conference is put together and put on by a group of individuals who are working to balance the academic side of RJ with the practitioner side of RJ. As such, that group is aligned very well with the objectives of the Colorado RJ Council. Attendance at their National Conference includes a membership in their National Association, which could be a very useful resource for the Council to have. A proposal was made that the Council reimburse LCJP for the attendance of Deb at the National Conference in order to obtain a membership in this group. A motion was made that the RJ Council reimburse LCJP for Deb's attendance costs and passed.
- b. Discussion regarding the presentation of an RJ Summit in 2014. One of the original discussions that the Council had with respect to annual Summits or trainings was that, in order to build money and capacity,

it made sense to partner with the Pikes Peak group in Colorado Springs during odd years. With the Council's membership in the National organization, it might make sense to consider coordinating the 2014 Conference with Pikes Peak as well and focus on a proposal to sponsor and host the national conference in 2017. There are several issues that might be present with doing so—first, the National Conference is typically in June, though it does not have to be and that could be negotiated. In addition, with the Council now receiving funding from state sources, an issue could exist with the receipt of funds from registration fees, sponsorships, etc. It might be time for the Council to partner with an external nonprofit agency of some sort to manage these receipts; or, alternatively, receive permission to receive and expend funds as a matter of policy or legislation. Meg will check what language is necessary to be present in the legislation to enable the Council to accept funds, gifts, grants, and donations. There should be a way to do this, as DCJ and SOMB are able to receive funds and COVA contracted with Probation when they put on their first conference. There are a lot of logistical and authority issues that need to be resolved before the Council can commit to putting on a Summit or sponsoring a national event, and one benefit of coordinating with Pikes Peak for the 2014 provide time for the Council to work through these issues. A motion was put forth that the Council ask that Pikes Peak run the Summit for 2014 with some Council support, which was voted on and passed.

- c. The recent legislation provided funding for a position to support the RJ council, which will be located in the Planning and Analysis Courts section at SCAO. Eric Philp will asking Pet Lee to take a request to the legislature to give the Council permission to fill the position now and make up the cost as the fee from the legislation begins to be collected. This might enable the Council to have the position officially filled by January 1st. Greg will invite Steve from SCAO to attend the next meeting.

4.) Progress on Action Items/Workgroups - Council Updates

a. **Internal Council Capacity Building (Meg)**

*The first item on this workgroup's do list was to ensure that all of the seats on the Council were filled, which has now been accomplished. The only thing remaining is to fill the three practitioner vacancies. The Council discussed the process by which these 3 vacancies will be filled. There will be a working group that is put together to review the applications that will be submitted via the website. From that review, the working group will put together a list of the top five candidates which will be discussed by the Council as a whole. Once that list is agreed upon and finalized, it will be forwarded to SCAO, and the three appointees will be selected by SCAO. Once the announcement of these vacancies has been put together and is ready to send out, the announcement will be placed on the website and forwarded by each Council member to their email distribution lists. The application period will end on 7/31/13. Bev Title was nominated and appointed the head of the working group, which will consist of Bev, Matt, Spiro, Perrie, and Nancy.

In terms of the process: The notice of the request for applications will be sent out and also posted on the website along with the application itself. The application will then be filled in electronically on the website, and upon completion they will be submitted to an inbox housed on the administrative side of the website. Sarah and Deb will then perform an initial review of the applications as a preliminary vetting and look for things such as valid phone numbers, email addresses, and that the applicant is listed on the directory. Once the applications have been vetted, they will be forwarded to the subcommittee for a more detailed review.

The application/announcement contents were discussed to ensure that they were correct prior to posting. The cover page was made to strike the limitation on mileage and travel expenses, and will be amended to read something like "Reasonable travel expenses for attendance at meetings, including mileage and lodging, may be reimbursed for members who reside more than 100 miles away from the location of the scheduled meetings." Meetings will also not always be held in Boulder, depending on the location of the newly selected members there may be meetings held at more central locations. Finally, Molly offered to provide technical support, such as Skype, in order to enable more rural members to attend meetings. The cover page/announcement is amended to state that the RJ Council does support the use of technology to attend and participate in meetings when it is impossible to be

physically present. The Council is concerned that the representation is currently very urban and metro-Denver centered and wants to ensure that there are steps taken operationally and financially to encourage a more broad-based application pool across the state.

There was a discussion of if there should be an interview as part of the application process. The Council discussed potential concerns about requiring interviews. Interviews for these slots could be viewed as inequitable as none of the current Council members went through an interview process in order to receive their appointments. On the other hand, a number of those appointments were made through internal processes at the various agencies that the members represent. Since these appointees aren't members of an agency, the Council's process could be viewed as similar to the agency processes. In addition, the Council does have an interest in getting at the knowledge base, experience sets, and background of the finalists in more detail. The Council was cautioned that if it does decide to interview, from the perspective of the practitioners, the process needs to be extremely transparent with a clear outline of exactly what the Council is looking for in these finalists. A suggestion was made that the Council decide on a set of three questions that it puts out publicly as part of the application announcement, and state something like "the RJ Council would like to interview potential finalists as part of this selection process. In the event you are interviewed, we would like to talk to you more in depth about the following three questions." The Council is also concerned about diversity of representation on the Council, and cost of attendance, travel, etc. will be addressed at a future Council meeting in more detail.

There was a motion to amend the cover page of the announcement as discussed which was approved and adopted by the Council. The Council determined that there will be narrative limits on the application: the section on pertinent life and work experience will be capped at one page, and the vision will be limited to half of a page in 12 point font. For the questions about the models practiced and who they interface with, the answer lists from the general practice survey will be imported and used. Finally, there will be at least one clear statement that anyone appointed to the Council in this role will be expected to be aware of, acknowledge, and adhere to the code of conduct and practice standards.

A motion was made to adopt all recommendations and the procedure for the selection of the new practice members which was voted on and approved.

*Council brochure and talking points, being worked on by Meg and Beverly. They are still working on developing a mock up brochure draft for approval.

*Completion of Welcome packet. Meg is finalizing the updates to the Council history section of the packet, once that is done she will be providing the welcome packet to all of the newly appointed members (estimated to happen at the next meeting).

b. Council Internal Processes and Communications (Spiro)

*Discussion about how the Council does business and communicates, particularly during the legislative cycle. The recent RJ legislation and that legislative process highlighted the need for the Council to develop protocols for how these issues are addressed during tight time frames and changing on the ground developments. The following issues seem to be key concerns that need to be addressed: There is a need to clarify and become consistent about enforcing our processes in order to move through our activities in an efficient and effective manner. In addition, the Council in general, and individual Council members who represent the various state agencies need to have very clear understandings about to what extent they can take positions and provide feedback on proposed legislation during debate, especially now that state funding is starting to be directed to support the Council's activities. While the past approach to this question has been to ensure that one of the co-chairs of the Council is not a state employee, that does not seem to be an adequate solution given recent developments. In addition, with the speed and rapidity of developments during the legislative session, the Council needs to be able to react in a quicker manner to changes and needs to be as proactive in anticipating issues as possible. The Council's experience from the last legislative session shows that that the membership must feel that this is a safe space in which to have open, honest, and frank discussions with respect to proposed legislation

and the legislative process. One possible answer to how the Council can address these concerns is to figure out the way COVA approaches these issues. Nancy indicates that COVA has a standing public policy committee that meets on a very frequent basis. A number of issues with respect to victims are addressed and decided before they come up in legislation, and the committee spends a good amount of time surveying the landscape and attempting to determine what issues seem to be on the horizon. As part of this process, they work very hard to communicate with legislators and try very hard to never surprise them and let them know where COVA stands on a policy issue before there is a conflict. COVA also retains a lobbyist who monitors all changes to proposed legislation and lets COVA staff know when changes are afoot that need to be discussed, there are frequent conference calls to determine COVA's position during the legislative session, and a commitment from those staff to be available. Given the groundwork COVA has laid, perhaps a similar setup would work for the RJ Council—with a conference call group who commits to being available and responsive to issues that come up during the legislative session, and perhaps someone designated to be in the capitol during the legislative session. As part of that set up, the Council also needs to figure out how to identify potential legislation and issues before they are brought up so that it can be proactive instead of reactive.

There are two parts to this discussion: 1. figuring out a way to become proactive and developing an internal group that is monitoring the filed for upcoming developments and potential changes and 2. Development of a group that has the ability to react to changes during the course of a legislative session. A proposal was made that the Council create a legislative working group which will meet between the larger Council meetings which is designed as a group that proactively prepares for the upcoming legislative session. As an aside, Pete Lee will be calling into the meeting during the afternoon session and this might be a good subject to raise with him to see if he has any thoughts about this process. In addition, there are some issues that need to be cleaned up in the legislative text from previous sessions (such as funding issues for the conference/receipt of revenues, the actual FTE status of this allocated position, etc.). This experience has shown that there is a need to make sure that the Council is very clear about what gets put in legislation since it is very hard to change or clarify after it is passed. In addition, as part of this committee, Council members who are part of state agencies committed to developing relationships with their internal legislative liaisons in order to have an additional line of communication and an understanding about what needs the RJ Council needs to have communicated to the process and why. If possible, agency legislative liaisons should be encouraged to attend the RJ Summits. Attendance at legislative events and discussions during the session could be a requirement of the consultant position as well; they can serve the lobbyist role that COVA has someone performing. Currently, this is more designed as a think-tank group and an issue identification body, but these roles could develop out of it. This is also an area in which the Council could interface very well with the RJ Directors' group. Bev's suggestion is that this working group include representation from the Directors and possibly other outside groups. At this time, this subgroup will be comprised of Spiro, Nancy, Deb, Meg (when available), and Matt. Deb volunteered to be the Council point person for this group as long as she is serving in her current consultant role for the Council. Perrie raised the final issue that there are supposed to be limits on how the funding that is coming in to the Council can be spent, and part of the new position's functions is to identify how to fund the pilots. These topics should be part of this subcommittee's agenda.

*Become more efficient in decision-making and strategizing

*Does the Council need to designate an Executive Committee that can address issues that come up in a rapid manner and make decisions if they are needed? An issue was raised about how to replace the third member of that committee if they leave during their term. Pursuant to the by-laws, an initial motion was made to amend the by-laws regarding the executive committee to read: In the event that any position on the executive committee becomes vacant, the Council shall appoint a person or persons to fill those position(s) for the remainder of the current appointment period. The first reading was done for review, amendment, and consideration, and will be voted on for final adoption at the next Council meeting.

*Improve Communication. There might be situations that require an immediate decision from the Council. Council members are asked to make a response of any kind a priority to these requests, even if the response is "I am unable to respond due to X". Candace provided her private email to the Council in order to ensure that she can be contacted. Matt suggested that the Council adopt a standard format for these requests when they arise so that members are aware a response is required, something simple like: here's the issue, what feedback do you have? Council members generally agreed to be responsive to these requests.

*Ensuring quorums are present for all meetings. It is very important that people who are appointed to the Council attend the meetings, and the Council will continue to have an expectation that attendance is required. Things happen too fast, and with the increase in the Council's size, it is important everyone be in the same room and talking on a regular basis. Molly offered her technological expertise to help enable remote meeting attendance.

*Meg will continue to develop the introductory package and the orientation process for new Council members will be a focus of discussion at the August meeting.

c. External Standards (Perrie)

*Perrie reports that she has gotten no feedback from the outreach efforts that she has made about the standards. Given that these were previously discussed and vetted extensively through the Council and the RJ Directors and there has been no additional response from the community, it appears that we are now at the point of posting the standards as fully adopted. The draft designation will be removed from the document on the website. The Council does understand and intend this to be a living document, and can be amended upon feedback from the community at a future time via the formation of issue specific ad hoc groups. Since there are now a number of pilot projects that are going to be bound by these standards with on the ground work, there might be questions or requests for clarification when these start to be adhered to by practitioners.

*Standards- Draft is removed from the document title and a comment will be added that the document is a living document which can be amended.

*Set date for stakeholder meetings (Beverly)—Krista Brittan wanted to be involved in this conversation when it takes place. It has not happened yet, but Bev will continue to work on this item and report back to the Council. Molly is willing to assist with supporting attendance of stakeholders at these meetings through virtual technology.

*Corrections-based Victim Services agencies (looking at Victim Offender Dialog within systems) – Spiro

*Discussion around common language.

d. Education and Engagement (Matt)

Matt has put together two proposals for presentations/sessions at the next COVA conference. There has not been a determination on who has been selected as of this meeting.

*PowerPoint Draft (Matt): Matt is in the process of putting together a draft power point presentation. For DA presentations, Matt asked Stan what information would be particularly relevant and useful for those audiences. Stan responded that the presentation should focus on having DA's leave with three main themes: RJ can save you money and time, and can be handled in a way that is fair to victims to get a good result, and when done well is something the defense can't manipulate. We will eventually need to do put together trainings for Deputy DA's to help them identify where RJ can work and where RJ might not be a viable option. Examples of referred cases that worked with some information about why would be useful in this process. Stan offered to assist Matt in the finalization of his presentations for DA's and their staff when he's gotten the presentation in close to final form.

*List of DAs and other' contacts for presentation schedule (Meg)- Stan offered to provide a list of the DA's so that Meg can begin putting together a presentation schedule. The next meeting is August 2nd. There needs to be a volunteer to do the presentation in the Pueblo DA's office. Matt has put together an outline for this particular presentation and has asked for some feedback. He does not know how long he needs to plan to present or how to tailor the information. He asked the Council to provide him some assistance in identifying which one big, key idea the attending DA's should leave with when the presentation is completed. His overview at this point is that he has a structure of a three act presentation, the first act is "What is RJ" with a methodology of knocking holes in the knowledge of the audience and using those holes to address misunderstandings and fill in knowledge gaps with the RJ Council's perspective. The second act is to identify the stakeholders in RJ processes, followed by a third act which gives an overview of what an RJ process looks like in practice. The Council provided feedback that the anything presented in an overview can become stuck in attendees minds as "this is what RJ is" and he should make sure to paint with broader brushstrokes than a specific modality. Matt will work more on this particular section of the presentation and send it to Council members for review and revisions. This discussion was followed by a determination that the Council should develop more directed presentations for the pilot project locations in order to address those specific needs.

*Blog topics and articles for RJ site – Deb reminded the Council members that they need to provide these in order to support the activity on the website.

*Website traffic report. Between April and June there were 23,267 visits to the website and there were 4 blogs posted. First time/unique visits increased by 7,000. It appears that there is definitely interest, and if more blogs are posted there would be more traffic and activity. During the same time period, we sent 3 email blasts to 746 recipients which had an open rate of 250. There are 6 new member accounts and 3 more additions to the directory.

e. **External Research (Greg)**

*There will be a meeting on July 17th with the research people to begin to get some parameters around the expectations for the data that needs to be getting collected by the pilots. At that meeting, the Council has invited researchers, database miners, and pilot project folks to come and discuss these data collection mandates and try to figure out what data collection systems currently exist and which need to be developed or created to meet the requirements of the legislation. One thing that is already in place is the systems that DCJ has created for administering the juvenile diversion programs. Projected attendees for the 7/17 meeting are the Omni Institute, representatives from each of the pilot projects, Dana Software, Civicore, Ft. Collins, Boulder County, VINE, Insight to Impact, Amanda Mahan, researchers from CSU and Metro State, STAAT, and database professionals who Perrie has contacted. Fundamentally, a review of the legislation showed that there are a large number of mandated data points that need to be collected, and a large number of these currently are not being collected. Under the legislation, the pilot projects are responsible for collecting the data and the Council is then responsible for putting it together in a usable format and reporting it. In the legislation, the requirement is framed as collecting the cost of each process and determining cost savings and recidivism/demographic information for specific RJ processes. One thought that was presented was if there was a way to track what it costs an individual to go through a standard criminal justice process and compare it to the costs of an RJ process. The primary goal for the 7/17 meeting is to identify the most efficient and cost effective data collection systems that are web based in order to meet the legislative mandate; and to find if something exists that meets these requirement that we can build the additional data collection requests into it instead of reinventing the wheel. If something does not exist, then the meeting will be helpful in establishing what can be developed in the time before the mandates go into effect on 8/7/13. From the point of collecting the data, we then need to reconnect back to the points that Stan mentioned earlier as important for DA's and establish a team that is moving forward on these data collection processes. In support of the data collection needs, Amanda Mahan has already put together the foundational information about project locations, offerings, and served populations.

There is a difference between the data collection requirements for pilot projects and non-pilot projects. The general collection requirements are:

- *Satisfaction data, to be collected from a satisfaction survey administered pre- and post- process for all participants. The RJ Council will have to develop this survey. Roger sent Deb some samples of satisfaction surveys that they use in their state, so there's a starting place to work from. In support of this requirement, the RJ Council will have to figure out a way to train the system players, including those in the courts, on who gets these surveys and when.
- *The number of cases in which RJ was considered, used, and not used.
- *The demographic information about program participants.
- *The RJ practice(s) used and the results of the satisfaction evaluations for those processes. These need to be identified by the court, by the outcome, and the point of the system at which the RJ consideration was made.

In addition to this data, the pilot projects are required to collect:

- *The description of the RJ processes used and costs associated with those processes
- *The number of juveniles in that location's justice system who met criteria for participation in the RJ pilot.
- *The number of juveniles who participated in the pilot, their demographic information, and their charge at the point of arrest.
- *The number of juveniles who reached an RJ agreement and successfully completed.
- *For those who did not complete successfully, the reasons for not succeeding.
- *The results of the satisfaction evaluations.
- *The number of juveniles who participated in the pilot RJ process and who then had a subsequent arrest or petition filed within one year.
- *Victim information, including the number of victims contacted, the number who participated, the number who submitted victim impact statements, the number who participated by use of a surrogate, and the number who declined to participate.

Perrie indicated that, in her location, it seems like a lot of that data is currently already being collected in various ways. A lot of the non-pilot specific data is not information that a practitioner would have easy access to, a lot of it seems to be more Judicial or law enforcement process system data. In order to get at that information, a suggestion was made to invite staff from CDAC to attend on 7/17. This process is similar with what had to be done to get the data systems in place for diversion, and there might be some knowledge from that experience that would be useful in setting up these data collection methods.

The Council identified that some of the challenges in data collection could come from some of the specific mandates. In particular:

- *There are large number of points at which RJ referrals are made in the system, and it may be difficult to capture each of them.
- *Data is tracked by programs and locations using a wide variety of methods and systems.
- *Capacity—which programs have the staff who have the knowledge, skill set, and available staff time to achieve this data collection and compilation.

The first report to DCJ on these programs is due December 1st, 2014 for the pilot project. Initially, the information will be put together to provide a picture of where things are at the start of these pilot programs which can then be compared to the results during the life of the projects. Representative Lee indicated that the Council is considered to be the expert on the field and is open to feedback about the requirements and the information that the legislature is interested in knowing. If there are more efficient or effective measures, he is willing to return to the process and attempt to make changes to the

legislative requirements. In particular, there seems to be a great deal of interest in the use of RJ as a proportion of the utilization of the criminal justice system.

On Wednesday, the Council needs to get these requirements communicated to the pilot projects and get an understanding of what resources are available and what is doable given the time frames that we are operating under. The reports that will be submitted to DCJ might have to include caveats about what information can be collected and which information is not accessible due to the limitations of the system. One objective of the meeting is to have the pilot project staff assess what can be done and what it would cost to put together the necessary tracking systems for these data points. The pilot projects stepped forward to take on these responsibilities, and should be resources for gathering a lot of this information, even if the amount of information requested appears to be overwhelming.

*On August 6th, 2013, there will be a meeting from 9-3 with staff from the locations who have Pilot Projects at the Boulder Justice Center. The Council spent the remainder of the meeting setting the agenda for this meeting and establishing the information that needs to get communicated and understood before the 8/7/13 start date.

First Segment: This part of the presentation will focus on introductions and provide an overview of the data collection requirements, definitions, processes/systems. There will be discussions with the pilots about where they are at, what their vision is, and what progress they have already made. This part will conclude with an assessment of where the projects perceive their problems to be and what potential solutions they have already come up with. At this point, the elected DA's will be allowed to leave and the remainder of the agenda will be presented with more of an open space approach than a traditional training/board meeting approach.

Second Segment: This segment will start with the review of what the Council knows about the implementation timeline. Discussion will include the funded staff position, when money could possibly start being available for the pilot projects, and what training and technical assistance the Council can provide and how it can provide those resources. There will be discussion about what resources are in place in each location, the standards and practice guidelines, and potential RJ support in each location from the system and from community practitioners. This discussion will also help identify if there's a gap in any pilot location which might help the Council to proactively prepare for any pitfalls that might show up. In this section, there might be a place for Mike Riede to present his RJ introduction in order to establish a joint shared starting place with common language and common ground (the Council discussed this potentially being added to the start of the day as a first agenda item). This segment will conclude with a discussion of what money programs might be asking for when it becomes available so that the Council can plan, but that discussion will be framed in order to avoid asking a general "what do you want" followed by the disappointment caused by not being able to provide everything asked for.

Final Points for the Meeting: Finally, the meeting will wrap up with a sense of what each pilot intends to do and what their plan and visions are and what expectations they have of the Council. There will be some discussion about sustainability of their projects into the future. Finally, they will be invited to attend future Council meetings.

Deb will use this information to construct an agenda, and then forward it to the Council for members to sign up for sections.

*The Council feels that there will need to be future, in depth conversations about the legislation as it applies to the pilots; including how to distribute future funding and those decision making processes. In order to facilitate responsiveness to the pilots, the Council formed a pilot project subcommittee that will consist of Meg, Esther, and Greg. An additional agenda item for this subcommittee is evaluating the part time designation of the funded position in light of the expectations and job duties and attempting to find ways to increase the available funded staff support.

*Amanda provided an update to the RJ Council on her research and project, and answered questions. She received feedback from the Council on her proposed letter of intent and her problem statement. Finally, she asked for and received suggestions from the Council on how her research can support the Council's work with the pilot projects.

*Bev has been contacted by someone in Yuma who is asking about how to start an RJ program in their schools. She's not sure there's a good answer yet about how to provide this information and support, but is seeing potential with the technology solutions that Molly has to start allowing this to happen.

*Molly provided a handout regarding technology solutions to the Council.

c. Ongoing Agenda and Action Items:

- How do we have the balance of the 3 entities in our process i.e. community, victim, offender? Currently being addressed; this is what the conversation was about today.
- Bev/Nancy and Greg do the True Colors training with us?
- Continue to keep an eye on professional development and expansion of knowledge of RJ possibilities for the members of the Council, e.g., RJ for bullying in schools. Training on EBP in Criminal Justice , implementation science work. Greg will be setting up a few of these trainings and pay for them
- Update on COSA—Greg
- Spiro will review the victim empathy curriculum that the Council obtained from the Forum. As part of that review, he will develop a list of suggested changes for the Council to review and consider for adoption. Can be on a future agenda

The next Restorative Justice Council meeting will be in the Boulder Justice Center in the Probation Department Conference Room on Friday, Aug 9th, from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. IMPLEMENTATION SCIENCE will be a part of that agenda