

STATE OF COLORADO

The Colorado Restorative Justice Council engages communities to create lifelong cultures of respect and responsibility.



Matt Riede, Chair, 1st Judicial District Victim Advocate— Present

Alice Price, Practitioner, Vice Chair— Present

Spiro Koinis, Division of Youth Corrections Victim and Restorative Justice Services Coordinator (Past Chair)—

Greg Brown, Chief Probation Officer, Twentieth Judicial District (Executive Committee)—

Melissa Westover, Practitioner/CCRJ Director (Executive Committee) - Present

Meg Williams, Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Justice, Manager – Present

Robb Miller, Deputy District Attorney, Nineteenth Judicial District-

Mary Mc Ghee, Colorado Organization for Victim Assistance Board Member— Present

Robin Singer, Colorado Department of Education – Present

Stacy Davis, Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Council—

Rebecca Oakes, Adult Parole Board— Present

Pat Kelly, Juvenile Parole Board— Present

Monica Chambers, Department of Corrections—Present

Lynn Lee , Practitioner Pikes Peak Restorative Justice Council — Present

Martin Gonzales, Judge, 12th Judicial District—

Elizabeth Porter-Merrill, Public Defender State of Colorado—Present

Benito Garcia, Chief of Police Milliken, CO- Present

Luke Yoder, Executive Director Center for Restorative Programs, CCRJ Director- Present

Jennifer Gallegos- Practitioner member, The RJ Solution- Present

Facilitation by: Matt Riede

Brenidy Rice: Present

Minutes taken by: Recoded and transcribed by Matt Riede

Guests: Dana Rae (COVA NIJ project)

RJ COUNCIL MINUTES

Regular Meeting

June 2, 2017 9a-3p

Jefferson County Courts Building, 100 Jefferson County Parkway, Golden CO 80401

Lookout Mountain Conference Room

1. Welcome Introductions (Welcome new RJ Council member Jen Gallegos)

Jen Gallegos introduces herself: her background is mostly in education. She taught math at a private high school where she transitioned into special education. She then worked at North High School where she was introduced to RJ. At Thornton High School she became Dean of Students and began implementing RJ practices. She then went to Jefferson County schools as an assistant principle where she also implemented RJ practice for students and faculty. Currently she is taking time off from teaching to be home with her baby.

2. RJ Council Business:

Matt informed the Council that he is applying for the RJ coordinator position and will leave the room when the Council discusses this agenda item. The Council agreed to go into executive session and turn off the recoding once Matt leaves the room.

Vote to Adopt April minutes:

Jack has not been able to complete the minutes yet, but is working on them. It is the end of the fiscal year which has required all of his extra time. The RJ Council will vote to adopt the minutes at the August meeting.

3. CCRJD Training Document

Pat was working with Mary and Spiro to provide Tyler and the CCRJD with feedback on the training document. Tyler will take the feedback to the July CCRJD meeting for their review and then present the next draft at the August RJ Council meeting. Mary will show the document to Nancy Lewis at COVA to see if she has any feedback.

Some lessons learned from this review process:

- In general, the Council wants to make sure all stakeholders are involved with creating a document before it goes to final draft.
- The Council could have given the CCRJD more guidance and tools as they were creating the document.
- The Council needs to make sure that there is a strong communication loop between groups/individuals they are working with.

Action Steps: Mary and Spiro will work with Tyler on the document in preparation for the July 27th CCRJD meeting. Mary will present the document to Nancy Lewis, so that she has a chance to provide feedback. Pat will get the updated document from Tyler once it's completed and send it to Matt so that he can send it to the entire Council for their review prior to the August Council meeting. The Council will vote to adopt the document at the August 24th meeting.

4. NIJ Grant Project

Dana Vaughn-Kivenge at COVA:

Dana reached out to victim advocates, crime victim support groups and victim service communities from all over the state to gain their insight/feedback on the NIJ victim information flyer. She estimates around 50 people were able to review the document. RJ and VOD is not well understood in the victim advocate community. She is putting together an educational and awareness campaign. She put out two surveys to victim advocates to see what their needs were in regards to education and awareness of RJ and VOD. Most victim advocates conveyed through the survey that needed more educational materials to hand out to victims. Dana stressed that it is critical to get the victim advocate community onboard with RJ and VODs, because they are the gatekeepers to victims for the study. She has been contacting researchers around the U.S. to see what studies are available to look at how to better engage victims and victim service communities in RJ.

COVA's RJ Program database and status of rjcolorado.org database:

Dana also reported that in an effort to engage the Colorado RJ community in the conversation about victim engagement she discovered that about a third of the practitioners and directors listed on the RJ Council website is no longer valid. She has been creating a database on her own of the RJ practitioners around the state so she can refer victims to practicing RJ programs. She is finding a lot of mistrust from the victim service community of RJ, so she sees a need to bring together the victim services community and the RJ community.

Pat was wondering if Dana can provide us with her updated database. Matt stated that it is actually mandated in statute that the database be updated annually and that he's not sure how the Council has been ensuring that this update is happening. Liz recommends that there be an automated message that is sent to the registered practitioners and directors requiring that they reactivate their membership. Dana reported that some of the practitioners listed on the website no longer reside in Colorado, but wanted to stay connected to the RJ community here. The quarterly newsletter would be the most appropriate source of information/connection for the out of state practitioners, but we only want in state practitioners listed in the database.

Action step: Matt will look into addressing the out-of-date database on our website. Melissa, Lynn and Jen reported difficulties using the database. Lynn stated that she had a difficult time putting up Kay Pranis' training on the website. Please send Matt any other issues you have experienced with the website. Jen stated that education people are contacting her and telling her the website is not user friendly.

Discuss VOD flyer and next steps for COVA:

Mary suggested that probation VSOs, NYC and DOC be listed on the flyer as potential contacts for the VOD study. Dana stated that the research group determined that it would be best to make her the point of contact for victims on the brochure and that then Dana can then refer victims to the various agencies. Dana's role is to oversee the control group of the study (those who are not participating). Matt stated that probation VSOs could potentially put the VOD flyer in their initial notification letters to victims and include in the letter the possible benefits from participating in a VOD. Monica stated that she can provide DOCs HRVOD brochure and an email brochure which contains great information on the benefits for victims. She said probation can borrow and adapt from her brochure to meet probation's needs. Monica will send everyone on the Council the emailed version. She will also send us the brochure. Lynn had a question around why the NIJ study left out child abuse. Dana stated that they are not having any children involved in this study, victim or offender, and that is why child abuse was left out. Meg the Office for Victims Programs would be a great group to send this flyer to and she wants to get them up-to-speed with this study. They have contacts all over the state. Dana stated that Kelly Kissell has been attending some of their meetings, but Dana will do additional outreaches as well.

Dana stated that this version of the brochure is the final draft of the document and that it can be accessed on COVA's website. Melissa would like the Council to help the project with communication and

outreach efforts. How can we assist? Perhaps we can have the training committee can look into outreach efforts for the NIJ project.

Next steps for COVA NIJ project:

Dana will be doing webinars and sending out information to make sure victim services communities are engaged and excited about the study. She is also encouraging that the RJ community to send in proposals for presentations for the COVA conference.

John Wilson's HRVOD training experience for Council members:

Mary said that John Wilson and Lynn Lee's trainings are very complementary. She felt like it was a positive experience and it was a diverse group of professionals. Liz thought it was a great training. She felt that the training was victim centered and is confident in communicating that to the victim services community. Next step is for new facilitators to team up with a more experienced facilitator to facilitate a VOD. John Wilson's training was focused on theory and discussion, but lacked practice. Which is why Lynn's training is such a nice compliment to John's because her training incorporates practice. Mary stated that she will be taking this piece back to the NIJ subcommittee to discuss curriculum and creating the most effective training. She will also ask the subcommittee how the RJ Council can support education and outreach efforts to the "gatekeepers".

5. Pilot Programs Memo to the Council

Matt gave the background and reason for the Memo from the Pilot programs. Matt spoke with the 12th, 19th and the 20th JDs to better understand their challenges and barriers. Matt went through some of the challenges and barriers the pilot programs are facing:

Distinguishing data from different processes:

There is concern that the pilot programs do not have a full three years of data collection yet. And now that the pilot programs have sunset, they are concerned that data collection will be diluted with the new program's information, which are school based processes.

Finding other funding sources to supplement RJ Council funding limits their ability to collect data:

If programs go to other funding sources, like DCJ, JAG and TGYS to supplement RJ Council funding, they are then going to have to go through different reporting requirements with the other grants. The RJ Council's funded programs database is the most cumbersome of all of them.

Luke: another important point is that it's not just the different places or databases that programs have to enter data, but that they also have to separate populations they are serving for each funding source, which pulls the data into a bunch of different pieces. For example, with diversion funding they can only enter into diversion's database clients who have been served through diversion funds. It limits the pool of data that they are able to report on the pilot programs.

Possible solutions:

- Allow funded programs to enter in all cases they are serving into the RJ cash fund database. This would still require duplicated data entry, but it would begin to streamline the process.
- Work with DCJ on a database to streamline data entry.

Meg: The hard part is that she has to report to the State Legislature on how many kids the 1.2 million diversion funds served and the outcomes deriving from that specific fund. Meg thinks that we could potentially separate the data collection and evaluation piece. Specifically, the data collection piece would be used to report back to the funders the information they need. And then for evaluation piece can be more inclusive of all the kids served in an RJ program. For example, we could look at the services that are similar and determine if we can streamline the evaluations for kids who go through similar services. Meg suggests that we bring together the three main funding sources TGYS (CSU), DCJ (who is also using OMNI) and the RJ Council to look at mitigating duplicative efforts of the RJ programs.

Action Step: Matt will finish his analysis of the pilot programs challenges and barriers. And then we can pull OMNI and the programs in to see if we can address these data entry issues. Meg will work with Matt and this piece.

Issues with data collection and evaluation:

Some of the programs have reported spending a huge amount of time working with the Council's database trying to figure out why their numbers are off from the ones the Council is collecting. One program stated that they have dedicated hours and hours to this piece. One program reported that they do not use the Council's database for their own program tracking purposes, because they do not trust the accuracy of the data. One program stated that this is the first quarter where there has not been a discrepancy in data collection between what they have on their spreadsheet and what the RJ database is reporting back to them. OMNI does work hard to resolve these data issues with the programs and it's the most RJ focused evaluation effort that Luke has ever been a part of.

Meg remembers having this conversation before, and that part of the challenge for evaluators is that RJ is unique to other services in the juvenile justice system.

The data is an accurate representation of the overall trends, but it can be improved. The important question to ask is how will these data flaws impact the overall data evaluation? Brenidy was able to meet with OMNI and they informed her that around the January/February time period ETO did some updates on their database which caused inaccurate data to be pulled, impacting the trust funded programs had in ETO.

The pilots have gone through tons of revisions of the database and every time it happens it impacts the data they were collecting previously.

The survey expanded from 9 questions to 43 questions:

Luke is not clear on who made the decision to expand the survey. We need to look at the evaluation process and see if we can explain how the additional questions are helping with the evaluation as a whole. Lynn said that it would be great to have a survey that all RJ practitioners can use, but it needs to be reduced to fewer questions or no one would use it.

Little communication from the Council on the step-down in funding:

It wasn't clear to them that we would start stepping down the funding for the programs and when that would occur. In fact, when the pilot programs provision of the statute was repealed, some of the pilot programs were not sure if they would continue to receive funding from the RJ Council. Matt looked at the Council's minutes since 2012 and it was not clear to him when the Council made the decision to begin the step-down in funding. **Recommendation:** develop a formal process of how we communicate our intention with the funded programs, perhaps through a formal memo if need be to keep record. The Council was not sure financially what the commitment would be for funding additional programs beyond the pilot programs. The Council needs to then determine what our commitment should be to programs. Will funding be in perpetuity? Or will funding last for a certain number of years like JAG grants which try to promote community investment into programs? But we need to get a sense from SCAO what our continued funding levels will be at in the future, so that the Council can determine how we will fund programs and the different types of programs.

Action steps for the Council regarding the budget:

General assembly members during the continuation hearing were questioning the remaining balance in the RJ cash fund. The Council risks re-allocation of funding if there is money in the cash fund, or even decreasing the surcharge from \$10 to \$8 or even \$7. The Council needs to be sure it has a clear message on how we've spent the money, our long-range plan and our efforts to education the RJ community on who to apply for funding.

How can the Council support Judicial's efforts with communicating the Council's efforts and needs? The Council is advisory to the Chief Justice, so Council members cannot advocate on behalf of the Council to the General Assembly.

Action step: Brenidy will invite Terry Scallon to a meeting with the RJ Council sub-committee before the next RJ Council meeting. Members of legislative sub-committee: Alice (Chair of sub-committee) Lynn, Liz, Melissa and Mary are members of the legislative sub-committee. Mary will work with Brenidy to coordinate a meeting with Terry before the next Council meeting.

Mary said it's going to be important over the coming months to clarify roles of staff and the Council, before we determine clear lines of communication between the funded programs and the Council.

There is concern that funding will decrease more quickly than they can be replace it:

The state is clear on what the cost is for the diversion program per juvenile compared to probation and NYC. Therefore, it would be really helpful to have that same information about the cost benefit of the RJ program per juvenile referral.

Focus on long-term viability of pilot programs has shifted to onboarding new programs:

Quarterly meetings have primarily been focused on addressing issues of the programs that are just getting started and it's moved away from the issues the pilot programs are facing with their development. Luke emphasized that the pilot programs are committed to bringing the other programs along, but he feels like they've lost the space to talk about how they grow.

Suggestions from pilot programs moving forward:

1. Three year funding plan that is specific and clear
2. Create a cost benefit analysis for the programs, so that can be used to educate their local funding sources.
3. Pilot site specific meeting focusing on their needs and challenges.

Action step: Matt will work with Meg and Mary to continue to learn about barriers and challenges of the funded programs and bring OMNI into the conversation.

6. FY 18 Funded Programs

The RJ Council funded two additional programs this year out of 10. All six funded programs were continued. Total amount awarded to programs is \$691,052.82 Teens Inc. and YouthZone. The original intent of the Council was to dedicate \$800,000 to fund programs in FY 18, but there were some unanticipated expenses from the evaluation and database cost, which decreased the amount we could spend toward programs.

Matt sent letters to the programs that were awarded funds and letters to the programs that were not approved. Some of the declined programs are requesting feedback on why they were not awarded funding. How should the Council address this issue? Meg's board makes their initial recommendation, and when they deny funding, she requires that they give her specific information on why they scored them low. Some the declined programs use that information to appeal the decision other programs use that information to improve their next application.

Mary reports that the funded programs sub-committee were a little frustrated with how the process unfolded and that ultimately their recommendation was not followed. The primary areas of concern were that the Council announced that \$300,000 would be used to fund new programs, which turned out not being the case for the reasons mentioned about additional funding for OMNI and the database. The sub-committee recommended that six new programs be funded for FY 18, but due to staffing considerations only two programs were approved for funding. Mary thinks it is critical that the Council be clear about staff and Council responsibilities and have a solid long-range budget, so this does not happen during the next round of funding.

Recommendation: We could create two bodies, one that reviews and scores the grants adding notes that are strengths and weaknesses. And create a second body that takes those reviews and scores and then makes the final selection of the top grants.

The JAG Board scores their grants online. And they have the applicants come in and present their applications. Then on the last day they rank order high to low. The score is not the final determinant, because the need for the program can outweigh a well written grant.

Action step: Mary and the funded programs sub-committee will create a script and do a follow-up phone call with the one declined program requesting feedback. She will first create a script and send it out. Mary will also make the phone call to that program.

Action step: Funded programs sub-committee will discuss lessons learned from the FY 18 grant review process and report out at the retreat.

Action step: Sub-committee will also draft a letter for declined programs that will speak to areas of improvements for each of the declined programs.

7. RJ Council Committees:

Matt stated that he was reviewing the action plan created from the retreat in 2016 retreat and it appears there are a number of incomplete tasks. We may have over scheduled ourselves in terms of what we wanted to do. Meg stated that we probably do not have the staff to accomplish the things we set out to do at the 2016 retreat, so it's critical that we're realistic with what we're able to do. We need to be clear about staff and the Councils capacity to do the work. Let's spread the work out over a 3-5 year period at the August retreat.

Action step: Matt will send out Judith Burton's report to the Council. Is Jude reaching out to the each council member?

8. RJ Budget and Cash Fund

Taking out ETO from the OMNI contract with the intention of moving to a new database was only a difference of \$16,000 when it was originally thought that it would be a difference \$60,000.

Facilicase proposed an amount for development and licenses to use the database, which by Brenidy's assessment is a reasonable proposed cost. We will be moving from ETO to Facilicase. Brenidy provided the Council with a copy of Facilicases proposal which covers three years.

The hope is that other RJ programs from all over the state could use and be entering data into the system and collecting statewide RJ data.

This fiscal year is dedicated to development and we should be able to launch the new database in FY 19.

9. Training and Education/Awareness – NARCJ 2019 Conference

PD and DA's office:

Purpose of this project is to get a PD and DA to do outreach and education across the whole state. Council members met with Doug and he had the idea of working with the Denver DA Beth Mc... It sounds like both of them are thinking more funding would be needed for this position. It was the intent to make it a part-time position, but Doug and Beth do not think \$100,000 at 50/50 is enough to fund the position.

Doug would consider putting in a .5 FTE position into his budget, but that is more of a long-term plan. Liz recommends that we set up another meeting with Doug and Beth.

The original intent of the Council was to fund these two positions in the FY 18 budget, but we ran out of funding and had to put this initiative into the FY 19 budget. The hope is that the PD's office and DA dedicate funding toward these positions as well.

Action step: Brenidy and Judicial budget staff will update the Council on the budget.

Action step: Then set up meeting with Doug and Beth to continue discussion/planning of these two positions.

Recommendation: Bring in the 19th and 20th JDs to provide feedback on how to approach the DA's office with this project.

Pikes Peak Conference: Lynn is reporting that they are not putting on a 2018 conference. They will continue on with small workshops, like they did with Kay Pranis.

NARCJ 2019 Conference: Luke and Lynn will attend the 2019 advisory committee meeting at the Oakland Conference to represent the RJ Council. Deb will let us know what our role will be with the 2019 conference.

Conflict resolution month is in October Liz and Lynn did a presentation for them a while ago.

Monica and Spiro will be in Hershey, PA attending the National Association of Victim Assistance and Corrections conference. They will be presenting on the NIJ project and the Councils efforts at the conference.

Action step: Liz made a suggestion that Council members bring potential conferences that they would like to present at to the retreat in August.

Liz was asked to be a part of an RJ panel at the Charles Koch Institute conference "Advancing Justice Summit" in October. The summit will be held in DC. **Action step:** Mary will get Liz in contact with Susan Howley from National Center for Victims of Crime, who are also speaking on the panel, to talk with them about the summit and their role on the panel.

10. RJ Council Retreat:

Anjali notified Brenidy that she is only available Friday and not Thursday for the retreat. The Council agreed to switch the meeting dates, the regular council meeting will be on Thursday August 24th and the retreat on Friday on August 25th.

Brenidy will look in the budget to see if we can pay for Council rooms.

Action step: The executive committee will work with Anjali to figure out the agenda and get it out to the Council.

11. RJ Coordinator Position:

The Council went into executive session and Matt left the room and turned off the recorder.

The Council came back together and adjourned the meeting