Regular Board Meeting
Thursday, November 30, 2017
10 a.m. to 12 p.m.
Michael A. Bilandic Building, 160 N. LaSalle, N-505
Chicago, Illinois

AGENDA

I. Call to Order and Roll Call

II. Approval of Minutes

III. Chairperson’s Remarks

IV. Executive Director’s Report

V. ICJIA Financial Report

VI. Committee Reports

VII. Discussion: ICJIA’s Board Member Priorities

VIII. Public Comment

IX. Adjourn
Memorandum

To: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority Board Members

From: Judge Elizabeth Robb, Chair, and John Maki, Executive Director

Date: November 16, 2017

Re: November 30, 2017, Meeting Overview

The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority’s (ICJIA) Quarterly Board Meeting will be held Thursday, November 30th, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 pm. at the Michael A. Bilandic Building (160 N. LaSalle in Chicago), room N-505. (Please note, we have changed the meeting to Thursday at 10:00 to better accommodate members’ attendance.) To enter the Bilandic Building, visitors must present a valid State I.D. and pass through a metal detector. All ICJIA Board meetings are subject to the Open Meetings Act. Members of the general public are encouraged to attend.

ICJIA’s statutorily-created oversight Board serves a unique and vital role in improving the State’s public safety outcomes. Composed of state and local public safety officials, policy experts, and community leaders, the Board is designed to embody and represent the state’s criminal justice system. It is tasked with setting agency priorities, tracking the progress of ongoing programs, and overseeing the agency’s grant-making. To that end, ICJIA’s quarterly Board meetings bring research and practical insights to bear on important and emerging issues affecting public safety in Illinois, with the goal of identifying how the agency should address them through research and grant-making.

The primary focus of this meeting will be a presentation and discussion about our members’ current priorities and concerns about the criminal justice system and practices in Illinois. To facilitate this presentation, I ask that each member be prepared to give a 2-3 minute overview of what he or she sees as the most important criminal justice priorities. Afterward, staff will moderate a discussion among the board about how these priorities fit into ICJIA’s ongoing strategic planning process. As background, I have attached to this memo the principles and priorities that the Board has approved for the Justice Assistance Grant, Violence Against Women Act, and Victims of Crime Act formula funds. I will reach out to you prior to the board meeting to get your initial thoughts about this discussion.
Time permitting, ICJIA’s executive staff will provide members with essential updates on the agency’s work. This will include updates on our federal formula grants, state-funded programs, and our strategic policy initiatives.

We look forward to your participation and guidance.

John Maki,  
Executive Director
Guiding Principles

1. Legitimacy: Criminal justice practices and policy should provide an equitable justice system for all Illinois residents by strengthening the trust between the public and the justice system and promoting the fair distribution of rights, resources and opportunities.

2. Fair and Just: Criminal justice laws, policies, and practices should be fairly and effectively enforced, ensuring that punishment is proportional to the seriousness of the offense committed, designed to achieve offender accountability, victim restoration and public safety, and limited to the amount necessary to achieve the intended outcomes.

3. Respect: Criminal justice practices and policy should ensure that victims are treated with respect in regard to their dignity and privacy, and that their rights are enforced.

4. Due Process: Criminal justice practices and policy should ensure that all individuals are afforded equal access to fair treatment under the law.

5. Recovery: Support and services should be provided to victims who suffer physical, emotional or financial harm as the direct result of the offender’s criminal conduct. These services should be provided whether or not the victims choose to participate in the criminal justice system.

6. Rehabilitation: The criminal justice system should require and support offender rehabilitation services to offenders who want them. These services should be provided in a culturally competent, gender sensitive, and trauma informed manner.

7. Strengthen Communities: The criminal justice system should strengthen communities and their capacities to prevent crime and violence.

8. Prevention: The criminal justice system should prevent crime and violence to mitigate its harmful effects on individuals and communities.

9. Research Informed: Criminal justice policies and practices should be informed by statistics, research, and community input. Criminal justice data, statistical analyses, and research should be accessible to all communities.

10. Collaboration: The sectors of criminal justice system and victim service providers should collaborate to provide efficient, effective, and expedient justice. This collaboration should foster cross-system coordination and appropriate information sharing.

11. Efficient: The criminal justice system should avoid unnecessary costs and maximize its limited resources to achieve its intended outcomes.
Grantmaking Principles

1. The Authority should strive to maximize the use of available federal and state funds, seeking any and all reasonable alternatives to lapsing funds back to the federal or state government.
2. The Authority's decision to award federal and state funds should have a foundation in the best available research, evaluation, practice and professional advice.
3. The Authority's decision to award federal and state funds should take into account the balance of resources across the justice system and its potential impact in other areas of the system.
4. The Authority's federal and state funds should not result in the duplication of efforts already in place.
5. The Authority's federal and state funds cannot be used to supplant other funds.
6. The Authority's federal and state funds should be allocated (a) to areas demonstrating need based on an analysis of the nature and extent of the problem(s) and (b) to programs in areas where there is an opportunity to impact the identified problem(s).

In addition, to the extent permitted by program guidelines, some portion of available federal and state funds should be used for the following:

1. To encourage collaborative approaches to problem solving, planning and program implementation.
2. To encourage innovative pilot or demonstration projects.
3. To evaluate funded projects and support an ongoing program of research designed to further planning and program development.
4. To build the capacity of those in the criminal justice system.

Together, these Guiding and Grantmaking Principles provide the Authority’s staff and Board with the core purposes and operational imperatives inform and direct the agency’s core work.

Preamble:

The Byrne JAG Goals outlined below were developed by Authority Board members and staff to bring future Byrne JAG funding in line with best practices in criminal justice. These goals will begin to be used to allocate resources starting in federal fiscal year 2016. While each JAG purpose area below addresses the unique needs of that sector, collectively, the goals are intended to increase public safety; sustain and strengthen the trust between the public and the justice system; fairly and effectively enforce the law; respect the constitutional rights of everyone; use the resources of the justice system to reduce risk to the community, and utilize evidence based and informed practices. Any implementation of these goals will take into account a proportional distribution of funds to all parts of the criminal justice system and respect the geographical needs across Illinois.
Law Enforcement

Goal: To support law enforcement by providing them with the resources necessary to protect and serve the community through the development and implementation of data-driven, promising, or research-informed policing strategies that protect public safety and reduce crime, particularly violent crime.

Prosecution, Court Programs, and Indigent Defense

Prosecution Goal: To support all public prosecutors, including appellate prosecutors, by providing the resources and training necessary to assist them in protecting public safety by holding offenders accountable while ensuring the constitutional rights of the accused and enforcing crime victims’ constitutional and statutory rights.

Court Programs Goal: To support problem solving, specialty and other courts by providing resources for court programs that provide offender rehabilitation without endangering public safety and afford crime victims’ their constitutional and statutory rights.

Indigent Defense Goal: To support public and appellate defenders by providing resources and training necessary to assist public and appellate defenders in protecting the fundamental rights, liberties and due process of the accused and to assist public and appellate defenders in connecting defendants with community based services when possible and appropriate in order to reduce recidivism.

Prevention and Education

Goal: To provide resources for research-informed and promising strategies and programming that reduce crime and violence, mitigate its harmful effects and encourage the participation of crime victims and witnesses in the criminal justice system and in doing so strengthening communities’ capacities to learn about and to prevent crime and violence and to hold offenders accountable.

Corrections and Community Corrections

Goal: To provide resources both to enhance the safety of correctional facilities, victims and the public by supporting research informed or promising behavioral change programming informed by proven risk assessment and also to service offenders with mental illness, developmental disabilities and substance use disorders in order to reduce reoffending, with an emphasis on programming that allows offenders to safely remain in their communities and to pay restitution to victims of their crimes.

Drug Enforcement and Treatment Programs

Goal: To support research-informed and promising drug enforcement and treatment efforts by providing resources to programs that break the cycle of system involvement in the criminal justice system for people who abuse legal and illegal drugs and substances, that ensure the safety of the crime victim and the public, and that promote the payment of restitution to crime victims and to support evidence based programs that enhance public safety and reduce the amount of drugs and substances illegally manufactured and distributed.
Crime Victim and Witness programs (other than compensation)

Goal: To support crime victim and witness programs by providing resources for services that meet the financial, physical and emotional needs of crime victims and witnesses regardless of whether charges are filed, that acknowledge the importance of crime victim and witness participation in the criminal justice system, and that promote, respect and enforce the constitutional and statutory rights of crime victims.

Planning, Evaluation, and Technology Improvement

Goal: To support planning, research and evaluation by providing resources for projects that examine key criminal justice topics and programs and identify research-informed and promising practices for the purposes of informing key stakeholders. To support the development of a statewide information sharing environment, through the use of Global standards, that facilities timely, accurate, and efficient exchange of operational data for criminal justice stakeholders.

From Ad Hoc Victim Services Committee Research Report:

On January 10 and 11, the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA) convened the Ad Hoc Victim Services Committee. The Committee meets every three years to define priorities for use of S.T.O.P. Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) and Victim of Crime Act (VOCA) funds. The purpose of the VOCA funds is to support direct service efforts that respond to the emotional, psychological, or physical needs of crime victims; assist victims in stabilizing their lives after victimization; help victims understand and participate in the criminal justice system; or restore a measure of security and safety for the victim. VAWA funds are intended to promote a coordinated, multidisciplinary approach to enhancing victim advocacy and improving the criminal justice system’s response to violent crimes against women through the development and improvement of effective law enforcement and prosecution strategies and advocacy and services.

Research Approach

ICJIA researchers, with assistance from Aeffect, Inc., a research consulting agency, completed a six-month research project to identify crime victim needs and service gaps and measure the existing capacity of Illinois victim service providers. The research focused on crime victimization throughout the state, including a wide range of crime types and victim service practices. The research approach included a review of existing literature, analysis of administrative data, surveys and interviews of crime victims and family members, and surveys and focus groups with victim service providers and criminal justice practitioners. Two additional reports documenting the specific findings from the victim survey and interviews and the victim service provider survey and focus groups will be available by Spring 2017. Using the data collected, ICJIA researchers identified 12 key funding priorities that when implemented will create a comprehensive plan to addressing the needs of crime victims in Illinois. ICJIA staff presented the 12 funding priorities to members of the Victim Services Ad Hoc Committee to obtain feedback and insight. The recommended funding priorities were presented to the ICJIA Board for approval on January 27,
The priority areas are listed below. The priority areas will guide statewide funding decisions and the development of Notices of Fund Opportunity (NOFO) for the next three years.

Victim Services Funding Priorities
The following priorities were identified, listed in no particular order:

Priority 1: Fund initiatives that raise the public's awareness of victim services.
Lack of awareness was identified as an obstacle to service seeking by both victims and service providers as well as the larger victimization literature. Greater awareness of services and victim rights gives victims the opportunity to make an informed decision on how best to engage in help seeking and service utilization, based upon their unique needs. Efforts to increase the public’s awareness of services also may aid providers in reaching people who are underserved or those who choose not to report their experiences to law enforcement agencies. Initiatives to increase awareness should not only involve notifying the public of the service options available, but also the rights available to them following a victimization. Raising the public’s awareness of existing programs also benefits providers. Providers discussed the importance of being informed of the services available in the communities they serve to better assist victims in accessing all of the services they need.

Priority 2: Increase funding to address fundamental needs of crime victims.
Victims, service providers, and criminal justice practitioners alike reported that victims in Illinois, regardless of crime type, face barriers to accessing services. Many of these barriers reflect the fundamental needs of victims, such as transportation, language services, housing relocation, emergency and permanent housing, life skills training, and legal assistance. These fundamental needs, when left unmet, can inhibit engagement in treatment and undermine long-term safety plans.

Priority 3: Fund core direct services to victims of all crime types.
Another theme that emerged was that victims are in need of comprehensive, wrap-around services. These services include early crisis intervention, criminal justice information and advocacy, mental health and counseling, legal services, housing/relocation, and assistance applying for victim’s compensation. Lack of core services was noted across all of the crime types analyzed (although specific service needs varied). Funding should be made available to ensure all crime victims, both primary and secondary, can obtain these core victim services. Along with funding for these core services, the state should address the existing capacity of victim service providers to offer these services and strategize with providers to support them in an effort to reduce staff burnout and turnover.

Priority 4: Increase funding for advocates and social workers within a variety of organizations to improve victim immediate access to services.
Researchers consistently were told that early points of contact are critical to educating, referring, and engaging victims in services, and the need for criminal justice education and advocacy services was identified across nearly every crime type examined. Funding should be used to
connect advocates and social workers to victims at earlier points in order to increase service awareness and utilization. Funds may be provided to establish contracts with external advocates and social workers or may be used to form or enhance advocate and social worker units in organizations that often have contact with victims. Collaboration between existing advocacy services and these organizations also is encouraged. Organizations that often have contact with victims include colleges, community-based programs, coroner’s offices, courts, hospitals, law enforcement agencies, jails, and schools.

**Priority 5: Increase funding of services for underserved victims of crime.**

Researchers identified several categories of underserved victims in Illinois. These include victims experiencing language barriers, people of color, the elderly, males and younger persons, people who are homeless, victims on college campuses, members of the LGBTQ community, victims with an undocumented immigration status, people with disabilities, and dually-involved persons (those involved in the juvenile and criminal justice systems as both victims and offenders). Underserved victims of crime may not access services due to a lack of awareness, concerns about discrimination and bias, unhelpful or hurtful responses, cultural and social beliefs, and past funding limitations. Funding should be made available to specifically develop, enhance, and expand victim services to the underserved victims identified.

**Priority 6: Encourage development or expansion of programs that address the impact of multiple victimization experiences.**

Funding should encourage the development or expansion of programming or networks of services that attend to the impact of multiple victimization experiences. Some individuals may experience different forms of victimization throughout their lifetimes or may experience the same type of victimization multiple times. Multiple victimization experiences increase one’s risk for future victimization, and unaddressed trauma from previous victimization experiences can be further exacerbated by new ones, decreasing the long-term well-being of individuals, families, and communities.

**Priority 7: Promote multidisciplinary responses to victimization.**

Multidisciplinary approaches are effective in addressing a wide range of victimization. Collaborative and multidisciplinary programs have been shown to be more responsive to victims and improve criminal justice outcomes than single agency or disciplinary approaches. Multidisciplinary approaches promote coordinated responses to victimization that can result in improved case outcomes while minimizing the additional trauma to victims. Funding should be made available for expanding multidisciplinary responses to crime victimization to underserved regions of the state and crime types.

**Priority 8: Encourage trauma-informed and trauma-focused services for victims of crime.**

Research indicates that services that are sensitive to or focused on the trauma of survivors are crucial in mitigating the risk of re-victimization. Trauma-informed services are tailored to meet the needs of crime victims with consideration of their trauma histories and cultural backgrounds. Trauma-focused services are services that specifically address trauma symptoms and the impact
of trauma on the victim. Funding should encourage and prioritize services that are trauma-informed and trauma-focused whenever appropriate.

Priority 9: Fund services that address long-term victim needs, such as counseling and mental health services.
Funding should be made available for agencies to provide services beyond those that address the immediate crisis needs of victims. One of the most notable themes identified was the lack of individual and family counseling and mental health services for crime victims in the state. This gap in services cut across every crime type examined. Illinois’ long-standing fiscal crisis has significantly reduced the state’s mental health infrastructure, limiting the capacity of those agencies that remain to provide long-term mental health services to crime victims. Research indicates, however, that evidence-based clinical care can significantly improve long-term well-being of child, adolescent, and adult victims.

Priority 10: Support programs that specifically address needs of individuals exposed to community violence.
Funding should be specifically allocated for establishing or enhancing services to victims of community violence, particularly those exposed to homicide, gun violence, robbery, or non-domestic-related aggravated and simple assaults. Existing services for these victims in Illinois are scarce and in some places non-existent. Services that are designed to address the particular needs of children, adolescents, and adults are needed. Priority should be given to communities that develop comprehensive plans to address victimization and those which promote the development of community-based approaches for all victims, regardless of circumstance.

Priority 11: Encourage the use of evidence-informed (or promising) and evidence-based practices and programming.
For all the recommendations made in this report, emphasis for funding should be placed on defining the outcomes intended for the programs and employing programming most likely to ensure these outcomes. Programming for victims that are informed by or rooted in research are those that hold promise and are likely to result in positive victim outcomes. Evidence-informed (or promising) practices and programs are those research suggests lead to positive outcomes; however, further study is needed. Evidence-based practices and programming are those that have been proven to be effective by rigorous and multiple independent research studies when implemented with fidelity. Examples of such practices and programs include cognitive-behavioral therapy and multidisciplinary responses and trainings to address violent crime victimization. Funding should encourage and prioritize services that are evidence-informed or evidence-based.

Priority 12: Fund activities that encourage data collection and reporting, document victim outcomes, facilitate program evaluation, and increase knowledge of victimization and service provision in Illinois.
In order to assure the effectiveness of the programming recommended here, funds should be earmarked specifically for collecting data and in evaluating the defined outcomes and the programming methods employed to reach them. Gauging the effectiveness of victim services
begins with an examination of victim service data. Data collection efforts should focus on documenting the quantity, quality, and effectiveness of victim services in Illinois. Programs should be encouraged to apply for funding that equips and facilitates these data collection efforts in their agency.

Research clearly indicates that evaluation is key to early identification of issues in program implementation and design, ultimately leading to stronger victim outcomes. Without evaluation, providers and funders alike are left to rely on anecdotal evidence about the impact of victim services. Funding should be used to support program evaluations.
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING
ILLINOIS CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION AUTHORITY
Friday, September 8, 2017, at 9 a.m.
Michael A. Bilandic Building, 160 N. LaSalle, N-502
Chicago, Illinois

Roll Call

ICJIA Vice Chair Patrick Delfino welcomed Board members and guests to the quarterly Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority Regular Meeting. He called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. and asked Deputy General Counsel Robin Murphy to call the roll. Chair Robb participated by phone, but was absent for OMA purposes. Quorum requires 12 of 22 members, which was not achieved during this meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICJIA Board Member Attendance</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director John Baldwin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender Carla Barnes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk Dorothy Brown (after roll call)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defender Amy Campanelli</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff Tom Dart</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Patrick Delfino, Vice Chair</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Brent Fischer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State’s Attorney Kim Foxx</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent Eddie T. Johnson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk Maureen Josh</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State’s Attorney Bryan Kibler</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Hora for Attorney General Lisa Madigan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Jerry Mitchell</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Pamela Paziotopoulos</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Michael J. Pelletier</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President Toni Preckwinkle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Elizabeth Robb, Chair</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Leo Schmitz</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Nirav Shah</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director BJ Walker</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jennifer Vollen-Katz</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Wolff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Director’s Report

Director Maki spoke briefly about ICJIA’s two most recent notices of funding opportunity, including one for community-based violence intervention (state) and one for victims of community violence (federal). He also said ICJIA was staffing two unfunded initiatives: the Sex Offenses and Sex Offender Registration Task Force and Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils.

ICJIA Financial Report

ICJIA Chief Financial Officer Randy Kurtz compared ICJIA’s FY17 grantmaking to that projected for FY18. He reported:

- Total state grants received from ICJIA will rise from $7 million in FY17 to $20.6 million in FY18.
  - Adult Redeploy Illinois’ state grant will increase to $6.7 million in FY18, up from $5 million in FY17.
  - Ceasefire received the largest appropriation in its history
  - Violence intervention/prevention became a new spending category in FY18, with ICJIA granting $6.3 million to support violence intervention and prevention programs.
  - Safe from the Start and Family Violence Coordinating Councils together received $1.5 million for FY18 after being unfunded in FY17.

- Total federal grants received by ICJIA rose from $36 million in FFY17 to $82.8 million in FFY18.
  - Violence Against Women Act funds, Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grants, and other federal program funding remained about the same.
  - Victims of Crime Act funding projected to more than triple from $22.3 million in FFY17 to $70 million in FFY18.

Mr. Kurtz said ICJIA has spent or formally obligated 100 percent of its VOCA award, while the national spending average was 69 percent. He added that most states simply increased funding for existing grantees, where the Authority put together an Ad Hoc committee on victim needs, and conducted research to identify gaps in services.

Committee Reports

Ms. Hora reported $67.2 million was designated at the May and July Budget Committee meetings, including $6.8 million in state funding and $60.4 million in federal funding. She said the committee approved $7.2 million for the community-based violence intervention grant funding opportunity.
Ms. Wolff informed the Board that the Strategic Opportunities Committee (SOC) had received a presentation on the ICJIA’s violence prevention mandate, which included discussion on community involvement and how federal funding plans complement and agree with one another. She said attendees of the August meeting participated in a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats analysis of the SOC and Budget committee.

**Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats Analysis**

Director Maki introduced the analysis by outlining some of the challenges the agency has met in recent years:

- Managed an increase in grants (from $37.6 million in FY15 to $103 million in FY18) without an increase in staff.
- Strengthening research and technical assistance, including an increase in publications that inform practice; participation in statewide policy initiatives; and involvement in national projects, such as Data-Driven Health & Justice and the National Criminal Justice Reform Project.
- Grant Accountability and Transparency Act implementation.

Director Maki spoke about changes in the role of the Board throughout ICJIA’s history and introduced Dr. Megan Alderden to explain the SWOT procedure.

Dr. Alderden described how a SWOT analysis is used to build awareness of weaknesses and threats and devise ways to respond to them with strengths and opportunities. The most heavily discussed topics were on improving attendance at Board and committee meetings with possible date and time changes and ways to orient new members, including the possibility of a new committee.

The following strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats were discussed by ICJIA Board members. **Bolded** suggestions were made during the Board meeting. *Italicized* suggestions were made at the August SOC meeting. A list of potential solutions to some of the issues and challenges discussed follows the SWOT table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Some Board members willingness to engage</td>
<td>- Attendance (quorum, participation, preparedness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Board represents criminal justice system</td>
<td>- Meetings lack purpose, topics not relevant to members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clear, transparent grant process</td>
<td>- Board members are busy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Board protects process</td>
<td>- Appearance of Chicago/Cook County focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Information provided to board has improved</td>
<td>- Technical capabilities (video/teleconferencing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Committee structure</td>
<td>- Lack of clarity about internal grant process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public information</td>
<td>- Some funds lack strategic plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Board members may have conflicts of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lack of board orientation (acronyms, dates, quorum, voting, committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>requirements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Voices of IDJJ and ex-offender communities missing from board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Need to improve materials to illustrate work the board has done</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>THREATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Alternative meeting locations (Springfield, Peoria, Champaign)</td>
<td>- Changes in Board membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- GATA provides better organization, clearer vision, greater transparency and accountability</td>
<td>- Multiple external interests in funds and how to use them (potential influence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use of designees for committees</td>
<td>- Lapsing funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Voting as draw for attendance</td>
<td>- ICJIA offices in Chicago (and many board members based here)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tapping into board member connections with local associations and data sources</td>
<td>- Grant work technicalities difficult to understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Statutes determining designee participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board members offered several potential solutions to the issues discussed. These include:

- Enhanced materials (with a combination of macro- and micro-level information)
- Establishment of an orientation committee (with a team of ICJIA staff and Board members familiarizing new members with statutes and goals)
- Questionnaire to board (asking for topics of interest that deserve research presentations, biggest agency and jurisdictional concerns, and how to ensure attendance)
- Full criminal justice system SWOT
- More robust designee process (altering ICJIA’s administrative code to allow ex-officio members to send designees, while requiring these designees are in high enough positions that they can speak with the voice of the Board member and that the same designee attends consistently)

Adjourn

Vice Chair Delfino invited members of the public to comment. Seeing none, he adjourned the meeting at 10:57 a.m.