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Purpose of the Plan

In 2009, the Longmont Community Justice Partnership had a different name (Teaching Peace), a smaller staff, fewer programs and an ambitious strategic plan. The three year strategic plan served as a guide for the organization’s activities providing detailed goals, objectives and action plans to help achieve the three-year vision.

By the fall of 2011, the board and executive director of Longmont Community Justice Partnership (LCJP) realized that they had met the majority of the 2009 goals and decided that a new strategic plan was in order. This plan would allow the board and staff of LCJP to hear from key stakeholders, consider external trends and forces, and create a future business model vision for 2012—2014. In addition, the process would include developing strategic decision-making criteria for use in making plan decisions and addressing new opportunities going during the period while the plan is implemented.
The Planning Process

LCJP’s strategic planning process engaged the board, staff, volunteers, funders, partners and clients, explored external trends and factors influencing the work of LCJP, and explored the internal capacities and needs of the organization based on the planning work. Highlights of the process—conducted in partnership with planning consultants, interSector Partners, L3C (interSector) include:

- **October 2011**
  - LCJP’s executive director and board chair met with interSector to develop the planning process
  - LCJP began gathering stakeholder lists and strategizing about the best ways to engage a wide variety of stakeholders using methods that would be most meaningful to them

- **November 2011**
  - interSector developed, LCJP approved and interSector administered a community stakeholder electronic survey
  - interSector began telephone interviews with the LCJP board of directors
  - LCJP staff met with interSector in one-on-one interviews
  - LCJP staff coordinated and interSector conducted three key stakeholder focus groups

- **December 2011**
  - interSector drafted a process update and preliminary big questions for review by the board
  - LCJP’s chair and executive director met with interSector to review all stakeholder input and finalize plans for the retreat
  - interSector compiled a pre-retreat reading packet for the board and staff

- **January 2012**
  - The LCJP board of directors and leadership staff met on January 10, 2012 for a full-day planning retreat facilitated by interSector
  - interSector drafted the strategic plan
  - LCJP staff provided feedback to the plan and interSector made revisions to the plan

- **February 2012**
  - **To be completed:** LCJP staff refined the action plans and finalized the draft for review and approval by the board of directors
  - The LCJP board of directors reviewed, suggested revisions to and approved the 2012–2014 strategic plan
LCJP History

Founded November 30, 1994, by Lana Leonard and Beverly Title for the primary purpose of violence prevention, the nonprofit organization was consciously named Teaching Peace in the affirmative to reflect "what we're about, not what we're against." The first work of the organization focused on bullying & school violence prevention and multicultural storytelling, reflecting the expertise of the founders.

In 1996 the founders learned about restorative justice and were inspired to ask several key stakeholders to partner in bringing this work to Longmont. Those asked were the police chief, Mike Butler, the local school superintendent, Jack Hay, the municipal judge, Diana VanDeHay, and chief probation officer, Greg Winger, and the head of Longmont nonprofit Alternatives for Youth, that operated a school for students who were expelled from the SVVSD. All agreed to participate and a new program focus for Teaching Peace formed with the Longmont Community Justice Partnership (LCJP). Over the ensuing years, LCJP became the primary work of Teaching Peace accounting for close to 90% of its work.

In 2010, the organization underwent a transition and re-branded as the Longmont Community Justice Partnership. Remembering our roots in non-violence, story-telling and naming ourselves based on what we stand for, not what we are against, LCJP emerged as the majority of stakeholders #1 choice for the organizational identity. Restorative practices in our community have become 100% of our service offerings. We are proud of our heritage from ancient tribal practices to modern conflict resolution.

LCJP Mission

LCJP’s mission is to cultivate a safe and caring community, reduce crime and bring together those involved in crime or conflict to be heard creating justice for all.

As part of this plan, during the stakeholder input process, LCJP stakeholders were asked how well they think LCJP is doing when it comes to achieving this mission. The following table compares the responses from 71 stakeholders during the 2011 process with responses from the 2009 process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well or Very Well</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>83.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Excerpted from the LCJP Web site: www.lcjp.org
**LCJP S.W.O.T. and Current Reality**

**S.W.O.T.**

LCJP’s board of directors, staff and community stakeholders conducted a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, & Threats analysis (S.W.O.T.)—an in-depth exploration of the organization’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats / challenges. A S.W.O.T. analysis typically looks at internal strengths and weaknesses, as well as external opportunities and threats.

The following table includes highlights from the stakeholder input reports (including focus groups, staff interviews and the survey), consultant observations/input and discussion of the board and staff members at the January 10, 2012 retreat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strengths (areas to capitalize on)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Weaknesses (areas for improvement)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mission</td>
<td>• Policies/procedures are lacking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff (dedication, skill, energy, Deb was mentioned many times)</td>
<td>• Cross-training/succession planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School programs</td>
<td>• Delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Board of directors (qualified, gets along, dedicated, believes in RJ)</td>
<td>• Board sometimes too focused on detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Foundation of Teaching Peace; reputation</td>
<td>• Funding diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Longmont Police Dept. relationship</td>
<td>• Volunteer program and ongoing cultivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Volunteer training</td>
<td>• Staff and volunteer burnout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diversity of staff (cultural, skills, language)</td>
<td>• Distracted by trying to do too much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LCJP is seen as a leader</td>
<td>• Initiatives are tied to people; need to be institutionalized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Opportunities (internal and external to LCJP)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Threats (external to LCJP)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• New and improved community relationships</td>
<td>• Potential loss of Police Department support; what if Mike Butler leaves or retires?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Institutionalizing the referral system with LPD</td>
<td>• Community does not know about restorative justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Earned income options</td>
<td>• Jealousy from other organizations that haven’t had this level of success and/or cooperation from the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data collection, analysis and publishing</td>
<td>• Funding trends and cut-backs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continuing evaluation of outcomes</td>
<td>Space is limited; outgrown the current location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Becoming a leader in the RJ field nationally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expanding programs geographically or to other arenas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Replication of Restorative Practices in Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceptions of LCJP’s Work

The following are perceptions of the LCJP’s work in several areas from the stakeholder input survey conducted in 2011. Responses from the 2009 survey are provided for comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011 Responses</th>
<th>2009 Responses</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making a positive difference in the community</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>+6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving as a community resource</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>+6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging diverse communities</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>+17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing issues of crime and conflict</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing meaningful volunteer opportunities</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building strong partnerships/collaborations with other community organizations</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>+17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and communicating its results</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>+1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educating the community about restorative justice</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stakeholder Concerns and Interests

Many stakeholder concerns and interests are included in the S.W.O.T. analysis on the previous page. A few items in particular stood out to the board and staff and greatly informed LCJP’s strategic vision for the next three years and the development of its 3-year business model. These included:

Concern over the organization’s rapid growth and the implications of that growth including:
- Lack of adequate systems, policies and processes to support the growth
- Perceived loss of the “community feeling” of LCJP
- Loss of institutional memory / history as more staff members are added and responsibilities are segmented
- Staff capacity at its maximum; opportunity to refocus on employees and HR systems

Desire to see LCJP continue to be a positive force in the restorative justice movement:
- Without compromising local programming
- While fully building out the Longmont, Boulder County, SVVSD restorative justice systems
- While continuing to capitalize on the tremendous opportunities for statewide, national and international recognition for LCJP’s model program
- Through strategic programming and partnerships (products/services, data collection and systems) rather than scaling rapidly through replication or expansion
## Longmont Community Justice Partnership’s Current Situation and 3-Year Vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic service area</th>
<th>Data and input considered when determining the Three Year Vision</th>
<th>LCJP’s Three Year Vision (December 31, 2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longmont, St. Vrain Valley School District, Boulder County, Colorado, statewide through RJ Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers served</td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement referrals (youth &amp; adults), law enforcement staff, students, teachers, school administrators, staff and volunteers of local agencies, The RJ Community in Colorado, volunteers, court systems, people with an interest in safe communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs and services offered</td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Restorative Justice Program, Colorado Restorative Justice Coordinating Council, Restorative Justice Training Collaboration, Restorative Practices in Schools (RATES and Pilot Project), volunteer program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Add: products and trainings (replication), internship program, broader RJ movement activity (DYC, standards, professional association, etc.) Not sure if it will continue due to number of referrals: RATES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Sources and Allocation (2010 Year End)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding Sources and Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A more diverse revenue structure than the current business model, focus on increasing: corporate/business donations, individual donations and earned income strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Grow the overall revenue pie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Sources</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>$186,964</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City contract</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions (corp. &amp; ind.)</td>
<td>43,061</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Events</td>
<td>20,422</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Revenue (fees)</td>
<td>21,295</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$472,888</strong></td>
<td>~100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 staff, 1 intern, 100+ volunteers inc. high school students, 7-member board, community partners, RPS advisory group, trainers, school personnel, 6 Police Dept. liaisons, Public Safety IT support, professional staff at Police Dept., consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Focus on developing the HR/management systems of LCJP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased fundraising and marketing capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Product/training resources (staff, interns, volunteers or consultants to help develop and market LCJP products)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Think about where the pressure points are workload-wise; is staff needed in those areas (referral staff, case coordinators, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved diversity on the board; keep the board about the same size with a maximum of 9 directors (the bylaws state 13 is the max)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LCJP Strategic Decision-Making Criteria

As discussed in the Purpose of the Plan section, one of the desired outcomes of the planning process was for the LCJP board and staff to create criteria to support decision-making. This was an important task for both the purposes of creating the strategic plan as well as to prepare LCJP for how it will consider new opportunities that arise outside of the strategic planning process over the next three years. The following key criteria were identified:

**Mission**
Does this opportunity or strategy uphold the mission? Is this consistent with general restorative justice principles? Does this allow us to operate as a restorative organization?

**Community**
Did the community have input into this decision? Does this help us to serve the community?

**Funding**
Is funding available? If not, can we get funding? Is there a reason to do this other than the money? Can this opportunity engage the board in fundraising? Might this strategy or opportunity open the door to more funding sources?

**Human resources**
Do we have the staff capacity? Does this benefit the staff? Is the staff enthused about this? Does the board have passion for this? Do we have or can we quickly acquire the expertise to do this?

**Sustainability**
Can this be replicated? Is it sustainable? Will this help us to step out of emergency mode? Can this be institutionalized through systems, processes or policies? Will this increase referrals?

**Efficiency, Effectiveness, Quality**
Are we making a difference? Are we achieving positive outcomes for individuals and the community? Is this a best practice? Are the outcomes documentable? Does this simplify how we work/make things easier?

**Innovation**
Is this proactive? Is this new and creative? Will doing this help us to stay ahead?

**Risk**
Does the opportunity present an acceptable level of risk? Can we afford to risk it failing?

 Will it work?
When planning for the next three years, the board and staff of LCJP identified and explored a number of questions that would need to be answered as the organization works to achieve its future business model. While many questions were administrative or operational in nature, a number of big questions were outlined—those questions whose answers would inform the development of LCJP’s goals and objectives for the next three years.

**Big questions included:**

- How do we ensure that all work we are doing directs us toward the overarching goal of institutionalizing restorative justice?
- How can we diversify our funding sources?
- How do we structure LCJP for long-term success; what are the right management systems to meet today’s challenges while being flexible enough for addressing the future?
- How can we increase the use of restorative practices by building visibility and awareness of LCJP?
- What do we need to do to develop our products and trainings with an eye toward replication, earned income strategies AND increasing awareness of LCJP?
18-month Goals and Objectives

The following goals, objectives and associated action plans (Appendix D) represent the board and staff’s analysis of the big questions while taking into account LCJP’s current reality, S.W.O.T. analysis, trends and external factors/pressures facing the organization.

The goals and objectives outlined are intended to be accomplished in 18 months, or by mid-year 2013. At that time, LCJP will identify the remaining big questions that need to be answered to achieve the three-year vision, and develop/reconfirm goals, objectives and action plans for the last 18 months of the 3-year strategic plan (July 2013—December 2014).

Institutionalizing Restorative Justice

LCJP’s board and staff believe that the primary goal for the next three years should be significant movement toward institutionalizing restorative justice concepts and principles in the Longmont/SVVSD/Boulder County service area. This change is defined through several characteristics:

- Restorative justice principles and practices become a key part of the public safety, justice and school systems
- Referral systems include restorative justice options
- Restorative justice becomes the way or a way of doing business
- The community’s mindset shifts from one of punishment toward one of repairing harm utilizing restorative practices
- Restorative justice is not person or personality-driven
- Government and the community become true partners in delivering restorative justice services

Institutionalizing change is not a small task—it requires the change becoming part of the fabric of a community or culture. Two techniques are critical to institutionalizing change\(^2\): 1. demonstrating how the change helps to make things better (through statistics, outcomes, enhanced performance, etc.) and 2. building the next generation of leaders who have a fundamental belief in and understanding of the benefits of the change.

---

LCJP’s 18-month goals support movement toward institutionalizing restorative justice practices and principles utilizing these two techniques. As the board and staff developed the strategic plan, they also quickly realized that the organizational priorities were organized around the same strategic focus areas as LCJP’s 2009 strategic plan:

- Human Resources
- Programs/Products
- Marketing/Communications
- Funding

This focus area alignment with the 2009 plan is an excellent indication that LCJP is consistent in its efforts to address strategic priorities and is demonstrating progression in the work under each focus area over time.
Goals and Objectives

Human Resources

Goal 1: Develop LCJP as a professional, healthy and creative workplace by enhancing LCJP’s management systems to support employee and organizational needs today and into the future

Objective 1.1: Strengthen and improve the LCJP hiring process by June 30, 2012

Objective 1.2: Explore staff retention opportunities (training, professional development, salary/benefit packages, cross-training, review and career enhancement) and begin implementing a plan by September 30, 2012

Objective 1.3: Determine the “right size” for staffing LCJP including the number of employees and distribution of work; begin to implement needed changes by November 1, 2012

Objective 1.4: Determine the appropriate size and functionality of office space needed to house LCJP’s right-sized staff by November 1, 2012; implement changes to office space or begin preparations for move by January 1, 2013

Objective 1.5: Create an organizational succession plan—to include executive director, key positions and board of directors—by September 1, 2012

Goal 2: Enhance LCJP’s volunteer program to

To be developed by the staff team

Marketing / Communications

Goal 3: Increase the use and acceptance of restorative justice practices by improving community awareness and visibility of LCJP

Objective 2.1: Identify LCJP’s target markets (including groups, volunteers, donors, partners, etc.) and key messages for each target market by March 31, 2012

Objective 2.2: Develop a plan for outreach and marketing to each target market by May 31, 2012

Objective 2.3: Implement the outreach/marketing plan from June—November 2012; evaluate outcomes and revise the plan for 2013 by December 31, 2012
Programs and Products

Goal 4: Enhance earned income and support replication by developing products, trainings and consulting services

Objective 3.1: Review existing products and create a process for revising them by September 30, 2012

Objective 3.2: Determine new products for development by September 30, 2012

Objective 3.3: Create a consulting services product line and launch plan based on LCJP’s existing and new products by January 1, 2013

Objective 3.4: Market and promote LCJP’s products and consulting services for a January 15, 2013 launch

Funding

Goal 5: Increase LCJP’s sustainability by diversifying funding sources

Objective 5.1: Develop the structure and duties of a development/fundraising committee and seat the committee by June 30, 2012

Objective 5.2: Map LCJP’s corporate and individual donor network create a fundraising plan for each market by September 30, 2012

Objective 5.3: Implement LCJP’s fundraising plans during Q4 2012 and evaluate their successes by January 31, 2012

Objective 5.4: Adjust fundraising plans according to the evaluation of 2012 fundraising activities and implement revised plan during 2013
Recommendations

A frequent concern during strategic planning is to end up with “just another plan sitting on a shelf.” Organizations that make their plan a “living document” that guides work and changes as the environment changes regularly utilize the following recommendations as the plan is implemented. LCJP is already familiar with many of these recommendations, but they are listed here as a reminder and as a primer for newer team members to help keep these ideas top of mind.

- Keep everyone who was involved in the planning process involved in implementing the plan. The more people engaged; the higher chance of success.
- Provide board members with hard copies of the plan and make copies of the appendices available to them. The plan itself—the future business model, goals, strategies and action plan—are essential. The additional pages of attachments can be available for review as needed.
- Provide staff members with hard copies of the plan and make copies of the appendices available to them. The organizational plan will be critical to staff as they develop their individual work plans, sub-plans (communications or fundraising, for example) and contribute to the overall implementation plan.
- Host a meeting for LCJP volunteers to walk them through the future business model/vision, goals, objectives and action plans. Create action steps that outline how volunteers can be involved in making the plan and vision/future model become reality.
- Add the action plan to the board’s agenda every month. Spend 5-10 minutes discussing progress toward achieving strategies and approaches. Consider committee and staff updates to show how the plan is interwoven throughout the organization. Spend five minutes discussing obstacles to achieving the plan and brainstorming how to overcome them.
- Consider creating a visual for the future business model. If you have an artistic client, board member or staff person, ask them to draw your future business model. Copy it, distribute it and post on the web site.
- Talk about the plan. Develop a common language by repeatedly referring to the future business models, goals and objectives. Make the plan a part of everyday discussions and people will join in.
- Use the strategic decision-making criteria to address new opportunities or major initiatives. Consider using this tool for operational decision-making as well to get the team used to using the questions and basing decisions on the decision-making criteria.
Appendices

A. Focus Group Summary Report
B. Stakeholder Survey Report
C. Staff Interview Summary Report
D. 18-Month Action Plan
Appendix A: Focus Group Summary Report

Focus Group Summary Report
December 2011

As part of its 2011 strategic planning process, the Longmont Community Justice Partnership engaged stakeholders through interviews, focus groups and an electronic survey. On Tuesday, November 29, 2011, LCJP’s planning consultants, interSector Partners, L3C (interSector), met with three groups of LCJP stakeholders in a focus group format designed to engage stakeholders in open and honest discussions of the organization. Each group was welcomed by executive director, Deb Witzel, and was provided some opening guidelines for the focus group. The following report outlines the discussion questions and responses.

Funder Focus Group: 3 attendees
1:30—2:30 p.m.

Following introductions, funders were asked to share why they support LCJP. Responses included:

- The RJ process is amazing
- Young people make dumb mistakes and if you catch them young, they are less likely to reoffend
- LCJP’s leadership is strong
- The board is involved
- Demonstrated outcomes
- The program’s growth at Longmont High

“I’ve watched kids that didn’t feel like they belonged to learn that they are part of a bigger world and that their actions make a difference.”

“Deb is terrific and has done a great job dealing with the transition; really an exceptional job.”

Next, funders were invited to share their perceptions of LCJP’s biggest strengths.

- LCJP is internationally known
- RJ is experiencing a groundswell
- Strong leadership and demonstrated outcomes
- The chief of safety buys into this. He’s on the board.
- Able to show how restorative justice saves money
- The model chosen includes the community at-large as a victim
- The community piece is the key distinction
- A structured process, yet freedom within individual contracts
- Momentum and enthusiasm from the judicial system
- People feel included; RJ circles in Boulder don’t have the same feeling of inclusion
“The RJ process brings people’s heart to the forefront. It humanizes police officers for teens, humanizes teens for adults and community members. It reminds us that we are people.”

“Personally, I’ve appreciated the opportunity to see that when given the chance, people will put their best foot forward. We forget that relationships are paramount.”

The group was then asked to share what they thought were LCJP’s weaknesses or areas to improve?

- Things feel scattered
- The organization is more about personalities now than when it was Teaching Peace
- The standards have gone down; not all offenders who participate are willing to be accountable
- Growth has been too fast
- Growth has been a blessing and a curse
- 40% of cases are facilitated by employees; this staffing is not sustainable
- Lack of LCJP staff serving as ambassadors in the community
- The name; the transition was very difficult
- Trying to take on the world and don’t need to

“The organization has become compartmentalized; this flies in the face of what restorative justice is.”

“They are doing great work, but it’s great work here in this house. I rarely come across LCJP representatives in the community. I don’t see them at the St. Vrain Latino Coalition or Chamber of Commerce meetings, for instance.”

When asked what opportunities the group saw for LCJP to grow, the following points of discussion were shared.

- It’s getting crazy with people in and people out; too much transition. Growth is not the answer.
- It feels like a training ground for people to come in and out
- Any growth strategy would not be appealing to me as a funder
- It is not right to grow because there is money to be had
- An advisory role to other communities (like Intercambio); don’t expand to run more programs, but help others to create them
- Statewide presence is not needed
- Carefully consider how to make LCJP serve as a state model without diluting the core program
- School programs are going well; consider growing within schools
- Legislative work is not the right thing for LCJP. The focus should be on meeting the local need.
- Focus on internal growth for the near future; when resources are sorted out, consider external growth
“It was a steady, sustained growth when it was Teaching Peace. Now it is a push to grow. If you have a simple way to do something that works, and you know that it grows, why try to make it more complex to have triple the growth.”

“Is growth needed or for a purpose? I don’t know if I’m qualified to answer this question. I don’t know what the needs are statewide or county-wide.”

“You attract people when you are doing something right. When you are trying so hard to promote yourselves, you can lose your core and then no one wants to know what you are up to.”

“Staff changes and people leaving may be a symptom that growth is too fast.”

Next, funders shared thoughts on important trends that they track within their work and/or lives that they feel may be important for LCJP to be aware of when planning for its future.

- More people are paying attention to and looking for alternatives like restorative justice
- Valuing what is “new”
- Communities and people are fed up with government regulations (Occupy movement)
- Focus on making change happen at a grassroots level; bottom up
- Young people are returning to their roots
- Enthusiasm about supporting people to become self-sufficient; more basic needs funding than in the past
- Increasing funding spent on the criminal justice and prison/jail systems

The group was asked to share how they picture LCJP in three years, in December 2014. They shared what they would like to see.

- Go back to our core competency
- More of the community feeling that was once there
- There are a lot of new people
- The people that are here as employees know that they are valued and respected; they are listened to and have the training they need
- LCJP is refocused on the 5 Rs
- More selective in which cases it takes
- Stress on the staff is reduced by a more successful volunteer program
- The organization is located in a welcoming, inviting house with more room for staff
- Making greater impacts on kids through the schools

“I was shocked when the new volunteer coordinator didn’t have the information he needed about me; he called to ask about my involvement. It’s necessary to carry that through [institutional knowledge] as part of the group.”

“I don’t want to see LCJP move to a modern office complex. The house (or a house) is a metaphor for the program and the relationships.”
Key Stakeholder Focus Group: 7 attendees (Partners, Community Supporters)
3:00—4:15 p.m.

Following introductions, key community stakeholders were asked to share what they believe to be LCJP’s biggest strengths

- An excellent alternative to the court system; it’s an eye opener for the younger kids to see that we can have conversations
- Community basis
- Excellent way for kids to tie back into the community
- Passion of the people involved in LCJP is a huge strength
- Creative look outside of traditional RJ
- Very creative staff and schools advisory board
- Interwoven in the community
- A lot of people know it exists and a lot of people are involved
- It’s a laboratory; it’s the only viable alternative to handle non-violent criminal justice
- The success rate: 93%
- The marvelous cooperation between the LPD and the community
- Saving lives
- Beverly Title and Mike Butler’s relationship
- It changes people’s minds
- Partnership with the PD, community, volunteers, supporters, families, young people
- The partnership approach itself; we all come together, no talking down to anyone
- Consistent focus on harm and repair

“We walk our talk; organization and leadership here lives by the 5 Rs. It’s our ideal; not just at work, but as a guide for life. Everybody is treated with respect.”

“If we could grow, expand and perfect it, our model could be used in almost any case.”

“Relationship between LCJP and the PD is very interwoven and very real.”

The group was asked their thoughts on weaknesses or areas that LCJP could improve.

Funding & Financing
- Funding; it’s good now, but as the City Council and someday the police department administration change, funding may change
- Serious funding from outside is available; but not accessing it
- LCJP is not reasonably supported by the community in the proportion to which it contributes to the community

Staffing & Volunteers
- Vulnerability; the staff is undersized and underfunded for what is expected of it
- Burnout and rate of turnover is huge; institutional wisdom suffers
- Lack of training is tough; about the time people finally get comfortable with the work, they realize that they can’t sustain their families with the income and expectations of their jobs
- Job descriptions are too long
- Lack of career opportunities – have to provide these to get good people to stay
- Lack of a strategy for how to create a career ladder
- Unhealthy work ethic; expectations are too high are sucking the life out of people
- Size of the organization; this size organization will kill you and everyone in it; it’s too small
- Not attracting and retaining Latino volunteers for programs or the board

Reach & Focus
- Geographic scope is not nailed down
- Focused primarily on youth; could expand to other aspects of the community
- Inability to expand where there is room; RATES could grow to serve 27,000 kids, not 2 or 3
- Not reaching all of the people in the police department or schools that we could

  “Funding hampers our ability to expand school programs. When our grants run out, what are we going to do? The schools won’t pick it up.”

  “Could improve support across the police department; is there an opportunity to get more law enforcement staff on the side of RJ?”

  “We are still battling PR and marketing in the schools and the Longmont Police Department. There is more potential to open their minds as we are dealing a lot with the ‘old school mentality’.”

The stakeholder group was asked what opportunities it saw for LCJP to grow.

Organic growth
- The success of LCJP itself dictates growth; the more successful it becomes the more it grows
- It’s growing organically, but we don’t have the resources to keep up with the growth

Local growth
- Growth among youth; they are impressionable, they can learn skills to deal with themselves and their peers; cross-cultural approaches; help them to develop life skills
- Growth in relationships with higher education system in teaching programs – new teachers are not learning much if anything on basic classroom behavior management skill-building; it’s about daily conversations in the classroom coming from a restorative practices background – might be an avenue for funding, i.e. UNC teaching program
- Become a demonstration project to get the word out

Statewide and/or National growth
- Growth through data – John and LCJP partnership on the database to give each other clout; growing into other RJ programs
- Where in the system you’re located has a lot to do with how much data you can collect; if the program is in the PD, more data can be collected and LCJP could be a leader
- The key to our growth is in the DATA!
- Need to retain intimacy and grow – maybe with affiliated entities to get the work done?
Both
- Can do both; retain intimate, local, volunteer-run community program AND have an entity that is affiliated that shares those models with the world
- The circle work serves as a demonstration project; refine and perfect an approach that we then apply in new settings – so many possibilities for using the restorative justice process
- Need to refine and perfect a model that can then be used in different applications

No growth
- Until the program grows to $1.5 or $2M, it is not sustainable; it has to get large enough for some economies of scale
- Focus on sustainability first

When asked what trends they were aware of that may be important for LCJP to pay attention to when thinking about its future, the focus group participants shared a wide variety of issues and ideas.

Diverse populations
- 24-25% Latino population in Longmont; 82% of those people are foreign born, primarily from Mexico. This new demographic within a demographic has no trust for the system (Latino Advisory Council is a good step on the part of the police department).
- Law enforcement interest in outreach to Latino communities
- Interest in funding programs for Latino families and communities

Funder / donor interests
- Desire for baselines; data collection; etc.; accountability
- Funding collaboratives; fundamental requirements
- Funders looking more for specific results
- Almost all nonprofits are going to have to show performance results

RJ gaining in popularity
- RJ is a new, emerging field and a place to make your mark
- Alternatives to criminal justice; alternatives in general (energy, business structures)

Education/youth
- School programs; reaching youth when they can still learn a different way – ECE programs, etc.
- Principals get a lot of pressure from teachers and staff to get rid of kids
- Bullying initiatives

Saving money, creative funding
- Interest in saving money; reducing government, etc. It’s a good argument for the restorative justice
- Federal and state funding are leaving; local funding will be the focus or large foundation grants
- States searching for ways to save money

Others
• Lack of continuity of RJ programs throughout the state and the country; Boulder, Ft. Collins and others are all doing their own thing; great variability among programs
• Going back to basics; adapting to the local community
• Legislation: bullying, youth health and wellness; etc. There are some legislative trends that have huge implications for the work here
• We’re working everyone to death now in this electronic age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The group was asked to picture LCJP three years from now—December 2014. What would you like to see the organization look like? In other words, what is your vision?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Buy this house and the next door house  
| • Fully flesh out the database system and deliver it out to the RJ community  
| • Sustain the statewide leadership around the issue; utilize the clout that LCJP has to get the statewide entities on board with a common data collection system  
| • Concentrated effort to get in and work within our Latino community; we could throw some effort into this – it would take big resources; we need to get out of the box  
| • Restorative community center – 600 Martin; police substation is there, we could build a true restorative community  
| • Restorative practices in every level of our school system; all kids are in school, every culture  
| • Buy-in from families; build trust; how do we start small as a community to facilitate that  
| • Connect with nonviolent communication world |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finally, the group shared closing thoughts:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Culture eats strategy for breakfast!  
| • Make sure strategy addresses culture in this strategic plan. |
Volunteer Focus Group: 9 attendees
5:00—6:00 p.m.

To open, participants were asked to introduce themselves and explain how they engage with LCJP as a volunteer.

4 indicated they are facilitators
4 indicated they are co-facilitators
7 said they serve as a community member
Others said that they have:

- Worked on the fundraiser
- Conducted analysis work

Participants were asked why they volunteer with LCJP.

Belief
- Believe in it; it’s a wonderful amazing process where everyone has a voice
- I believe in this process more than the legal, criminal justice
- I believe in justice and I think that all of us have been through things that are unjust

Experience
- I was a teacher at the alternative high school, and we did some restorative justice work with the kids there. I felt badly that kids could get caught up in the system and once in, it’s hard to get out; wanted to be involved in something wasn’t about punishment

Learning (self and others)
- There are no bystanders in the revolution; I’m focused on constructive resolution; I like the organizational objective to actively support a viable alternative, but I wanted to learn more about the modality
- When someone makes a mistake it’s the perfect time for a learning experience,
- I’m attracted to the possibility of someone having a second chance and realizing with the help of the group that they can address harms done and get a fresh start with wisdom and learning

Outcomes
- A primary attractant is the item of accountability; in criminal justice don’t have to take accountability; in this process, you really have to take accountability at many levels
- Resolution for the offender and the victim

Community impact
- Community organizations in which the involvement of all aspects of the community from police, nonprofits to community is great – not many chances to have those
- Impressed with a police department that leads in this way
The group identified LCJP’s biggest strengths.

- Strong partnerships in the community (since 1996) – it’s taken a long time to develop these and they are huge
- Training for volunteers
- Resources for volunteers
- Doing a reasonably good job of harnessing all that we volunteers have to offer
- Seems like everyone is where they need to be – same with paperwork!
- If you’re new – there will be no surprises
- There’s a procedure for everything
- The passion and commitment of staff is amazing (Amanda, Heidi, Pablo)
- Capacity and diversity of staff
- Solid leadership of the board
- Diverse skill sets
- LCJP just works and we have the stats to prove it!

Next, they discussed weaknesses or areas to improve.

- LCJP is not out in the community enough; we need to make more noise
- It’s tricky to get clear information from staff
- Too many last minute panic calls; need more clear and consistent communications
- Emails go unanswered for too long
- Volunteers don’t always get all the pieces to the puzzle; we shouldn’t walk into situations we don’t fully understand
- With so few staff and so many volunteers there is frequent miscommunication
- We need more solid, absolute and accurate answers to things
- LCJP has grown so quickly and we need more resources. I feel like we need F/T resources to correct many of these weaknesses, not more P/T resources
- Maybe publishing staff hours and schedules would help. Then we would know better what to expect
- Hours are difficult sometimes (Wednesday nights and Saturdays are tough). It seems like there used to be more varied time slots available for volunteering.
- The building is an asset but also a challenge when trying to attract staff
- The timing of cases seems to be a challenge. Crucial cases take too long; is there a way to streamline the case prioritization process?
- Feel like the integrity of the LCJP process/program is being compromised a little. We are putting volunteers out there too quickly and many are not ready. This is compared to the way it used to be.
- We need more money
- It seems like 20% of the volunteers are handling 80% of the cases
- Team meetings are very disorganized, do not follow agendas and have poor attendance. Staff does not come prepared and people come late and leave early. This is an underutilized opportunity.
The volunteer focus group participants shared ideas for how LCJP can get more involvement from its current volunteers.

**Training & mentoring**
- How about a facilitator mentoring program? Give us more time with the experts.
- More one-on-one training time
- Video trainings to help us feel prepared
- More structured training programs and learning opportunities
- Team meetings as a place to debrief and stay trained

**Communications**
- Fix links in emails from LCJP (Only one person having this problem)
- Assign one staff member to a group or number of volunteers so there is one go-to person
- Team meetings as a way to stay up-to-date
- More formal debriefing mechanism/process is critical. It needs to be structured.
- We all need feedback. I feel like no one is talking to me.
- We are left to assume that no word means we are doing a good job. Not sure if that’s right or not...

The group then shared its vision for LCJP three years in the future.

**Visibility**
- We have videos, YouTube, etc. so we can make more noise in the community
- The community knows about us; we have booths everywhere at community events
- More community visibility

**Partnerships**
- We’re partnering more with community organizations to get the word and work out
- We’re partnering with banks for fundraising (Compass, 1st Bank)

**Schools**
- LCJP is in more schools

**Resources for volunteers**
- We have a Resources Manual that covers everything we do; it’s easily accessible in the office and online
- We have a library of resources, all accessible by topic. There’s so much to know, sometimes it’s hard to keep up with it all
- As a community member, I’d like more foreknowledge of the case and issues surrounding the case. Pair us up with available resources to share with the participants ahead of time so I’m not always doing everything “on the fly” – sometimes I feel inadequate because I don’t feel I’m prepared
Space

- We can’t pre-conference in this space well; doing so at the Safety and Justice Center makes it seem more real, more professional
- I like having a space to meet with people, here or Safety and Justice Center
- Continue meeting in homes, but have space to meet when a home is not ideal or safe

Other ideas

- We have more money so we have more staff
- We have a better partnership with the DA’s office leading to referrals! Prosecutors are just not well informed about LCJP, but they refer clients.
- We’ve conquered the idea that we’re not professional or that RJ is not important because it’s an alternative

“The critical question is [while in growth mode] how do we attend to the mechanics of what we’re doing in the interest of what we’re trying to do without sacrificing quality of the programs and process and the people that are doing it? Serious, informed, attention is required.”
Appendix B: Stakeholder Survey Report

Stakeholder Survey Summary Report
December 2011

As part of its 2011 strategic planning process, the Longmont Community Justice partnership engaged stakeholders through interviews, focus groups and an electronic survey. The survey was administered to 58 key stakeholders on November 14, 2011 and to an additional 48 stakeholders on November 28, 2011. The second round was sent to people who had been invited to focus groups, but were unable to attend. The survey closed on December 7, 2011 with an overall response rate of 67%.

The following report shares the results of the survey as well as providing some comparisons to 2009 data.

What is your relationship to LCJP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor/supporter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement partner</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community partner</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client / participant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former board member</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political leader</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics
Total Responses 71
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open-Text Response Breakdown for &quot;Other&quot;</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left Blank</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRJD and helping plan RJ Summit 2012</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating nonprofit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Intern/volunteer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Consultant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am the chair for the Pikes Peak RJ Council, so know Deb W. through RJ related events</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional peer - partner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJ Advisory board member</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Admin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer and Educational partner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contract bookkeeper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>donor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fellow RJ director</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friend</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involved with similar program in Colorado</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other RJ practitioner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJTC member</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approximately how long have you been associated with LCJP *under its current or former name, Teaching Peace*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to three years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three to five years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five to ten years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over ten years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistics**

| Total Responses | 71 |
The mission of LCJP is: To cultivate a safe and caring community, reduce crime and bring together those involved in crime or conflict to be heard, creating justice for all.

How well do you think LCJP is doing when it comes to achieving its mission?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics

Total Responses 71

The 2009 Teaching Peace stakeholder survey also asked this question. Responses were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Count (n=55)</th>
<th>Percent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Well</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total percentage of those responding that Teaching Peace / LCJP was doing “very well” or “well” when it comes to achieving its mission increased by 6.46% from 2009 to 2011.
On the scale below, please rate your perception of LCJP’s work in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
<th>Strong Neutral</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making a positive difference in the community</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving as a community resource</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging diverse communities</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing issues of crime and conflict</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing meaningful volunteer opportunities</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building strong partnerships/collaborations with other community organizations</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and communicating its results</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educating the community about restorative justice</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

interSector Partners, L3C encouraged LCJP to ask the above question so that it could be compared to responses to the same question asked in a July 2009 Teaching Peace stakeholder survey. Fifty-five people responded to the 2009 survey. A comparison of the “strong” and “very strong” responses is included here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2011 Responses</th>
<th>2009 Responses</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making a positive difference in the community</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving as a community resource</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging diverse communities</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing issues of crime and conflict</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing meaningful volunteer opportunities</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building strong partnerships/collaborations with other community organizations</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and communicating its results</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educating the community about restorative justice</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what degree do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable/Not sure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCJP plays an important role in the community</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of LCJP's community restorative justice program</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have participated in LCJP's community restorative justice program</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of LCJP's restorative justice practices in schools</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have participated in LCJP's restorative practices in schools</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of LCJP's training programs</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have participated in LCJP's training programs</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of the products offered by LCJP such as implementation manuals and videos</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have purchased or utilized LCJP products in the past</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that restorative justice should be the first thought for resolving the harm of crime and conflict by all people</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the restorative justice philosophy</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the following list, please rank what you believe to be the top three strengths of LCJP: *(Please rank your top 3 with 1 being the top strength, 2 being next and 3 being the third strength)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mission</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community programs</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School programs</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community partnerships</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open and caring atmosphere</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorative justice products</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training programs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The volunteer program</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Respondents: 71**

¹ *Score is a weighted calculation. Items ranked first are valued higher than the following ranks; the score is the sum of all weighted rank counts.*
When you think ahead to the future of LCJP in three years, which of the following best describes what you believe is the ideal direction for LCJP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCJP offers the same or similar services to the same groups of people</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCJP offers the same and new services to the same groups of people</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCJP offers the same or similar services to a wider audience</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCJP offers the same and new services to a wider audience</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Again, think ahead three years, which of the following best describes what you would like to see from LCJP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCJP retains its local focus</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCJP offers programs locally, but has expanded services throughout Colorado</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCJP offers programs locally, but has expanded services throughout Colorado and beyond</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCJP offers programs locally and supports the development of other programs across the country through training and technical assistance</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics

Total Responses 71
You've answered "None of these" to one of or both of the questions above, what ideas do you have for LCJP's future direction? Please be as specific as possible.

Response

I don't have enough information to know the answer to these three questions.

Expanding further into schools. I would like to see them using Restorative Practices, language, etc. beginning in elementary schools so students, parents, staff, etc. are familiar and comfortable using Restorative Practices in each of the schools. I think doing this would begin to create an amazing climate in our schools, which would then expand out into the larger community.

Please share your ideas for other ways that LCJP could expand restorative justice programming into the community.

Response

14 people responded with some version of "I'm not sure" (n/a, nothing to share, ?, I don't know, etc.)

Provide resources
Continue partnerships
Continue the implementation of philosophies in the schools and to younger clients.
Continue to offer the same services. You are doing it well
Could have a stronger impact in the schools.
Education - ongoing including modeling and mentoring.
Expand the RJ pilot to other feeder systems
Expanding the RJ in Schools throughout school district.
I appreciate LCJP's ongoing mission regarding restorative justice.
I don't know the LCJP community firsthand.
I think they should work more closely with the legal system and the schools together.
I would have to do some brainstorming on this.....
More communication and involvement with local businesses big and small
More marketing & educational presentations
More marketing so that more are aware of the program.
More media outreach?
My database.
Offer more information sessions and provide opportunities for participation in circles
Offer the alcohol specific program, Rethinking Drinking
Presenter pool
Response

Rethinking Drinking - address underage drinking

Spanish Training

The program needs more publicity so community members know about the work that is being done.

To expand to address more severe crimes and/or reconciliation process between groups of people

Utilize technology better, including social-media.

Work more closely with other types of organizations.

education - there are so many people that live in Longmont who do not know about LCJP

help other areas/ schools/ counties develop a program like LCJP is to their community.

more PR - not sure the average person knows about LCJP

more community education around the principles of restorative justice

I think that LCJP needs to increase the community's awareness of what it has accomplished to the benefit of the community.

More referrals from police and schools. Could you add neighbor disputes (Jon Clarke)? How about small claims court? Divorces?

I realize mediation and RJ are different, but, hey, there are a lot of wrongs to be righted in the world, even if there are two parties “wronging” each other.

They could look at expanding it into businesses, corporations, government entities, etc. I think it would be amazing to become a city based on restorative practices.

Educating community groups, churches, leaders about RJ; continue to be involved in state RJ initiatives; support/participate in CO Division of Youth Corrections RJ initiatives through training/support of NE region.

LCJP does an excellent job with the resources that they have. Deb Witzel does an outstanding job and is a great representative in the community. I love the work LCJP does with youth in the community...restoring relationships through the restorative process. I also think the work they are doing in the schools is wonderful and very needed. I would simply wish that they could continue to do their work but expand the restorative practices in schools even more.

I believe LCJP is still involved in the Statewide RJ efforts, it is important to keep this momentum going and sharing the opportunities as they already do.

I really appreciate the work being done in the schools and wish it could be expanded to all schools.

We need more support in the schools, especially middle school. This is a new way of thinking about discipline... it's hard for some people to let go of the punitive protocol that has been in place for so long. RJ needs to be modeled, supported, and encouraged.

I'm too new to have any useful suggestions. I don't know enough about what is being done - and not done. I suggest you contact my wife, Louise Pearson. She is a new volunteer.

I think they are doing a great job. I don't have an additional idea and find it annoying to be required to fill in this field.

I'm not sure. I think that LCJP is getting more focus from the community, but I am not sure how we could expand.

I'd love to see the RP in schools program expand to all the middle and high schools AND have school administrators be trained in RP.

Education about the program and the results of the program. The more people know the more likely they are to use the program.
Response

Challenging question in these resource-restricted times. Ensure that partnerships with criminal justice system are strong and continue to look for potential resource leveraging opportunities.

Increased marketing opportunities thru community groups such as service clubs, Neighborhood Group Leaders Association, El Comite, Latino Advisory Board, expansion into more schools.

Add RJ opportunities for crimes of violence a year or two after the offender has been convicted in which the offender and victim can meet and the victim can explain the harm s/he suffered as a result of the offender's act and the offender may be given an opportunity to make some kind of amends. Or create "reintegration" circles for offenders who have done some jail time, patterned after those being done in Estes Park.

Programs: Philosophically, restorative justice is preferable to the criminal justice system for young, first-time offenders. It has the potential to break the cycle of criminal activity by offering the perpetrator a chance to see and hear how his/her actions affected others and make amends through restitution. It should be scaled and embedded in other institutions. Sustainability: The organization has reached a point of organizational growth and transition in its lifecycle. It is moving from a founder-oriented agency to a community-based agency, adding staff and board members, while solidifying its mission and programming. Evaluation: The agency has earned the respect of the Longmont Police and St. Vrain Valley School District through its demonstrated success rates. The recidivism rate for clients is at 10%, compared to the national average at 70%. These statistics should be widely used and adopted as a rational for partnerships in other areas. Governance: A small board will not accomplish expansion. If the organization is to grow, so must the board and requisite policies and procedures including a strong nomination process, solid term limits, and a solid schedule of meetings.

Increase the number of schools served (I consider the schools part of the community) Increase community awareness of restorative justice and what it is - school presentations? (this info may then get back to parents); presentations to other types of relevant organizations, agencies
I've always felt that LCJP could expand restorative practices to non-criminal violations. In this way, they might become a greater resource for the community not limited to court/school referrals.

LCJP is piloting in 3 schools in SVVSD. It would be great for LCJP to expand into all schools in the district.

Many people haven't even heard about restorative justice, much less about LCJP. What are LCJP benefits to community/society who have never had to be involved in the justice system? How to move hearts for something that has not touched you personally? What are other restorative justice agencies (U.S. and world-wide) doing to get the word out to their communities? FACEBOOK - Restorative Justice Around the World. Local, school-wide essay contest about RJ. Got a connection to the Discovery/Learning Channels?

I feel strongly that RJ should be presented as a viable option to all school systems throughout Colorado. I'm not sure of marketing strategies for the Longmont community, however, so can't speak to that.

Continue to work with the state council to promote RJ programs in communities and schools statewide. Coordinate with other strong RJ programs throughout the state.

Work with younger children through elementary & middle schools so they can begin to understand there is a method to say you are sorry if you do something to harm a person or property.

Serving the existing local and school communities in more ways (e.g., "Rethinking Drinking") will help to solidify LCJP towards making their services a "must" during the City and school districts budget planning processes
Take RJ into the schools for immediate response to incidences. Organize communities so that they can start to address crime and conflict in their own neighborhoods through development of leadership within communities.

Increase marketing of your products and services. Continue collaborative efforts with both public and community based organizations in support of strengthening RJ in Colorado.

LCJP's support of RJ through the CCRJD, the RJ Colorado website, and working in collaboration with other organizations (as they have been doing as a leader) is an area where they can continue to expand RJ.

I think that LCJP is an asset to the community, but is not widely known. Focus on doing the basics really well - don't spread the program too thin (i.e. expanding into other cities, etc.) until it is more established in Longmont.
Is there anything else that you would like the LCJP board or staff to know as they plan for the organization's future?

Response

7 people responded with some version of “I’m not sure” (no, n/a, nothing to share, ?, I don’t know, etc.)

Board with less members from government and more from partners and community at large.

Good luck and keep up the great work, y’all.

I appreciate all that they have done and they should continue to dream BIG!!!

If in the schools consider making it more efficient.

It is great that you are doing some strategic planning. Deb Witzel is an amazing leader.

Keep a strong focus on diversity and the involvement of youth.

Keep up the good work.

Love the enthusiasm of the people who work there.

Make sure you are publicizing the good work you do.

The LCJP staff is awesome!

You have an excellent ED leading your efforts!

good luck!

keep up the good work!

Staffing: With up and down staff contingents, the strain on morale should be an area to watch, particularly given the strong involvement of a founder that may lead to a perception of struggles in innovate, new ideas. Finances: Recently the organization moved from a cash based accounting system to an accrual system and it conducted the first audit in the history of the agency. Low reserves and cash-flow issues will only get worse if the organization is to rely more heavily on reimbursements. Fundraising: The agency currently receives a large portion of its revenue from local government sources. While this is a tremendous show of support in the agency’s services, the organization will need to diversify its income sources if it is to expand.

Kids are the key. If they understand what RJ is about, how it works, and how they can play a part, they can be the fulcrum of change.

perhaps seek a volunteer whose sole function is to communicate LCJP’s results and especially the emotional stories through every available means (newspaper, magazines, journals, radio, TV) on a frequent and regular basis

I think a revamping of sorts needs to be done with the way volunteers are used. There seems to be a constant need for volunteers, and the way the process works makes it difficult for people who don't live in the immediate area to coordinate meetings. It might help to hold the conferences in other areas as well as refining the preconference requirements.

Get rid of CABs; they are too “factory-like” and defeat one of the purposes of RJ to respect each individual and give him or her individual attention.

More active, “hands on” board participation in annual fundraiser. Fundraising training seminar for board members.

Maintain the integrity of who you are. The chance to focus larger can lose your base, your direct community service keeps your work grounded, local and impactful, sometimes going ‘big’ can result in a dilution of the intent. Simultaneously, not contradictionally, you have much to offer in training and program development that will be of great value to others around the state, nation and beyond.

For public schools, the process is too long between incident and getting the panel together. If this could be
Response

shortened, there would be more participation.

Continue to sustain local programs: community and schools; Support/Sustain employees through better pay; continue to promote RJ principles and values within LCJP; connect with higher education institutions to highlight LCJP programs, furthering RJ and LCJP programs.

Hire enough staff so that existing staff members are not overextended and so do not burn out early; Recognize that part of the case managers’ jobs is to act as facilitators - they facilitate 40% of the cases as I understand -(and that this is likely a positive thing so that they stay connected to the ‘bones’ of restorative practice and experience the rewards of participating in circles)

I really value the work, thoughtfulness and commitment of the LCJP staff during the activities that I have experienced.

Just remember LCJP is valuable part of the overall picture. There are situations where LCJP is the most appropriate action; however there are situations where LCJP is not appropriate. I think keeping that in mind and working as a partner with law enforcement will help foster that relationship.

Quit using the word ‘urgent’ in email correspondence. If it's urgent please call a volunteer personally.

In order for LCJP to thrive in schools you must continue to find ways to make the restorative process more efficient. The amount of time and number of people involved can make restorative practices difficult and reduce the likelihood that these practices will be used to resolve issues.

I look to LCJP as the leading organization in Colorado for RJ leadership and expertise. Capitalize on that and model for the rest of us how to implement RJ with integrity.

LCJP is a strong leader in the RJ field and is active in building and creating surprised which supports all of RJ in Colorado and beyond. Great work...keep it up!

I hope the program can continue in the existing schools because it has made a difference in changing our school culture and climate and the results are in the data. In a time where funding continues to be cut in our schools, which results in program cuts, staff cuts, etc....it is helpful to have LCJP as a resource in our building! Please, please continue to find the funding to have this program exist!!

I have loved the opportunities I have had to work with the committed staff from LCJP. I very much appreciate their enthusiasm, expertise and professionalism.

LCJP/TP has always been at the cutting edge of advancing the practice of RJ...no doubt this will continue.

There is such an incredible wealth of knowledge in Deb and her staff; I think it would be great to "sell" their technical expertise through fees for training. LCJP might be able to increase its fund base as well as help others across the country learn how to do this outstanding work.

work in prisoner re-entry; reconnecting to family and community to provide a pro-social support network

To draw from how restorative justice and reconciliation programs in other countries are used to resolve issues or repair harms between groups of people

As above, I think incorporating RP into ALL school discipline/issues, thereby institutionalizing RP in every student's mentality is invaluable!
Appendix C: Staff Interview Summary Report

Staff Interview Summary Report
December 2011
As part of its 2011 strategic planning process, the Longmont Community Justice Partnership (LCJP) engaged stakeholders through interviews, focus groups and an electronic survey. InterSector Partners, L3C, met with LCJP staff members for in-person and/or telephone interviews to better understand their perceptions of LCJP and ideas for the future.

The following report includes the questions asked and answers provided during this important part of LCJP’s stakeholder input process.

LCJP’s mission is To cultivate a safe and caring community, reduce crime and bring together those involved in crime or conflict to be heard, creating justice for all. How well do you believe LCJP is achieving its mission?

Cultivate a safe and caring community
- Anyone who comes through our program recognizes they may in fact be a part of a community. I don't see many other venues for that question to come up, where people ask themselves whether they are actually a part of something.
- Great at creating a sense of community; a phenomenal job
- Second for me is cultivating a safe community

Reduce crime
- Yes. I think so. We are reducing crime.
- Top for me is reducing crime

Bring together those involved in crime and conflict to be heard
- We continually need to work on the bringing people together part. We don’t do it very well.
- I think we’re doing pretty well. The part that stands out is “to be heard” – that sounds to me like community outreach, and I think that needs to be improved a lot.
- With our limited resources, we don’t just get to go out into the community and participate in community events. We’re stretched too thin.
- It sounds like we are trying to reach into multiple facets of the community. Everyone is stretched thin and that affects ability to meet the mission.
- I think we’re doing exceedingly well in some ways (like bringing people together when they are referred). We don’t do a lot of reaching out or bringing community together outside of referrals; we don’t have time.
- The restorative justice program is really strong. There is a lot of work going toward that part of the mission.
General comments

- We’re doing well, but there is so much more to be done. I don’t think we could do much better, but there is more to do.
- I feel pleased at what’s happening at this house and in the schools. The school stuff is rocking.
- Overall, we are meeting the community goal, reducing crime and being part of the processes/circles supports all parts of the mission
- I think we’re doing a great job. We may be overwhelmed because we are so good. We need capacity. We’re especially good at the circles process across the board.

What is your vision for what LCJP could be doing in five years time? If resources were unlimited, what would you like to see LCJP do?

- In 5 years, we’ll be specialized. We’ll have special circles for different social groups divided by age, socioeconomic conditions, cultural backgrounds and gender.
- I have an image of the parks around here. Folks show up in the park in the summer to have community decision-making discussions. I see the community realizing that we don’t have to turn decisions over to our neighborhood or government.
- With unlimited resources, I would make restorative story films. We need stories to help people see that they have been turning their power over to experts.
- LCJP would become a laboratory for purposeful ceremony around death and dying, hospice, elder care, estate law, etc.
- We’ll have our own building that is adequate to develop what we decide to develop.
- We need to provide better bilingual Spanish-English service.
- Deepening some of the programming. We have focused on expansion, and it’s time to deepen our work.
- Relationship-building will be very solid due to a renewed focus on people and relationships.
- We need to be trained on the same rules policies and technology at the same time as the police and intelligence communities. Case coordinators need that training. The police need the LCJP training, too.
- LCJP should have the capacity to have its own model of crime intervention through restorative justice. It’s being developed, but it’s not being systematized, it’s not coming together as a model.
- With unlimited money, I would put 50% of that money on school programs and 50% on the community. LCJP would create a training for RJ for all the school students and administrators and also for the police department and city agencies.
- In five years, we’ll have made progress on the RJ culture in general focusing on community and civil society.
- The schools program has a new respect within the community and we have continued to expand the program to have the level of prominence that the relationship with the police department has.
- I hope that the schools program is more robust and not just be a pilot program. I’d like to see it moved beyond our pilot schools into other schools in St. Vrain and Boulder Valley school districts.
• We’ll have more staff.
• We’ll have more space. We have four people in one office now. We rent and could very well rent another space. I think it would help us move into a different mindset. As we grow, we need a more professional space.
• We’re topping out all the way around. Space, energy, capacity. This will be resolved.
• Our program manual and some new products are updated, and we are marketing them for earned revenue.
• We still focus on our core in the community of keeping as many people out of the courts as possible.
• School programs are flourishing with the new legislation. LCJP contracts with the districts.
• We are changing school district policies.
• We are proactively making presentations in the community. We go out and not only educate people about RJ and our organization and what we can offer to the community, but to cultivate a safe and caring community, people need to know how to do that before the crime or conflict happens.
• Eventually, we move beyond Longmont, but not now. We’re dangerously spread. Because of the inspiration that RJ is and because of the vision and motivation of our leadership team, there are advantages and disadvantages to expanding.
• I see a lot of potential for schools if there is willingness for cooperation.
• Having more specific standards, handbooks or approaches that we can count on and turn to.
• I think there’s still a lot of potential to cultivate in the criminal justice system; we need to repair relationships with municipal court.
• At the district level, want to integrate RJ, but we can’t contribute resources to that.
• We have a functional, yet interesting space. Maybe we have an administrative office space elsewhere and the house is used for programming. We need one conference room-type space that the entire staff can use and spread out with computers, etc.
• There is potential to move beyond Longmont. Huge potential consulting for other communities. We’ve done it and we have the products (they need to be updated).
• Legislation passing gives us a huge opportunity. There is no one available to help people get started in their communities.
• Educating the community and other organizations about what restorative justice is and how LCJP operates. There are a lot of misunderstandings about what RJ is, how it works and what the goals are.
• We have a research component that shows real outcomes over many populations.
• We have a much simpler model of communication and engagement. With technology, we could have volunteers step into more leadership roles; staff spends less time on managing case loads and more time on promoting RJ and programming. We need a frictionless system.
• We consolidate our trainings.
- People know about us and we are very visible because we’ve made an effort to educate the community; young people coming out of school into social work and legal and law enforcement careers with no knowledge of restorative justice; we can change that in five years.
- We have a person dedicated to database management and Web site design.

**What trends do you see in RJ work or otherwise that the board and staff should be paying attention to?**

- Partnerships are an important trend. We tend to be on our own and the police department is on its own and volunteers are a group, but we don’t really focus on partnerships. We don’t allocate resource toward partnerships. We aren’t building all three partners. We are building with and for them, but not in true partnership.
- A desire in the community for collaboration.
- Various belief structures like: if you don’t punish then you’re not keeping the community safe.
- Social media is a huge part; the user experience is very important; we have to make it easy. This is obviously the best way to get the word out.
- Longmont is small enough to make the community building emerge and big enough to have resources to really make it happen. There is a sense of community responsibility that I haven’t encountered in other communities. It’s easy to get a sense of community; this is essential to restorative justice. How can we cultivate responsibility and reduce the blaming game?
- The terminology and general vision statements that I hear are very limited. It’s not visionary: crime management, offender management. No talk of personhood-making, community building. We are ahead of the trend in the state. We are setting the trend.
- Training and community outreach. We are part of the collaboration, but that feels like every year we’re wondering if we want to do it. It seems like it could be a more prominent part of our work. It’s a money-maker. And it helps us to be a leader in the RJ field; we are the ones that people look to if we do this; it shows we’re cutting edge. It’s hard to think about making it profitable because it was formed as a collaboration – we could make money if we were in charge of it.
- Our volunteers are older or aging, so we need to be open to accommodating the needs of older volunteers (phone calls, sending things through the mail, etc.), while still being innovative and attracting the next generation
- We are very individually driven in the U.S. A trend is to focus on community and the overall effect. Part of what we do is based on an indigenous tribal tradition; it’s a return to that—lessons from the past, local-focus, community value. A lot is shifting and shaking up our value system; people are looking at their lives differently – it’s shifting how people see community, how they see work, what they define as a career.
- Kids are really struggling. There is very little home support.
- Personal responsibility is important. If we can get in ECE programming, we have a chance at this. We can show them the benefits of taking responsibility rather than the punishment of others. Early prevention is a huge trend.
- Trends in health care and the judicial system of growing problems that our current approaches can’t handle. We keep throwing money at that. RJ dances between psych and legal system
addressing needs in both; and in education. We have an amazing solution to the issues that all are dealing with.

- Inclusion of youth in programming. There is a push to give youth a voice rather than simply handing them programs. It’s a big trend and it is important for teenagers to share with us what they want and need.
- I’d like us to create a holistic picture of how the world’s fit together and what our role is. We’ve created individual program, but not demonstrated well how all fit together.
- We are leaders, but there is a disconnect for the general public, it’s like they can’t handle that whole message, so we spoon feed. A trend that we could start is owning this space.

When making decisions on behalf of LCJP, what are the top things you take into consideration?

**Stakeholders**
- Who are the stakeholders—did they have input? What are the needs of the stakeholders? What are the current strategies we use to meet needs?
- Does this help to serve the community?

**Human resources**
- Benefits and rights as workers are important to sort out. We work so much, but there is not a limit. We need to think about how to help people be aware of self-care, changing activities, taking breaks, etc.
- Does this benefit the staff or is it something they want?
- Are we supporting our staff and volunteers to the degree that they can be sustained over time so that our investment in them actually has a return?
- Do we have the skills to do this?
- Do the board, staff and volunteers have passion toward this?
- Do we have the staff capacity to accomplish this?

**RJ framework**
- Controversy now: How do we operate as a restorative group not only in our service-delivery, but in all practices? HR rules and requirements make it very hard to act through RJ.

**Funding and financing**
- Can we afford it?
- Are we doing this just to get money?
- Does this engage the board in fundraising?
- Can we support this program?
- Can it allow us to access more sources of funding?
Sustainability
- What’s the long-term play? Is this proactive? Are we relying on expectations from the past – i.e. grants from years and years?
- Can we sustain this?
- Can we create a system or structure around this that will build the institutional approach and memory

Other thoughts/ideas
- Does this allow us to stay true to our mission?
- Will this help us get out of emergency mode?
- Will doing this help us to stay ahead?
- Is it something we can start and finish?
- Is this new and creative?
- Does this create additional silos or allow us to work cross-disciplinary?
- Does this make things easier?
- Can we avoid duplication by doing this?
- Will this help us to simplify how we operate?

Is there anything else that you’d like to add?
- Research will be an asset for the organization. It will help for decisions. It will help for lobbying. We need to take this seriously. We have some statistics and outcomes, but we don’t have an eye on how to use research and improve it and have it as a part of everyday life. We need better data collection.
- It takes months to understand how the programs work. The language and nuances are very dense and complex; we could get clearer about how we convey that to the staff, volunteers and community as a whole.
- It takes a village to raise a child. I’m saying there’s more than that. It is the gathering around that child’s mistakes that offers the opportunity to define a village. There is no community without these gifts of conflict.
- A lot of change is happening. We need to strengthen as a group. It’s hard to think about a strategic plan when we’re all just getting by. How do we capitalize on our success without compromising ourselves? Reconnecting with what we really do is important.
- We need to use the restorative model within our staff. Living that as a staff culture is really important.
- In the next year, we need to focus on taking care of what we’ve got. Growth has been our focus in the past few years. Now we’re at this tipping point; it’s a very critical point. We need to focus internally for at least the next six months and get back to a stable foundation. Once we have that stable foundation, we can really work on cultivating our relationships with the community and other agencies.
- We need to return to the big picture of cultivating relationships across the board. Delegating is important. We need to be super clear on who holds what. Get clear on what we each do day to day.
• I’d like to see a fundraising position. If we had a grantwriter or writer/researcher, it would help us to raise money and relieve work from Deb.

• LCJP can expand its reach without too many resources by creating a restorative justice course at Metro State; it’s about how to think restoratively and what restorative justice is along with the models.

• We have made a lot of positive shifts; we’re in the forming stage still. There is room for things to be more clear-cut and therefore productive.

• So much is trial and error right now. We have to try things to see if they work.

• Things are really great here. I hope that we can get referrals from new sources.
**Appendix D: Action Plan**

LCJP’s action plan will allow the board and staff to easily measure progress toward achieving its annual goals and objectives. A revision/update to the goals, objectives and associated action plan near mid-year 2013 will help track progress toward achieving the 3-year vision.

**Goal 1: Develop LCJP as a professional, healthy and creative workplace by enhancing LCJP’s management systems to support employee and organizational needs today and into the future**

| Objective 1.1: Strengthen and improve the LCJP hiring process by June 30, 2012 |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Task/Activity                  | Responsible Party | Resources | Timeline | Progress |
|                                 |                  |           |          |          |
|                                 |                  |           |          |          |
|                                 |                  |           |          |          |

| Objective 1.2: Explore staff retention opportunities (training, professional development, salary/benefit packages, cross-training, review and career enhancement) and begin implementing a plan by September 30, 2012 |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Task/Activity                  | Responsible Party | Resources | Timeline | Progress |
|                                 |                  |           |          |          |
|                                 |                  |           |          |          |
|                                 |                  |           |          |          |
|                                 |                  |           |          |          |
**Objective 1.3:** Determine the “right size” for staffing LCJP including the number of employees and distribution of work; begin to implement needed changes by November 1, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 1.4:** Determine the appropriate size and functionality of office space needed to house LCJP’s right-sized staff by November 1, 2012; implement changes to office space or begin preparations for move by January 1, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective 1.5:** Create an organizational succession plan—to include executive director, key positions and board of directors—by September 1, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 2: Enhance LCJP’s volunteer program to ________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2.1:</th>
<th>Task/Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 2.2:</th>
<th>Task/Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective 2.3:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 3: Increase the use and acceptance of restorative justice practices by improving community awareness and visibility of LCJP

**Objective 3.1**: Identify LCJP’s target markets (including groups, volunteers, donors, partners, etc.) and key messages for each target market by March 31, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 3.2**: Develop a plan for outreach and marketing to each target market by May 31, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective 3.3:** Implement the outreach/marketing plan from June—November 2012; evaluate outcomes and revise the plan for 2013 by December 31, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 4: Enhance earned income and support replication by developing products, trainings and consulting services

**Objective 4.1:** Review existing products and create a process for revising them by September 30, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 4.2:** Determine new products for development by September 30, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective 4.3:** Create a consulting services product line and launch plan based on LCJP’s existing and new products by January 1, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 4.4:** Market and promote LCJP’s products and consulting services for a January 15, 2013 launch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LCJP 2012—2014 Strategic Plan
Page 55 of 57
Goal 5: Increase LCJP’s sustainability by diversifying funding sources

**Objective 5.1:** Develop the structure and duties of a development/fundraising committee and seat the committee by Jun 30, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 5.2:** Map LCJP’s corporate and individual donor network and create a fundraising plan for each market by September 30, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objective 5.3:** Implement LCJP’s fundraising plans during Q4 2012 and evaluate their successes by January 31, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 5.5:** Adjust fundraising plans according to the evaluation of 2012 fundraising activities and implement revised plan during 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task/Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>