U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Corrections

National Standards for Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils

Revised August 2025

NIC
National Institute of Corrections

U.S. Department of Justice

National Institute of Corrections

320 First Street, NW

Washington, DC 20534

Dr. Stephen LoBuglio

Director

Holly Busby

Deputy Director

Robbye Braxton

Chief, Community Services Division

Katie Green

Project Manager

nicic.gov

National Standards for Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils

Accession # 033675

Feedback Survey Statement

The National Institute of Corrections values your feedback. Please follow the link below to complete a user feedback survey about this publication. Your responses will assist us in continuing to provide you with high-quality learning and information materials.

https://www.research.net/r/NICPublicationSurvey

Disclaimer

This document was funded by contract No. 21CS12G5, awarded by the National Institute of Corrections. The National Institute of Corrections is a component of the United States Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Prisons. Points of view and opinions in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent official positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Abstract

The *National Standards for Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils* is a comprehensive framework for the formation and ongoing management of criminal justice coordinating councils (CJCCs). CJCCs are established bodies of key criminal justice, government, and community stakeholders that convene regularly to identify systemic challenges and work collaboratively to improve the local criminal justice system. CJCCs have existed for several decades and are widely considered a best practice because they heighten public safety; yet they vary considerably from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. These standards represent the accumulation of practical knowledge on CJCCs, and they outline practices and protocols deemed highly effective in operating a high-functioning council.

The standards cover thirteen elements of CJCCs: 1) vision and mission, 2) bylaws, 3) membership, 4) officers, 5) committee, 6) standing committees and workgroups, 7) meetings, 8) decision-making, 9) strategic planning, 10) data and research, 11) community engagement and outreach, 12) administration, and 13) support staff. Each element is associated with a set of standards, and commentary is provided to support each.

The standards reflect the ideal model for a CJCC. It may not be feasible for a jurisdiction to fully meet all the standards, but it should strive to meet or exceed the standards as best as possible.

Authors

Principal Author/Editor

- Thomas Eberly, Program Director, Justice Management Institute

Associate Author/Editor

- Aimee Wickman, Senior Program Associate, Justice Management Institute

Contributors/Reviewers

- Kristy Danford, Director (retired), Charleston County Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (South Carolina)
- Neal Goodloe, Criminal Justice Planner, Jefferson Area Community Criminal Justice Board (Virginia)
- Katie Green, Correctional Program Specialist, National Institute of Corrections
- Spurgeon Kennedy, Program Director, Justice Management Institute
- Holly Matthews, Executive Director, Lucas County Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (Ohio)
- Gabriel K. Nims, Criminal Justice Initiatives Coordinator, Bernalillo County Office of Criminal Justice and Behavioral Health Initiatives (New Mexico)
- Mandy Potapenko, Director, Milwaukee Community Justice Council (Wisconsin)

Table of Contents

About the National Network of Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils

The National Network of Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils (NNCJCC) was established in 2012 by the Justice Management Institute (JMI) with support from the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA). The NNCJCC is an association of local criminal justice coordinating councils (CJCCs), and its membership is composed of leadership and staff from well-developed and long-standing CJCCs. The mission of the NNCJCC is to advance the creation and sustainability of high-functioning CJCCs across the country. The network also seeks to promote information sharing between CJCCs and the development of evidence-based solutions with the goal of improving local criminal justice systems. An important objective of the NNCJCC is to advocate and support the work of CJCC directors responsible for leading systemic initiatives on behalf of their councils.

Although the NNCJCC is a selective, membership-based association, it strives to be a peer resource for any jurisdiction. If you are interested in learning more about the NNCJCC or CJCCs, please visit https://www.jmijustice.org/.

Acknowledgments

JMI and the NNCJCC would like to thank the National Institute of Corrections, particularly Correctional Program Specialist Katie Green and Deputy Director Holly Busby, for its tremendous support of this project. NIC has long recognized the inherent value of CJCCs and has produced numerous consequential resources to assist jurisdictions in developing and sustaining councils. These national standards for CJCCs, in many ways, represent the accumulation of knowledge that NIC has fostered about CJCCs and their commitment to improving local criminal justice systems.

We at JMI would also like to express our deepest gratitude to the subject matter experts who graciously contributed their time and knowledge to develop and review the national standards for CJCCs. Creating the standards was a yearlong project, and the subject matter experts were extremely passionate and committed to the work. These individuals truly brought expertise, and their contributions are found throughout this publication. The subject matter experts included the following individuals:

- Kristy Danford, Director (retired), Charleston County Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (South Carolina)
- Neal Goodloe, Criminal Justice Planner, Jefferson Area Community Criminal Justice Board (Virginia)
- Spurgeon Kennedy, Program Director, Justice Management Institute
- Holly Matthews, Executive Director, Lucas County Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (Ohio)
- Gabriel K. Nims, Criminal Justice Initiatives Coordinator, Bernalillo County Office of Criminal Justice and Behavioral Health Initiatives (New Mexico)
- Mandy Potapenko, Director, Milwaukee Community Justice Council (Wisconsin)

Finally, JMI would like to thank the NNCJCC members for their contributions to the development of the standards. The NNCJCC convened in May 2022, and meeting participants offered valuable feedback and guidance. The NNCJCC contributors included the following:

- Mike Brouwer, Criminal Justice Coordinator, Johnson County (Kansas)
- Jessica Gamez, Criminal Justice Advisory Board Program Manager, Dallas County (Texas)
- Tiana Glenna, Criminal Justice Supervisor, Eau Claire County (Wisconsin)
- Sonya Harper, Director of Criminal Justice Services, Mecklenburg County (North Carolina)
- Regenia Herring, Executive Director, Criminal Justice Commission, Palm Beach County (Florida)
- Kate Hoadley, Racial Justice Program Manager, Office of the Mayor of New Orleans (Louisiana)
- Tiffany Iheanacho, Justice Services Director, Buncombe County (North Carolina)
- Natalie Ivey, Pretrial Program Manager, Buncombe County (North Carolina)
- Kristy Love, Interim Executive Director, District of Columbia Criminal Justice Coordinating Council

- Sonja Marrett, Policy Advisor, Harris County Precinct One (Texas)
- Kellie McBride, Director of Restorative Justice and Court Services, Lewis and Clark County (Montana)
- Gabriela Piloseno, Coordinator, Pinellas County Public Safety Coordinating Council (Florida)
- Corey Ringenberg, Special Assistant to the County Manager, Coconino County (Arizona)
- Carrie Scardigli, Director, Hennepin County Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee (Minnesota)
- Tenisha Stevens, Director, Office of Criminal Justice Coordination, City of New Orleans (Louisiana)
- Mary Ellen Still, Probation Director, Dutchess County (New York)
- Dakisha Wesley, Assistant County Manager, Buncombe County (North Carolina)

Thomas Eberly
Program Director
Justice Management Institute

Aimee Wickman
Senior Program Associate
Justice Management Institute

Preface: The National Standards for CJCCs

The *National Standards for Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils* offer a comprehensive framework for establishing and operating a CJCC using proven practices. These standards are intended to help jurisdictions build and sustain high-functioning councils. While not every standard may be feasible in all settings, jurisdictions are encouraged to meet or exceed them whenever possible. The standards serve as a model to guide jurisdictions in ensuring their CJCCs operate at their highest potential.

The full standards for CJCCs are listed below for quick reference. The standards with commentary are provided in a subsequent section. The commentary provides detail about the purpose of the standard and guidance on implementation.

Standard 1:	**Vision and Mission Statements**
Standard 1.1:	**The CJCC shall have a vision and a mission statement.**
Standard 1.2:	**Vision and mission statements should be reviewed on a regular basis—at a minimum, every five years.**
Standard 2:	**Bylaws**
Standard 2.1(a):	**The CJCC shall have bylaws that define the organizational structure and operation of the CJCC.**
Standard 2.1(b)	**CJCC bylaws shall include, at a minimum, the following: 1) official name of the council, 2) purpose of the CJCC, 3) authority of the CJCC, 4) list of members by position, 5) requirements for meetings, 6) CJCC officers and their duties, 7) requirements for committees or workgroups, 8) parliamentary-style rules for speaking and vote taking, 9) requirements for disclosing conflict of interest, 10) staff responsibilities, 11) guidelines for strategic planning and annual reports, and 12) requirements for amending the bylaws.**
Standard 2.2:	**Bylaws shall be approved by membership of the CJCC.**
Standard 2.3:	**Bylaws shall be accessible to CJCC members and the public.**
Standard 2.4:	**Bylaws shall be amended by vote of CJCC members.**
Standard 2.5:	**Bylaws shall be reviewed periodically—at a minimum, every five years.**
Standard 3:	**Membership**
Standard 3.1(a):	**CJCC membership shall include executive-level leadership representing key entities from across the system with the power and authority to make decisions.**

Introduction

Purpose of the National Standards for CJCCs

Criminal justice systems are composed of numerous courts, offices, and agencies that are led by appointed or independently elected or appointed officials who often work at different levels of government. Despite this arrangement, it is essential for these courts, offices, and agencies to work together to effectively carry out their roles and responsibilities. Therefore, many jurisdictions have formed a criminal justice coordinating council, or CJCC, to facilitate communication and collaboration between the different entities. The CJCC works to ensure that all stakeholders are informed of the latest developments and initiatives and that they can work together to achieve the best possible outcomes.

CJCCs bring together elected officials, government administrators, and community decision-makers at the local level to support the operation of a jurisdiction's criminal justice system. CJCCs in these jurisdictions serve the important role of facilitating information sharing, promoting interagency collaboration, and problem-solving common challenges. Ultimately, they help a criminal justice system function truly as a system, thereby minimizing inefficiencies and making the most of a jurisdiction's limited resources.

The national standards for CJCCs provide a comprehensive framework for jurisdictions to create or enhance their local criminal justice councils. These standards are designed to ensure that CJCCs are structured and operated in a way that maximizes their effectiveness in improving the criminal justice system. The standards provide a detailed description of the ideal model of a CJCC, and the accompanying commentary offers guidance on how best to implement the standards. By following these standards, criminal justice stakeholders can ensure that their local CJCC is well-equipped to address challenges and create meaningful change.

Definition of a Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC)

Throughout this publication, the term "CJCC" (or "council") will be used although jurisdictions may have a different name for their council, such as criminal justice advisory group or criminal justice board. Regardless of the name used, these councils often exist for similar reasons. In this publication, a CJCC shall refer to any established body of key criminal justice, government, and community stakeholders that convene regularly to identify systemic challenges and work collaboratively to improve the local criminal justice system.

Guiding Principles of CJCCs

A set of guiding principles for CJCCs was identified by the Justice Management Institute (JMI) before embarking on the development of the national standards. The guiding principles encapsulate the fundamental precepts that epitomize CJCCs, meaning they should be universal. The guiding principles for CJCCs are as follows:

- Create a criminal justice system that is fair, just, and equitable.
- Enhance public safety and trust.

- Think systemically and strategically.
- Communicate and share information.
- Collaborate, build consensus, and share responsibility.
- Utilize data and research.
- Pursue innovation and evidence-based solutions.
- Maximize existing resources and taxpayer funds.
- Inform and involve the community.
- Include diverse perspectives in all aspects.
- Embrace transparency and accountability.

These guiding principles shaped and influenced the standards and commentary contained in this document.

Creation of the National Standards for CJCCs

The Justice Management Institute, a nonprofit agency based in Arlington, Virginia, is a national expert on CJCCs and is the founder of the National Network of Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils (NNCJCC). The NNCJCC consists of established CJCCs from across the country and is represented by CJCC directors (or individuals with a similar position) and/or CJCC chairpersons. The mission of the NNCJCC is to advance the creation and sustainability of high-performing criminal justice coordinating councils.

The National Institute of Corrections (NIC) collaborated with JMI and subject matter experts from the NNCJCC to create the national standards for CJCCs. NIC, JMI, and a team of subject matter experts met over the course of a year to draft and finalize these standards. The NNCJCC members also convened in May 2022 to contribute their guidance and expertise to the development of this document.

The development of the national standards was also shaped by findings from a study on CJCCs conducted by JMI. In the study, JMI gathered comprehensive information on councils from across the country and detailed their structure and activities. NIC published the full findings from the study in 2022, titled *National Survey of Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils*, and the report is available directly at nicic.gov. The report, and other valuable resources, may also be found at NIC's microsite dedicated to CJCCs at https://info.nicic.gov/cjcc/.

Limitations of the National Standards for CJCCs

The national standards for CJCCs are intended to be practical and aspirational, providing a framework for jurisdictions to establish a robust and productive CJCC that is sustainable over time. Although some standards, or aspects of a standard, may not be applicable or feasible for all jurisdictions, it is important to strive to apply these standards as best as possible. Additionally, jurisdictions should always refer to any state laws that may be applicable to a CJCC and adhere to those laws regardless of the national standards. By adhering to the standards, jurisdictions can ensure that their CJCC is well-equipped to meet the needs of their community.

National Standards for CJCCs with Commentary

Standard 1: Vision and Mission

Standard 1.1:

The CJCC shall have a vision and a mission statement.

Commentary:

The purpose of the CJCC shall be captured in a vision and a mission statement. The vision statement should reflect the CJCC's ideal state that the council desires to achieve for the justice system and the community. It should be aspirational and express what the CJCC is seeking to create in the future. The mission statement should explain the CJCC's purpose and describe what the CJCC is currently pursuing to achieve its vision.

The vision and mission statements are essential for guiding the CJCC's activities, unifying the council's membership, and conveying the role of the CJCC to the community. Given the importance of the vision and mission statements, they should be developed by CJCC members and formally adopted by the council.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 1.2; Standard 2.1(b); Standard 2.5; Standard 4.3(a); Standard 9.1(a); Standard 12.1

Standard 1.2:

Vision and mission statements should be reviewed on a regular basis—at a minimum, every five years.

Commentary:

The vision and mission statements should be reviewed and assessed periodically to ensure they align with any major transitions that have occurred in the CJCC, the criminal justice system, and/or the community. An intentional review of the vision and mission statements also provides an opportunity for the CJCC members to reaffirm their commitment to the premise and purpose of the council. It is recommended that the vision and mission statements be revisited when the CJCC creates and/or updates its strategic plan or when there is a significant change in the membership.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 1.1; Standard 2.5

Standard 2: Bylaws

Standard 2.1(a):

The CJCC shall have bylaws that define the organizational structure and operation of the CJCC.

Commentary:

The CJCC shall have bylaws to ensure the smooth functioning of the council. These bylaws are written rules that formalize the structure and responsibilities of the CJCC and provide a framework for preventing or resolving any conflicts or disagreements that may arise. They are essential for the CJCC to operate effectively and efficiently and to ensure that all members are aware of their roles and obligations.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 2.1(b); Standard 2.2; Standard 2.5; Standard 5.1(a)

Standard 2.1(b):

CJCC bylaws shall include, at a minimum, the following: 1) official name of the council, 2) purpose of the CJCC, 3) authority of the CJCC, 4) list of members by position, 5) requirements for meetings, 6) CJCC officers and their duties, 7) requirements for committees or workgroups, 8) parliamentary-style rules for speaking and vote taking, 9) requirements for disclosing conflict of interest, 10) staff responsibilities, 11) guidelines for strategic planning and annual reports, and 12) requirements for amending the bylaws.

Commentary:

CJCC bylaws must contain core elements as outlined below that adequately describe the purpose of the council, its role and responsibilities, and its operating structure:

1) *Official name of the Council* – the designated name of the CJCC, which may include common deviations such as criminal justice advisory board, criminal justice council, and public safety council. The official name should include the name of the jurisdiction that the CJCC serves.

2) *Purpose of the CJCC* – the fundamental reason that the council exists, including the vision and the mission statements.

3) *Authority of the CJCC* – the authorization under which the council was formed (e.g., state law, local ordinance, joint resolution of local governments, memorandum of agreement, other).

4) *List of members by position* – the number of CJCC members and the position title of members (e.g., sheriff, judge, prosecutor, police chief). The title of the position should be used in the bylaws instead of the individual's name.

5) *CJCC officers and their duties* – the leadership structure of the CJCC, which includes the officers' titles (e.g., chairperson and vice-chairperson) and assigned responsibilities in leading the council. The bylaws shall also include the selection process for officers and length of term.

6) *Steering committee members and duties* – the number of steering committee members, the member selection process and term, and the committee's assigned responsibilities.

7) *Requirements for committees and workgroups* – the process for forming committees and workgroups, selecting members, and assigning and monitoring responsibilities.

8) *Rules for speaking and voting* – guidelines for meeting procedures that also specify when and how voting will occur. Many CJCCs follow the guidelines outlined in *Robert's Rules of Order*.

9) *Requirements for disclosing conflict of interest* – the criteria and process for members to disclose personal interests outside of their official position that may be a source of conflict on specific matters before the council.

10) *Staff responsibilities* – the duties required of CJCC staff to support the council, the steering committee, and any committee or workgroup.

11) *Guidelines for strategic planning and annual reports* – formal expectations for producing a CJCC strategic plan and an annual report that summarizes the work of the council.

12) *Requirements for amending bylaws* – the procedure for revising the CJCC's bylaws.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 1.1; Standard 2.4; Standard 3.1(b); Standard 4.1; Standard 5.1; Standard 6.1; Standard 8.2(a); Standard 8.3; Standard 12.3(c)

Standard 2.2:

Bylaws shall be approved by membership of the CJCC.

Commentary:

Bylaws may be prepared by a group designated by the CJCC but must be formally reviewed and approved by the council via a vote.

Standard Cross-Reference: Standard 8.2(a)

Standard 2.3:

Bylaws shall be accessible to CJCC members and the public.

Commentary:

The bylaws shall be easily accessible to all council members and the public, preferably on the council's (or jurisdiction's) website and any other appropriate outlets. Furthermore, the bylaws shall be readily available during any CJCC meeting for reference by the members, officers, and staff.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 3.2; Standard 11.4

Standard 2.4:

Bylaws shall be amended by vote of CJCC members.

Commentary:

Bylaws may require amendments over time because of changes in the council, such as changes to membership or staff responsibilities. The bylaws shall specify a process for amending the bylaws that includes, at a minimum: 1) public notice of the proposed amendment(s), 2) inclusion of the amendment item(s) on the CJCC's published meeting agenda, and 3) a formal vote by the CJCC to approve the amendment(s). Once the bylaws have been formally amended by the CJCC, a copy of the revised bylaws shall be provided to each CJCC member and made publicly accessible.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 2.1(b); Standard 2.2; Standard 2.3

Standard 2.5:

Bylaws shall be reviewed periodically—at a minimum, every five years.

Commentary:

As a matter of standard practice, the bylaws of the CJCC should be reviewed at least every five years to ensure they accurately reflect the purpose, organizational structure, and operational procedures of the council. Furthermore, the review of the bylaws should be conducted in conjunction with a review of the CJCC's vision and mission statements to ensure that the council is in line with its goals and objectives.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 1.1; Standard 1.2; Standard 2.4

Standard 3: Membership

Standard 3.1(a):

CJCC membership shall include executive-level leadership representing key entities from across the system with the power and authority to make decisions.

Commentary:

According to the *Guidelines for Developing a Criminal Justice Coordinating Council*, "the CJCC should be governed by a membership that is broadly representative of both elected officials of general government and elected and appointed criminal justice administrators within the (jurisdiction's) geographical boundaries."[i] The CJCC shall include justice officials (e.g., the sheriff, the chief judge, and the county prosecutor); officials of general government (e.g., the county manager, a county commissioner or supervisor, city manager, and mayor); relevant stakeholders from key intercept points in the criminal justice system (e.g., the pretrial services director, the probation chief, and the re-entry director); officials of related non-justice agencies (e.g., the mental/behavioral health director, the housing director, and the school superintendent); and other pertinent stakeholders (e.g., state partners, community members, and crime victim advocates).

Active participation of executive-level leaders is crucial to the CJCC's achieving its goals and objectives. CJCCs will often falter without the involvement of executive-level leaders. Executive-level leaders are essential, as they can make important decisions and enter into collaborative partnerships on behalf of their agencies.

There may be situations in which an executive-level leader, such as a prosecutor or police chief, declines to participate in the CJCC. The CJCC chair or other member should seek to talk privately with the individual and encourage their participation so that their agency is represented on the council and included in any decisions. Although not ideal, a compromise may include the executive-level leader selecting an appropriate designee to serve in their place on the council. If a leader and/or agency refuses to participate, a CJCC can still be effective without the direct involvement of all executive-level leaders. A missing leader, or that leader's replacement, may eventually join the council, especially if the CJCC is accomplishing meaningful work.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 3.1(b); Standard 3.7

Standard 3.1(b):

CJCC membership shall include key justice system professionals that may include, but not be limited to, the chief judge of the felony criminal courts, chief judge of the misdemeanor courts, police chief, sheriff, jail administrator, chief prosecutor, public defender and/or chief defense bar attorney, clerk of court, probation/parole chief, pretrial services director, officials of general government (e.g., county/city manager), and directors across the continuum of care (e.g., substance use disorder, mental health, housing).

Commentary:

The core members of a CJCC are listed in this standard, although the official title of a position may vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. For instance, a chief judge may be referred to as the presiding judge in some jurisdictions. A jurisdiction may identify additional individuals/agencies to include on the CJCC other than those listed in this standard. The most important aspect of setting the CJCC membership is including and ensuring participation from the key decision-makers across the local criminal justice system.

Some CJCCs address both youth and adult systems, although most councils focus solely on the adult system because of distinct differences between the two. A fairly common practice is for the CJCC to include at least one executive-level leader from the youth justice system as a CJCC member to ensure information sharing takes place between the two systems. A jurisdiction may wish to consider forming a collaborative body for the youth justice system, possibly as a subcommittee of the CJCC, if one does not exist.

CJCC members should include officials from city, county, and state agencies. Typically, the three levels of government are naturally represented on a CJCC given the configuration of the local criminal justice system. For example, many police chiefs are part of city government, whereas sheriffs are typically county-level officials. CJCCs often include state officials in the form of the chief judge of the felony criminal courts or the probation/parole chief, but they may also include officials from pertinent state justice agencies (e.g., the department of corrections, the state mental health hospital, and re-entry services) and/or local state legislators as members. (Note: some states have statutes requiring jurisdictions to operate a CJCC, and the council membership is codified.)

CJCCs should strive for an equitable balance in their membership and avoid overrepresentation by any particular group. This approach includes having an appropriate balance of city, county, and state members. A balanced CJCC will help ensure that all agencies have an equal role in the council and any decision-making (i.e., voting).

Non-justice-related officials (e.g., the behavioral health director, the housing director) whose agencies routinely intersect with the criminal justice system are important to consider including as

members of the CJCC. These officials can be valuable collaborators in problem-solving common issues and providing resources that support justice agencies and justice-involved individuals.

CJCC staff should not serve as voting members of the CJCC. Their role is to objectively support the council; but they may participate during CJCC meetings. If a jurisdiction has a criminal justice director, or similar position, the position shall serve as a voting CJCC member unless the position directly supports the council or supervises the CJCC staff.

A single representative is preferable when there are multiple persons with the same title (i.e., type of position) to keep the CJCC a manageable size and to prevent over-representation of any one discipline on the CJCC. A common example is the position of police chief, as some counties may have multiple police chiefs from their municipalities. In these situations, it is recommended that one individual be selected to serve as representative for all police chiefs on the council. The CJCC may decide to include the police chief from the largest municipality, to rotate the police chief representative position, or to allow the police chiefs to select one police chief as their CJCC representative.

CJCC membership should reflect the jurisdiction's general population. This can be challenging for some CJCCs because the membership is determined by position (e.g., sheriff, judge, prosecutor, public defender). If the elected and appointed criminal justice officials are not diverse in gender, race, and ethnicity, then the CJCC should strive to include underrepresented populations when selecting any representative position(s) to serve on the council.

Every CJCC shall outline in its bylaws a transparent and fair process for appointing a representative member. The process should include a method for nominating and approving, by vote of the CJCC, the representative member. The bylaws shall also specify the criteria, such as nonattendance, for removing a representative member. The process for removal should include providing a written notice to the representative member before formal action is taken by the CJCC and a replacement is sought.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 3.1; Standard 3.3; Standard 3.4; Standard 3.7; Standard 12.1

Standard 3.2:

The CJCC shall establish a formal process for onboarding new members.

Commentary:

Onboarding of new members is essential for the success of the CJCC. A formal onboarding process creates a favorable first impression and lays the groundwork for new members to become connected and engaged. It also improves the likelihood that new members will be retained. To ensure that onboarding is successful, CJCC officers and staff should personally welcome new members and provide them with an orientation packet that includes the bylaws, vision and mission statements, strategic plan, annual report, membership list, and pertinent documents (e.g., recent agendas, minutes, and presentations). Additionally, new members should be welcomed via a social media announcement and given a formal introduction to the council.

An effective onboarding process should include six-month follow-up meetings with new members. The follow-up meetings should be used to obtain the members' feedback on the onboarding process and the council. New members may have useful suggestions for making improvements, which may increase their satisfaction as council members.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 3.5; Standard 4.3(a)

Standard 3.3:

The CJCC shall include at a minimum one representative from the community as a voting member.

Commentary:

One or more community members shall serve on the CJCC as a representative of the public. The community representative(s) should not be affiliated with another CJCC member or their agency. It is essential that the community representative(s) contribute expertise and/or perspectives that vary from that/those of the criminal justice and government officials serving on the council.

The community representative(s) shall be a resident of the jurisdiction, and their involvement should reflect the diverse constituencies within the community the CJCC serves. It is essential that the CJCC share power with the individuals directly impacted by the local criminal justice system and ensure that their voices are heard and considered when making decisions. This approach will ensure that the CJCC is truly representative of the community it serves.

The inclusion of one or more community members should be authentic, not symbolic or perfunctory. Authentic inclusion means that the community representative(s) is/are part of a true

collaboration and included equally in all phases of the CJCC's decision-making process. To ensure this, the CJCC should strive to decrease any barriers that may limit the involvement of the community member(s), which may include the specifics of meeting times and location. Furthermore, the CJCC and the CJCC staff should provide adequate training and support to the community member(s) about the council and the local criminal justice system so that they are empowered to be a productive and impactful contributor to the CJCC.

Involvement of one or more community members offers numerous benefits to the CJCC. The benefits include, but are not limited to, better programs and policies, greater transparency and trust, and stronger acceptance and support for initiatives. The presence of one or more community members also heightens accountability in the CJCC and increases the likelihood that the council will pursue its duties and responsibilities in earnest.

The recruitment and selection of one or more community members should be formally outlined in the council's bylaws. A community representative position should be open to any resident who is interested in serving on the council. The CJCC may also intentionally designate that the community representative(s) who joins the council have set experiences or backgrounds, such as being a crime victim, a formerly justice-involved individual, and/or any affected communities.

It is important to note that including community members on the CJCC is distinguished from efforts of community engagement as outlined in Section 11. Although community members on the CJCC may participate in planning and activities associated with community engagement, their participation on the CJCC is not equal to community engagement by the CJCC.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 3.1(b); Standard 11.1

Standard 3.4:

The size of the CJCC shall be manageable and appropriate to fulfill its mission.

Commentary:

The membership size of a CJCC will vary by jurisdiction. Findings from the *National Survey of Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils* indicate that most councils have between 16 and 25 members regardless of the jurisdiction's population size.[ii] CJCCs that are too small run the risk of excluding relevant stakeholders, and councils

that are too large may become unmanageable and unproductive. Each jurisdiction must determine the appropriate configuration of members given the structure of its criminal justice system and local government.

When forming a CJCC, it may be appropriate to start with a smaller membership initially and then include positions over time that add value to the council. Any new position added to the CJCC should occur by a vote of the council members and a change to the bylaws.

In striving to keep the CJCC a manageable size, a decision may be made to exclude some individuals and agencies from membership on the council. Non-CJCC member status does not preclude the individual or agency from attending CJCC meetings and participating as a member of the public. In addition, non-CJCC members may have the opportunity to serve on committees or workgroups of the CJCC; the committees or workgroups may align better with the committee's or workgroup's role or its agency's responsibilities.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 2.4; Standard 3.1(a); Standard 3.1(b)

Standard 3.5:

CJCC membership and expectations of members shall be listed in the bylaws.

Commentary:

The bylaws shall specifically state the title of the positions that will be included in the council's membership. The name of individuals should not be used in the bylaws.

The bylaws should also specify the expectations for members in relation to their association with the CJCC. Many CJCCs establish expectations, or ground rules, for their members related to responsibilities and duties. The expectations are specific not to any individual but to the council membership overall. Examples of member expectations include meeting attendance, open communication, collaboration, shared responsibility, and data-informed decision-making.

Standard 3.6:

CJCC membership shall publicly list its membership and update the membership list annually.

Commentary:

The names and titles of the CJCC members shall be compiled and posted on the jurisdiction's website and in other appropriate outlets to inform the public. The names of the CJCC members should be reviewed at least annually, and especially after general elections, to account for any changes that may have occurred.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 3.2; Standard 11.1; Standard 11.4

Standard 3.7:

Use of proxies and delegates shall be minimized and approved by CJCC officers; proxies and delegates shall have authority to make decisions on behalf of the member.

Commentary:

Participation of executive-level leaders is essential for the CJCC to reach its goals and objectives. Without the presence of key decision-makers at the council meetings, the other decision-makers may discontinue their own participation. Therefore, the primary expectation of a CJCC is that the executive leaders will be engaged and at the table.

There may be unforeseen circumstances when a CJCC member cannot attend a meeting and sends a proxy or delegate on their behalf. This is an acceptable practice, if situational. Any proxy or designee should be a high-ranking official in the organization who can speak and make binding decisions on behalf of the member.

CJCCs should require that each member submit the name and title of a proxy or designee to the CJCC chairperson. The CJCC chairperson should confirm that the proxy or delegate is suitable and confer with the member. The member should be responsible for notifying the CJCC chairperson if the designee is changed. As a standard practice, proxies and delegates should be included in any information disseminated to CJCC members. Proxies and delegates should also be permitted to attend CJCC meetings, but not to vote if the member is present.

The use of proxies and delegates by CJCC members who are representatives should be highly scrutinized. If a representative is regularly unable to participate in the council, then a new representative should be appointed.

It is the responsibility of CJCC officers to encourage participation of key decision-makers in the council. When a member ceases to attend meetings or attends sporadically, the officers should personally contact the member to reaffirm the member's commitment to the CJCC.

Requirements for proxies and delegates shall be outlined in the CJCC's bylaws and upheld by the CJCC officers.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 3.1(a); Standard 3.1(b); Standard 4.3(a)

Standard 4: Officers

Standard 4.1(a):

The CJCC shall have officers including, at a minimum, a chair and vice-chair, or co-chairs, from different disciplines.

Commentary:

A CJCC shall have officers, chosen from its membership, who will oversee the council and lead meetings. At a minimum, two officers shall be selected, either as co-chairs or with one taking the leadership role (i.e., chair) and the other serving as a second-in-command (i.e., vice-chair). If it is deemed necessary, the CJCC may also create other officer positions, such as a secretary or treasurer, but this is uncommon.

The officers of the CJCC shall come from different agencies to equitably distribute power in the council and allow for different perspectives in leadership. A favorable practice is to pair an official from a justice agency (e.g., court, law enforcement, prosecution) with an official from a non-justice agency (e.g., county commission, county or city management, department director) as officers. This arrangement helps build a collaborative relationship between the criminal justice system and those with access to needed resources.

Jurisdictions may also select a community member to serve as an officer of the CJCC. A skilled and respected community member who is also a CJCC officer can potentially serve as a neutral party while also holding the CJCC members accountable for working together for the common good.

CJCC staff shall never serve as officers. The duty of staff is to support the CJCC and its initiatives, not to lead the council. The distinction between staff and officers is necessary to ensure that the CJCC has checks and balances and operates as a true collaboration of system stakeholders.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 3.1; Standard 4.1 (b); Standard 4.2 (a); Standard 4.4; Standard 12.1

Standard 4.1(b):

CJCC officers shall act in the best interest of the council in conducting its business.

Commentary:

The CJCC officers must prioritize the best interests of the criminal justice system and adopt a systems ("big picture") perspective when leading the council. This stance may require officers to

assume a broader position or take on a different role than their official capacity (e.g., sheriff, judge, or prosecutor) might indicate. Although officers cannot be completely impartial and neutral in presiding over the council because of their obligations as executive-level leaders, they should strive to build consensus and be inclusive, trustworthy, and fair. Officers should be clear about whether their opinions spring from their official capacity or from their position as leader of the council. To overcome the challenges of serving dual roles, it is helpful when the officers are held in high regard by their peers and are considered impartial, knowledgeable, team-oriented, and visionary.

Given the objectivity desired from officer positions, the officers should abstain from voting on matters before the council unless it is to break a tie vote.

Standard 4.2(a):

The members of the CJCC shall select officers from the membership through a written nomination and election process.

Commentary:

The officers of the CJCC shall be selected from the council's membership through a formal nomination and election process. A common practice is for members to nominate one of their peers to the current chairperson, who compiles a list of candidates. The candidates are then voted upon by the membership at a CJCC meeting through a ballot process or a simple show of hands. Some councils will also conduct voting electronically using a web-based platform. In-person or electronic voting is acceptable, as long as it is consistent with the language of the CJCC's bylaws.

If the CJCC has difficulty identifying candidates for officer positions, then it may be necessary for the CJCC chairperson and CJCC staff to seek individuals to potentially serve. It is not unusual for CJCC members to feel they do not have the time to lead the council, and they may need reassurances and additional support.

The process for nominating and electing officers, along with the length of terms and term limits, shall be captured in the council's bylaws. The bylaws should also specify a procedure for replacing any officer who no longer holds their official position (e.g., a prosecutor who is not re-elected or retires) before the end of their term as a CJCC officer.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 3.1; Standard 4.1(a); Standard 4.2(b)

Standard 4.2(b):

CJCC officers shall serve set terms with the option for renewal.

Commentary:

Each CJCC shall set a specific length or term for the officers' positions. One- and two-year terms are commonplace, but two-year terms are preferred so that the officer has sufficient time to guide the council on pending initiatives. Terms should also be renewable but capped at no more than three consecutive one-year terms and two consecutive two-year terms. If possible, it is also helpful to stagger the terms of the chairperson and vice-chairperson to avoid having two new officers start at the same time. (Note: this approach works only when two-year terms are used.)

Many CJCCs follow a process whereby the chairperson is succeeded by the vice-chairperson. The benefit of this approach is that it allows the vice-chairperson time to learn the operation of the CJCC before taking over, which provides for a smoother transition. In councils where this approach is used, individuals generally serve one pre-defined term as vice-chairperson and then one term as chairperson.

A CJCC should not designate certain positions as permanent officers—for example, naming the sheriff as permanent chairperson. A CJCC can benefit from having officers from different disciplines, as new leadership can energize a council and bring forward new ideas. The bottom line for a council is to find the best possible leaders for officer positions.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 4.1(a); Standard 4.2 (a)

Standard 4.3(a):

CJCC officers shall facilitate the business conducted by the CJCC and preside over meetings.

Commentary:

Officers perform an important role in facilitating the CJCC. The most visible aspect of a CJCC officer's duties is presiding over the CJCC and steering committee meetings. During council meetings, it is the officers' responsibility, primarily the chairperson's, to guide the members through the council's agenda items productively and in accordance with the CJCC's bylaws. Effective officers tend to engage the members in meaningful discussion to ensure that all viewpoints are taken into consideration before decisions are made. They also use tact to defuse disagreements and they seek compromises in the best interest of the criminal justice system. Officers should avoid trying to impose their personal agenda on the CJCC.

In addition to presiding over CJCC meetings, officers are responsible for several other duties related to the council's operation. The most crucial responsibility is moving the council forward toward its vision and its mission in collaboration with the CJCC steering committee. Other duties typically assigned to the officers include, but are not limited to: 1) encouraging members to attend and participate, 2) finalizing the CJCC meeting agendas, 3) representing the CJCC at meetings and events when necessary, 4) serving as spokesperson for the CJCC to the media and public, 5) signing official correspondence from the council, 6) ensuring representative positions on the council are filled, and 7) advocating for the CJCC and its initiatives with funders and decision-makers.

All duties and responsibilities assigned to the CJCC officers shall be outlined in the council's bylaws.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 1.1; Standard 2.5; Standard 3.7; Standard 5.1(a); Standard 9.2; Standard 12.3

Standard 4.3(b):

CJCC officers shall work in consultation with CJCC staff to prepare for CJCC meetings and advance CJCC initiatives.

Commentary:

A CJCC shall have dedicated staff (at a minimum, a CJCC director) to support the officers, who have their primary work obligations in addition to leading the council. The CJCC support staff shall perform most of the work for the council, with guidance and direction from CJCC officers and the CJCC steering committee. CJCC staff typically work behind the scenes to ensure that the CJCC meetings are well-prepared and that the officers are in the best position to advance the work of the council. It is not the role of the CJCC staff to lead the council.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 4.1(a); Standard 5.2; Standard 12.3; Standard 13.1

Standard 4.4:

The CJCC vice-chair or co-chair shall, at a minimum, perform all the duties of the chair in the event of the chairperson's absence or inability to serve.

Commentary:

In most CJCCs, the primary role of the vice-chair is to assume the duties of the chairperson in the absence of the chair or whenever called upon. This includes when the chairperson vacates their position as an officer.

When a CJCC has co-chairs, the responsibilities of the chairperson shall be shared between the two officers. It can be beneficial to assign responsibilities to the co-chairs that match their personal strengths.

Standard Cross-Reference: Standard 4.3(a)

Standard 5: Steering Committee

Standard 5.1(a):

The CJCC shall have a steering committee responsible for guidance and management of the CJCC.

Commentary:

A CJCC shall have a steering committee (sometimes referred to as an executive or administrative committee) that is responsible for overseeing the operation and progress of the CJCC. Duties of the steering committee should include, but are not limited to, the following: 1) prioritizing CJCC initiatives; 2) monitoring council endeavors, including the work of committees and workgroups; 3) advising the CJCC officers; 4) identifying nominees for officer and representative member positions through a transparent and fair process; 5) ensuring the bylaws and strategic plan are updated; 6) drafting the agenda for CJCC meetings and ensuring matters are ready for council meetings; 7) selecting the CJCC director; 8) providing direction to the CJCC director; and 9) contributing to the performance evaluations of the CJCC director.

The purpose of the steering committee is to ensure the CJCC is properly coordinated and managed. The committee shall not replace or circumvent the role and responsibilities of the CJCC. The specific duties assigned to the steering committee shall be outlined in the CJCC's bylaws. Meetings of the steering committee shall be open to any CJCC member and follow public meeting laws, except for sensitive matters that require executive sessions (e.g., pending litigation, personnel matters).

The steering committee shall document its meetings (via minutes, notes, summaries, recordings, etc.), and the documentation should be available to the CJCC and the public.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 2.5; Standard 4.3(a); Standard 6.1; Standard 6.2; Standard 7.2(a); Standard 7.4; Standard 12.3(a); Standard 12.3(b); Standard 13.5

Standard 5.1(b):

At a minimum, the CJCC steering committee shall include the officers and a small fraction of the CJCC membership.

Commentary:

The CJCC officers (i.e., chairperson and vice-chairperson or co-chairs) shall automatically serve on the steering committee. The steering committee should also include a small number of key criminal justice decision-makers who are members of the CJCC. The size of the steering committee should not have as many members as the CJCC so that it can be nimble and efficient. In general, the

size of the steering committee should not exceed seven members or 25% of the council membership, although some CJCCs opt for a smaller steering committee. The recommended steering committee members include: 1) the CJCC chairperson (or co-chair), 2) the CJCC vice chairperson (or co-chair), 3) the chief judge of the criminal courts, 4) the sheriff, 5) the prosecutor/district attorney, 6) a police chief, and 7) the public defender/defense bar president. Given that the CJCC chairperson and/or vice-chairperson may be a designated position on the steering committee, the membership size of the steering committee may fluctuate (i.e., have fewer members). In addition, the composition of the steering committee may vary, as jurisdictions are structured differently.

The use of proxies and designees for the CJCC steering committee meetings shall be strongly discouraged and rarely used except in extenuating circumstances. Those selected to serve on the steering committee should make their steering committee obligations a priority.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 3.1; Standard 3.7

Standard 5.2:

The steering committee shall include the CJCC director in meetings and provide direction to the position.

Commentary:

The CJCC director is the primary staff person for the CJCC and the steering committee. The director shall attend steering committee meetings to provide information and assistance to the steering committee. The CJCC director should be excluded from the steering committee meetings only when the steering committee agrees by vote to enter an executive session to discuss sensitive personnel matters.

The steering committee should provide guidance and direction to the CJCC director on council matters. This includes authorizing the CJCC director to perform specific tasks in accordance with the job description. In this capacity, the CJCC director shall serve as a liaison and facilitator for the steering committee in all day-to-day business of the council, including, but not limited to, any of the CJCC's committees or workgroups.

In providing information to the steering committee, the CJCC director may also provide guidance to the CJCC and steering committee. A common example is that the steering committee may request that the CJCC director gather and analyze local data on

an issue, research best practices, and then provide a recommendation to the CJCC for addressing the problem. It is then the responsibility of the CJCC to make decisions based on the information presented by the CJCC director.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 12.3(a); Standard 13.1

Standard 6: Committees and Workgroups

Standard 6.1(a):

The CJCC shall create and utilize standing committees to address complex, ongoing priorities and strategic plan initiatives.

Commentary:

Standing committees shall be formed and utilized by the CJCC to work on complex problems that are ongoing in nature and align with the CJCC's priorities. For example, many councils form a behavioral health committee, or something similar, to address a variety of challenges that arise in the criminal justice and mental health systems. Other examples of standing committees formed by CJCCs include, but are not limited to, those related to the following issues: juvenile justice, homelessness/sheltering, information technology, jail population management, and reentry.[iii]

Standing committees shall be formed by a formal vote of the CJCC and should generally exist for an undefined amount of time, given the complexity of the issues they address. When forming a standing committee, the CJCC should define, in writing, the goals and objectives for the standing committee and identify officers and members. The standing committee should work toward its goals and objectives and should develop potential solutions to present to the CJCC. The CJCC should routinely provide guidance and direction to the standing committee and support the implementation of any approved solutions. The steering committee should monitor the standing committee to ensure it is meeting as needed and operating effectively. On an annual or biannual basis, the CJCC should review all standing committees to determine whether any changes are necessary and whether the existing committees are still needed.

In general, unless required to do otherwise by ordinance or statute, standing committee meetings should be conducted less formally than the CJCC. Voting should be limited to procedural matters, as key decisions should be reserved for the CJCC. Each standing committee meeting should have an agenda, and notes should be prepared to capture important details from the standing committee meeting and any action items that need to be completed before the next meeting. Standing committees should utilize workgroups when necessary to advance the development of initiatives.

The process for establishing a standing committee shall be captured in the council's bylaws.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 5.1(a); Standard 6.1(b); Standard 6.2; Standard 7.4

Standard 6.1(b):

The CJCC shall create and utilize workgroups for the purpose of addressing task-specific and time-bound initiatives.

Commentary:

The CJCC shall form workgroups as needed to address specific items that are narrow in scope. Workgroups may be created, for example, to study criminal case backlogs, review the jurisdiction's bail policy, prepare a grant proposal, or develop a community engagement process. The outcomes of the workgroup in addressing the assigned task should be reported to the CJCC for feedback and decision-making. The workgroup should disband once the specific task is completed.

Moving items to workgroups, or standing committees when appropriate, is an effective strategy for advancing the work of the council. Indeed, most of the work in a CJCC occurs in standing committees or workgroups, as the primary purpose of the CJCC is to make decisions and share information. Delegating to a workgroup is also useful in preventing CJCC meetings from getting bogged down on a specific topic that requires more information or time.

Like standing committees, workgroups should have explicit goals and objectives set by the CJCC. Workgroup meetings should be informal but should have an agenda and a record of important meeting details and action items.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 5.1(a); Standard 6.1(a); Standard 6.2

Standard 6.2:

Membership of standing committees and workgroups shall include CJCC members and nonmembers with subject matter expertise and lived experience.

Commentary:

Standing committees and workgroups shall be composed of CJCC members and non-CJCC members. Non-CJCC members may include deputy directors, managers, and line staff from public and nonpublic agencies with desired subject matter expertise. Standing committees and workgroups provide an excellent opportunity to expand the involvement of various agencies/organizations and stakeholders in the work of the CJCC, including community members and especially those with lived experience in the criminal justice and behavioral health systems.

The membership size of standing committees and workgroups will vary depending on the subject matter. All standing committee and workgroup members shall be nominated and approved by the CJCC. A minimum of one CJCC member shall serve on a standing committee or workgroup to ensure continuity between the CJCC and the standing committee or workgroup.

The CJCC's bylaws shall describe the council's requirements for nominating and appointing standing committee and workgroup members and leaders. In addition, the bylaws shall outline the process for removing members from the standing committees or workgroups, when necessary. Members may need to be removed, for instance, if they disengage from the standing committee or workgroup or leave their official position.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 5.1(a); Standard 6.1(a); Standard 6.1(b); Standard 6.3(a); Standard 6.3(b)

Standard 6.3(a):

Standing committees and workgroups shall have a chair and vice-chair or, alternatively, co-chairs.

Commentary:

Each standing committee and each workgroup formed by the CJCC shall have a chair and a vice-chair or co-chairs that are appointed by the council. The duties and responsibilities of the chair and the vice-chair shall be listed in the bylaws. Typical duties of a standing committee or workgroup chairperson include, but are not limited to, the following: 1) presiding over meetings; 2) keeping committee members informed about pertinent matters; 3) establishing meeting schedules; 4) setting the agenda for meetings; 5) ensuring preparation of meeting notes or minutes; and 6) reporting activities and progress to the CJCC, steering committee, and/or CJCC officers. The vice-chairperson generally is responsible for fulfilling the duties of the chair in their absence and assisting the chair as needed.

The standing committee and workgroup chair and vice-chair, or co-chairs, may be non-CJCC members. However, it is preferable to have the chair and/or vice-chair, or one or both co-chairs, as a CJCC member for continuity. This will allow the chair and/or vice-chair to easily channel information to the CJCC, steering committee, and CJCC officers. Non-CJCC members serving as chair or vice-chair of a standing committee or workgroup shall be invited to attend CJCC meetings and be called upon when necessary.

Standard 6.3(b):

The CJCC director and/or staff shall act as support to subcommittees and workgroups and serve as liaison for the CJCC and the steering committee.

Commentary:

The CJCC director and/or CJCC staff shall support the standing committee(s) and workgroup(s) and assist the chair and vice-chair as needed. Specifically, the staff should help the chair and/or vice-chair in preparing for the meeting (e.g., disseminating the meeting agenda and notes/minutes) and any additional tasks necessary (e.g., producing data, conducting research, and consulting stakeholders). The CJCC director and/or staff shall not serve as members of a standing committee or workgroup, although they may directly participate in the standing committee or workgroup meetings.

The CJCC director should serve as the primary liaison between the CJCC steering committee and the standing committee(s) and workgroup(s). The CJCC director shall ensure that information is exchanged between the steering committee and the standing committee(s) or workgroup(s). In addition, the CJCC director shall keep the steering committee abreast of the committee's or workgroup's progress.

Standard Cross-Reference: Standard 5.1(b); Standard 6.3(c); Standard 12.1; Standard 12.2(a)

Standard 6.3(c):

Sufficient communication shall be maintained among committee/workgroup members, and with the CJCC, to maintain continuity and progress toward goals and objectives.

Commentary:

The CJCC, steering committee, standing committee(s), and workgroup(s) shall communicate regularly to guarantee that all members are well informed and moving forward in unison. CJCC and steering committee meeting agendas shall include updates from the standing committee(s) and/or workgroup(s) with open discussions on progress. It is critical that the CJCC continuously provide the standing committee(s) and workgroup(s) with feedback and support on goals and objectives.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 5.1(b); Standard 6.3(b)

Standard 7: Meetings of the Full CJCC

Standard 7.1(a):

The CJCC shall meet at least every other month on a set, scheduled date and time.

Commentary:

The primary purpose of a CJCC is to improve communication and collaboration among executive-level leaders to improve the criminal justice system. To ensure that this objective is met, the CJCC should meet regularly, either monthly or every other month. These scheduled meetings will ensure that leaders and agencies are kept up to date on emerging issues in the criminal justice system and that they can work together to tackle shared challenges. Furthermore, regular meetings will help the council to maintain momentum and manage initiatives more effectively.

The CJCC should schedule meetings on the same day and time of the month so that members get accustomed to the event on their calendars. For example, the CJCC might set their meetings for the second Wednesday of every month at 3:00 P.M. The selection of the day of the week and the time is very important, and careful consideration should be given to the other commitments of the CJCC members. Judges and attorneys, for instance, may have difficulty attending meetings in the mornings because of court obligations. It is often helpful to conduct a survey of the CJCC members to determine the best day and time for a recurring meeting.

Likewise, choosing the location of the CJCC meeting is an important decision. The meeting location should be convenient for a majority of the members and easily accessible (e.g., regarding security, parking, and American Disabilities Act compliance), especially for the public. Conducting CJCC meetings virtually is also an option. Virtual meetings may make it easier for CJCC members and the public to attend, besides which they offer other benefits (e.g., the ability to record meetings, share computer screens, and mute distractions). Some people, however, find virtual meetings disadvantageous to relationship building and meaningful conversations, both of which are critical aspects of councils.

A recommended approach is for the CJCC and the steering committee to meet on rotating months. Having the CJCC meet every other month will allow the standing committees and workgroups time to work on initiatives between meetings of the council and reduce the burden of too many meetings for some CJCC members. In addition, it will provide the steering committee with an opportunity to meet on the off months to perform their duties, which include setting the council's meeting agenda.

Each jurisdiction should determine a meeting frequency that works best for their system and the challenges they are addressing. With new councils, it may be best to meet more often (i.e., monthly) to get the CJCC established and working in unison on initiatives. After the CJCC is running properly with committees and workgroups, then it may be more suitable to meet bimonthly.

Standard 7.1(b):

The CJCC shall follow the laws of open meetings.

Commentary:

Most states have enacted open meeting laws for government entities, although the requirements for open meetings vary from state to state. A jurisdiction should consult its legal counsel for a written opinion on the applicability of the state meeting laws to its CJCC, steering committee, standing committees, and workgroups. Consultation with the state attorney general's office or administrative office of the courts may also be helpful. The CJCC shall abide by all open meeting laws, and the requirements for open meetings should be referenced by statute or incorporated into the council's bylaws.

On occasion, it may be appropriate for the CJCC to enter an executive session where a meeting, or a portion of the meeting, is closed to non-council members. An executive session may be required for highly sensitive matters, such as pending litigation or personnel matters. Any executive session discussion shall be limited to the specific issue at hand. A state's open meeting laws may define the criteria for an executive session, and the criteria should be referenced by the council.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 5.1(a); Standard 7.3; Standard 7.4

Standard 7.2(a):

The CJCC shall provide agendas at least three working days before a meeting or in accordance with local open meetings law, specifying the date, time, and location.

Commentary:

Agendas for the CJCC shall be produced and disseminated before the council meeting. Dissemination of the agendas should precede the meeting by at least three business days. Jurisdictions should consult their open meeting laws to determine whether state statute dictates the number of days before a meeting the agenda must be posted. State law may also require that the meeting announcement and agenda be posted publicly at a government building and/or government website before the meeting.

The agenda should clearly specify the meeting location, meeting time, and items to be covered. The CJCC should avoid delving into items not included on the agenda, as best as possible, given that council members and the public were not given advanced notice. Addressing items not on the agenda may also derail the meeting and/or extend the meeting beyond the scheduled time. It is the CJCC chairperson's responsibility to actively facilitate the CJCC meeting and ensure it is on task and on time without stifling useful discussion.

A helpful practice is to designate on the agenda specific action items, such as approving a new policy or forming a committee, that the CJCC will be expected to make during a meeting. This tactic sets expectations for tasks to be accomplished and reinforces the notion that the CJCC is a decision-making body.

The CJCC agenda should be developed by the steering committee and approved by the CJCC officers before being released. The CJCC director, or the director's staff, should be responsible for preparing and distributing a meeting reminder and the agenda directly to all CJCC members and for placing any required public postings.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 5.1(a); Standard 7.1(b); Standard 12.3

Standard 7.2(b):

Notice of emergency meetings of the CJCC shall be provided 24 hours in advance and called by the CJCC chair or steering committee.

Commentary:

The CJCC may be required to call an emergency meeting to address a critical issue. Emergency meetings may be held in person, virtually, or telephonically. All CJCC members shall be notified 24 hours in advance of the emergency meeting. The public shall be notified in writing also that an emergency meeting is being called, even if an executive session is required. All emergency meetings shall strictly follow a written agenda, and meeting minutes shall be

prepared and disseminated swiftly to all CJCC members (unless confidentiality is required).

It is the responsibility of the CJCC chairperson or steering committee to call an emergency meeting. Unless circumstances do not permit, the CJCC director, or the director's staff, should provide notification about the emergency meeting.

The CJCC bylaws shall outline the criteria and process for calling an emergency meeting. An emergency meeting should address a crucial matter that was not reasonably foreseen and requires immediate attention and decision-making by the council. All other matters should be reserved for the regular scheduled CJCC meeting.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 5.1(a); Standard 7.1(b); Standard 12.3

Standard 7.3:

Meetings of the CJCC shall be open to the public and allow for public comment.

Commentary:

All meetings of the CJCC and the steering committee shall be open to the public unless an executive session is required. Members of the public should be provided an opportunity to address the CJCC, and time for public comment should be included on the meeting agenda. The inclusion of public comment is important because it preserves citizens' free speech, and it enables the public to share potentially useful information with the council. Public input also increases the community's trust in the CJCC and its decisions. However, it is important to remember that the meeting belongs to the CJCC and that the general public does not participate in the decision-making process during council meetings.

Each member of the public addressing the council should provide their name and city of residence and be given a specific time limit for comment, such as three minutes. All comments from the public should be directed to the chairperson only. The CJCC should avoid discussing any topics mentioned by the public that are not on the meeting agenda. The council may elect to add an issue raised by the public to the next meeting agenda.

Once again, a jurisdiction should consult its open meetings law to determine practices that must be followed for public comment during meetings. It is best to post written guidelines and expectations for public comment and to review the guidelines at the beginning of each comment period.

It is extremely important for the chairperson to curtail public comment during the meeting except during the allotted time. The chairperson must maintain control of the meeting or risk alienating CJCC members from participating on the council in the future.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 7.1(b); Standard 7.2(a); Standard 11.1

Standard 7.4:

Meeting documentation shall be produced and accessible.

Commentary:

The CJCC shall produce meeting documentation to record what occurred during meetings. The meeting documentation shall include the date and time of the meeting and who was present. Documenting meetings is necessary for a variety of purposes that include the following: 1) maintaining a record on matters discussed; 2) identifying meeting participants; 3) sustaining momentum from meeting to meeting; 4) capturing decisions, assignments, and action items; 5) acknowledging contributions of members; 6) providing information to members who were unable to attend; 7) increasing transparency and public trust; and 8) providing a reference point for future meetings.

Meeting documents from the previous meeting shall be formally reviewed by members at the beginning of the meeting. Members should be allowed to make amendments to the meeting documentation, if necessary, and a vote to accept the meeting documentation should occur. Once approved, the meeting documentation shall be posted for council members and the public to view, ideally on the CJCC's webpage and/or social media accounts.

Meeting documentation may take many forms, such as minutes, summaries, notes, and recordings. The CJCC shall review state open meeting laws to ensure that proper meeting documentation (and posting) is followed by the council, steering committee, committees, and workgroups. Minutes are recommended for the CJCC and steering committee, whereas notes and summaries are acceptable for committees and workgroups given that decision-making resides with the council.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 5.1(a); Standard 6.1(a); Standard 8.2(b)

Standard 7.5:

For meetings of the CJCC, a quorum of members shall be required and stipulated in the bylaws.

Commentary:

The CJCC shall establish a criterion for a quorum, the minimum number of members who must be present at a meeting to make any decisions valid. Generally, a quorum is defined as half of the total CJCC members plus one. Some jurisdictions may set a more stringent criterion, for example 75% of the total membership, but such a requirement may make it difficult to reach the necessary number of members to conduct business.

A quorum shall be required for any item(s) requiring a vote. Although a CJCC is consensus driven, the CJCC and the chairperson must be cognizant that the council cannot proceed with an action unless a necessary key stakeholder is present. For instance, the CJCC should not proceed with making any decisions that might directly affect the jail without the sheriff and/or jail administrator being present for the meeting.

The requirements for a quorum shall be clearly stated in the CJCC's bylaws.

Standard Cross-Reference: Standard 3.1(a)

Standard 8: Decision Making

Standard 8.1:

CJCCs are advisory in nature and shall rely on consensus.

Commentary:

Although a handful of states have codified CJCCs and some jurisdictions have enacted local resolutions or ordinances establishing their CJCCs, most CJCCs are formed informally and have no direct authority or power other than the influence derived from the composition of their membership. Furthermore, a CJCC cannot make decisions or take direct actions on any independently elected official or their office, or on any official or agency under the authority of another (e.g., the city, county, or state) without the consent of the independently elected official or the authority. For example, a CJCC cannot establish a jail-based treatment program without the approval of the independently elected sheriff who is responsible for the facility. Hence, most CJCCs are advisory in nature and rely on consensus decision-making to advance initiatives.

The advisory nature of CJCCs implies that local decision-makers come together to guide and support the criminal justice system in moving toward public safety goals. In this capacity, the council serves a valuable purpose by improving communication between agencies, gathering and reviewing information and data, providing expertise, prioritizing initiatives, advancing policies and procedures, spearheading development and implementation of programs and services, and advising elected officials on needs. Working as a collective in this manner, a CJCC can be highly influential even if it lacks direct authority or power.

Consensus is a critical component of the CJCC's influence, and there are benefits to operating a council under unanimity. Consensus encourages effective and open communication during meetings while promoting member engagement and overall collaboration. This dynamic, in turn, heightens the possibility that decisions will be more thorough, and that support of those decisions will be stronger. Consensus decision-making among CJCC peers can also be persuasive in swaying some executive leaders to consider changes when they might otherwise not be predisposed to do so.

Standard Cross-Reference: Standard 8.2(a)

Standard 8.2(a):

Voting shall be reserved for significant and procedural matters unless otherwise specified in bylaws or as required by open meetings law.

Commentary:

Although the CJCC should strive to make decisions by consensus, voting is useful for resolving procedural matters, such as approving meeting minutes, confirming new representative members, and electing officers. Councils may also use voting to strengthen the consensus process by taking an informal preliminary vote to discern where members initially stand on an item and/or at the conclusion of discussions to confirm that members are in agreement on an action. In situations where the CJCC has oversight over funds, such as serving as a pass-through for state or federal grant funds, the council shall use voting to formalize decisions and ensure transparency. Other situations requiring a vote shall be determined by the chair and/or steering committee.

The CJCC's bylaws shall specify the council's procedure for voting and the requirements for adopting an item. Many CJCCs adopt a form of Robert's Rules of Order when it comes to voting to ensure that an item up for consideration is clearly stated and that there is opportunity for discussion. Under this format, a CJCC member may propose a main motion to the chair, who then entertains a discussion and possible motions (e.g., substitute motions, friendly amendments, motion to table) before a member of the council chooses to second the motion for a vote. The chair should then lead a vote and announce the results and effects of the vote.

A quorum of members shall be present for all votes. An official proxy or designee for a CJCC member shall be counted toward a quorum and permitted to vote, but only if the CJCC member is absent. The bylaws should clearly state whether remote participation (via telephone or video conferencing) qualifies a member or designee for voting. At a minimum, a majority vote shall be required to carry an item, with the chair abstaining unless an additional vote is required to break a tie. Some CJCCs adopt a higher threshold for passing motions (e.g., a two-thirds vote to pass a motion), which is also acceptable.

As a standard practice, the council's meeting agenda should state any action items that may require a formal vote during the meeting. Noting the vote will alert members in advance that decisions will be made at the meeting and their participation is needed.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 3.7; Standard 4.3(a); Standard 5.1(a); Standard 7.5; Standard 8.1

Standard 8.2(b):

A record of votes shall be recorded in the meeting documentation.

Commentary:

When proceeding toward a vote, the CJCC meeting documentation shall capture the main motion and the name of the council member making the motion. Any discussion and additional motions that follow shall also be documented. The final wording of the motion as voted on by the CJCC, along with the results of the vote, shall be precisely stated in the meeting documentation.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 7.4; Standard 8.2(a)

Standard 8.3:

The CJCC shall have a policy that requires members to abstain from voting when they have a personal and/or fiduciary conflict of interest.

Commentary:

The CJCC shall review state laws on conflict of interest and adopt a formal policy accordingly. At a minimum, the CJCC shall enact a policy that restricts a member from voting on an item before the council when the member has a personal or fiduciary conflict.

The conflict-of-interest policy shall not limit the CJCC member's participation in any item or motion that directly or indirectly benefits the member's official capacity or the agency that they represent. For example, a public defender may advocate for a program or service that benefits his clients to the CJCC.

Ideally, the conflict-of-interest policy shall be incorporated into the CJCC's bylaws. The policy should also be presented to the CJCC members regularly, and the council should discuss hypothetical situations that could result in a conflict of interest.

Standard Cross-Reference: Standard 2.1(b)

Standard 9: Strategic Planning

Standard 9.1(a):

The CJCC shall create and adopt a strategic plan every three to five years to guide the foundational work of the CJCC.

Commentary:

The CJCC members shall collaborate on creating a strategic plan that specifies the council's priorities and core initiatives. The plan shall capture the vision that the council has for enhancing the criminal justice system through realistic and achievable initiatives. These initiatives should be ascribed the utmost importance, as they will serve as the council's foundational work and consume a substantial amount of time and resources because of their significance. However, it is important to note that these strategic initiatives are not the only work of the CJCC, as the council will continue to address ongoing business and any new issues that emerge. To ensure that these initiatives are properly developed and implemented, many CJCCs assign core initiatives from the strategic plan to committees when appropriate, with guidance and support coming from the council.

The strategic plan should contain a reasonable number of goals, and each goal may have a subset of initiatives. Generally, the plan should contain three to five major goals that will include multiple areas of the criminal justice system (e.g., law enforcement, jail, courts, probation, and community-based services). A highly effective practice is to create an action plan to accompany the strategic plan. The action plan should detail the specific initiatives or tasks, leaders, resources, and outputs/outcomes for each strategic goal and serve as a road map for the CJCC and committees. The action plan should also be viewed as a living document that can be modified and adjusted to account for unexpected opportunities or challenges that may arise over time.

A desirable time frame for a CJCC strategic plan is three to five years, especially given that many elected officials serve four-year terms. The strategic plan should contain a combination of short-, medium-, and long-term goals and initiatives. Incorporating short-term goals and initiatives is important because they can be accomplished quickly (i.e., within a year) and generate favorable results for the council. Medium- and long-term goals and initiatives typically produce more significant outcomes and are generally

more complicated and broader in scope. For the longer-range goals, it is helpful to have the strategic plan identify milestones that showcase progress and help sustain the council's commitment to the initiative.

There are several different paths to developing a strategic plan. Jurisdictions may opt for a strategic planning retreat, or they may devote several council meetings to creating a plan. The CJCC may also use committees and/or workgroups to develop strategies once the goals are set by the CJCC, and then the council can review and accept the proposed strategies by the committees and/or workgroups. After forming a strategic plan, the CJCC should take a formal vote to approve it. The vote should signify the council's commitment to executing the strategic plan.

It may be beneficial for a CJCC to contract with an experienced independent consultant to assist with the strategic planning process. A qualified consultant can help facilitate difficult discussions and guide the council toward a shared vision (i.e., priorities) and achievable goals.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 1.1; Standard 6.1(a); Standard 9.1(b); Standard 9.1(c); Standard 9.2; Standard 11.1; Standard 11.2

Standard 9.1(b):

Development of the strategic plan shall be data-guided and research-informed by CJCC membership and community stakeholders.

Commentary:

The CJCC strategic plan must be developed collaboratively by the council's members and should include input from relevant stakeholders, including the community. Collaboration is essential for creating a comprehensive strategic plan that will be backed by council members and stakeholders alike. The strategic plan should never be developed autonomously by the CJCC staff, the CJCC officers, or a small subgroup of the council (although an individual or group may take the lead in drafting the strategic plan on behalf of the council). Inclusion of relevant stakeholders (e.g., staff members, service providers, and elected officials) and community is essential because it bolsters the strategic plan by leveraging diverse perspectives and subject matter expertise. Community engagement in the strategic planning process may take many forms, including surveys, focus groups, workshops, public forums, and membership on planning subcommittees or workgroups.

When creating a strategic plan, the CJCC shall rely on qualitative and quantitative data. Using data is paramount because it reduces the uncertainty of strategic planning by 1) increasing knowledge of

current challenges, 2) centering priorities, 3) informing decision-making, 4) improving initiative development, and 5) revealing resource needs. In addition, data provides a baseline for the CJCC to compare future progress against and to determine whether the council's goals are being achieved.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 9.1(a); Standard 11.1; Standard 11.2

Standard 9.1(c):

The strategic plan shall be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time bound and shall guide the focus of the CJCC, steering committee, and committees.

Commentary:

The CJCC's strategic plan should follow the S.M.A.R.T. paradigm or something similar.[iv] S.M.A.R.T. is an acronym for Specific (outcomes that are well defined), Measurable (outcomes that are quantifiable), Achievable (outcomes that are doable), Realistic (outcomes that are practical), and Time-bound (outcomes with a clearly defined timeline). This established paradigm provides the framework for shaping effective strategies by emphasizing clarity, organization, and direction, an approach that increases the likelihood that the strategic plan will be implemented and the CJCC will reach its goals.

Once the CJCC has adopted a strategic plan, it must make the plan a centerpiece of its efforts. The council and steering committee must be intentional about executing the plan to ensure that the strategic plan comes to fruition. Components of the strategic plan (i.e., initiatives) should be properly delegated to CJCC members, staff, or committees and workgroups. Those assigned duties should then create their own plan of action with a subset of specific goals and objectives. For example, if the CJCC has a strategic goal of developing integrated information systems, the council should designate a committee to advance efforts on the initiative. The committee should develop its own goals and objectives for accomplishing the assigned task in a way that is more detailed than the CJCC's strategic plan, and it should create a corresponding action plan. The committee should share its strategy with the CJCC for guidance and approval and then provide regular progress reports. Following this simple approach will help the CJCC achieve its goals while providing a clear sense of purpose for the council and its members, staff, and committees and workgroups.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 6.1(a); Standard 6.1(b); Standard 9.1(a); Standard 9.2

Standard 9.2:

The strategic plan and related deliverables shall be reviewed regularly and updated as needed.

Commentary:

Monitoring progress on the strategic plan shall be an ongoing responsibility of the CJCC officers and the steering committee. The officers and steering committee should ensure that the goals, initiatives, and tasks outlined in the strategic plan are moving forward at the anticipated pace, and they should offer assistance and guidance if progress is not occurring. CJCC staff should routinely keep the officers and steering committee informed about the status of the goals, initiatives, and tasks, especially if unforeseen issues are arising. It may be necessary to make modifications to the strategic plan because of unanticipated events or a shift in priorities over time. Any proposed modifications to the strategic plan should be brought before the CJCC, and the officers shall determine if the changes are significant enough to warrant a formal vote of approval.

At least annually, the CJCC should dedicate a meeting to review the entire strategic plan to assess implementation progress and determine whether modifications should be made. It is important to view the strategic plan as a working document that can be revisited, especially as changes inevitably happen. The CJCC should problem-solve any barriers that emerge and pinpoint solutions to implementation challenges. It may also be necessary to re-prioritize some goals and objectives in response to new developments, such as funding cuts or new laws. Perhaps most importantly, the annual review of the strategic plan should serve as an affirmation of the CJCC members' shared vision for the criminal justice system.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 4.3(a); Standard 5.1(a); Standard 9.1(a)

Standard 9.3:

The strategic plan and related progress reports shall be made accessible to the public.

Commentary:

The CJCC shall make the strategic plan and related documents easily accessible to the public, ideally through the jurisdiction's website or the council's webpage. Providing access to the strategic plan informs the community about the CJCC's vision and signifies the council's commitment to improving the local criminal justice system. It also heightens both transparency and accountability between the criminal justice system and the community.

In addition to sharing the strategic plan, the CJCC should provide updates at least annually on the council's progress on strategic

initiatives. A formal, written summary is strongly recommended. Such a report will help CJCC members take stock in the council's progress while educating the public on the CJCC's important work.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 11.2; Standard 11.4

Standard 10: Data and Research

Standard 10.1:

The CJCC shall be data- and research-informed.

Commentary:

The CJCC shall utilize local, state, and national data in conducting its business. Leveraging data improves the council's ability to understand topics, problem-solve issues, and make informed decisions. Data can also spur innovation, increase impartiality, identify cost savings, reduce risk, bolster messaging, and measure progress. Data may be qualitative (based on observation) or quantitative (based on numbers and statistics), with the latter preferred because it is more scientific and objective. As a standard practice, the CJCC shall be data-driven and avoid the pitfalls of assumptions, anecdotes, circumstantial evidence, or isolated situations. To ensure the accuracy and reliability of the data, the CJCC shall use data from reputable sources and verify the data before using it. Furthermore, the CJCC shall ensure that the data is up-to-date and relevant to the current situation.

Following the guiding principles of CJCCs, the council shall use data to be research-informed and to pursue evidence-based solutions. Specifically, the CJCC shall rely on criminal justice, medical, and behavioral research that has been critically reviewed and deemed credible when formulating policies and programs. This body of research outlines specific practices that are effective for addressing criminogenic factors and maximizing use of limited resources. To ensure the council is making informed decisions, the National Institute of Corrections has developed a comprehensive library of resources on evidence-based practices to assist decision-makers. This library includes a range of resources, such as research studies, best practices, and tools, to help the CJCC make informed decisions.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 9.1(b); Standard 10.2(a); Standard 10.3(a); Standard 10.4; Standard 12.1

Standard 10.2(a):

The CJCC shall collect and analyze local, system-level data.

Commentary:

The CJCC shall be responsible for collecting and analyzing local criminal justice data. The council shall collect and analyze data primarily to monitor volume (e.g., arrests, cases), trends, outcomes,

and strategic plan progress. Monitoring volume and trends will strengthen the council's ability to manage the system, identify resource needs, track progress of initiatives, and make informed decisions. Furthermore, analysis of system data reveals the interconnectedness of the justice system and how changes in one area can have an impact on others. By understanding this dynamic and harnessing data, the CJCC can be highly effective in coordinating the criminal justice system and achieving its mission.

Collecting and analyzing data across the justice system can be challenging. It can take significant time and resources to obtain, compile, and interpret system information. Moreover, requests for system data can be a burden for the agencies providing the numbers. To address this challenge, the CJCC should collaborate with justice agencies to identify the most important data elements that are feasible to produce. Many agencies already generate some information internally to manage operations or meet state or federal reporting requirements. Compiling this information from justice agencies into a single report for the CJCC to review can be extremely valuable. Then, over time, the CJCC can work on building its data capacity and strengthening its use in data-guided decision-making.

With advancements in information technology, powerful software exists to mine information from various justice record management systems and compile it into a single platform. This software enables the CJCC to produce robust data dashboards in real time and can put useful information at the council's fingertips. Pursuing this technology, if feasible, should be strongly considered and the work of a dedicated subcommittee.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 10.1; Standard 10.2(b); Standard 12.2(a)

Standard 10.2(b):

CJCC members shall demonstrate a commitment to sharing relevant agency data to understand system functioning.

Commentary:

The primary criminal justice agencies in the jurisdiction, especially those member agencies of the CJCC, shall strive to share pertinent data in a timely fashion with the council on a regular basis. The council's primary objective in acquiring data from agencies shall be to effectively monitor and manage the criminal justice system and monitor strategic plan progress. If the agency data is used for related purposes, such as research or evaluations, the agency providing the data should be consulted by the CJCC beforehand

even if the data is considered public record. In addition, as a general courtesy, the CJCC shall share any reports, documents, etc. that are produced using agency data with the agency before any public release so that the agency can make factual corrections or add context, if necessary.

In some jurisdictions, a memorandum of understanding (MOU) exists between the council and the justice agencies providing data. The MOU typically outlines expectations for providing data and specifies how the data will be used by the council. A subcommittee of the CJCC may be responsible for providing governance over the agreement and the use of system data.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 10.1; Standard 10.2(a); Standard 10.3(a); Standard 10.3(b)

Standard 10.3(a):

The CJCC shall establish data metrics that track system performance and strategic goals.

Commentary:

The CJCC shall identify, collect, and analyze data metrics that inform the council about the performance of the criminal justice system and council initiatives. Ideally, the CJCC will produce two types of data metrics: 1) key performance indicators and 2) performance measures. Key performance indicators (KPIs) are a set of standing metrics that provide feedback on (i.e., indicate) how the criminal justice system is functioning in pertinent areas over time. Examples of KPIs may include the violent crime rate, the pretrial release rate, the criminal case clearance rate, the jail population rate, the probation revocation rate, the recidivism rate, etc. As a standard practice, the CJCC should identify ten to twenty KPIs that it tracks routinely, year after year. The council should also use the KPIs to set targets, or goals, for each indicator and a timeline for reaching the targets. For instance, the CJCC may set a goal of reducing the recidivism rate by 10% within five years. When setting a target like this, the CJCC should be intentional about aligning initiatives in the council's strategic plan with the desired KPI goals.

Performance measures, the second type of data metrics that CJCCs should produce, are metrics that quantify progress toward specific objectives. They measure the outcomes of implementing a new practice, program, or policy and inform the CJCC about whether the desired results were achieved. Performance measures should be used for each strategic planning initiative. For example, if the council's strategic plan includes an initiative to implement a new domestic violence program to lower recidivism, the CJCC will want

to know the impact of the new program. Specific performance measures that the council may want to track include the percentage of program participants who complete the program and the percentage of program completers who are rearrested for domestic violence within a two-year period. With the performance data, the CJCC should use the information to determine if the strategic planning initiative, the domestic violence program, is working or if changes need to be made.

Data metrics will help guide the CJCC on identifying issues, setting priorities, and designing solutions. They will also inform the council about the effectiveness of its strategies, the efficiency of operations, and the quality of services.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 9.1(a); Standard 9.1(c); Standard 10.1

Standard 10.3(b):

At a minimum, the CJCC must produce, annually, a system performance report that informs the community.

Commentary:

The CJCC shall produce an annual report. The annual report should contain an overview of the CJCC, a summary of initiatives (especially those related to the strategic plan), and pertinent performance data from across the criminal justice system (e.g., law enforcement, courts, prosecution, defense, jail, probation). The performance data should depict system volume, emerging trends, and progress toward goals. Information from the report should be used by the CJCC to identify areas requiring attention and to inform decision-making.

The data-driven report shall also be shared with the community to increase awareness and knowledge of the CJCC, the council's achievements from the past year, and the challenges that remain. The annual report provides an important opportunity for the CJCC to demonstrate accountability and transparency with the community. When producing the annual report, the CJCC should ensure that the document is clearly written and easy for the public to understand. Additionally, the CJCC should consider using visuals such as graphs, charts, and infographics to make the report more engaging and easier to comprehend. The report should be made easily accessible to the public through various mediums (e.g., websites, social media, local news, and speaking engagements).

The CJCC should strongly consider producing quarterly or mid-year system data reports. Increasing the frequency of data reports will enable the CJCC to be more responsive and proactive in addressing

issues as they arise. These reports should be much leaner versions of the annual report, focusing primarily on numbers rather than narrative.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 2.1(b); Standard 10.1; Standard 11.3; Standard 11.4; Standard 12.2(a)

Standard 10.4:

The CJCC shall routinely engage external partners in research and evaluation.

Commentary:

The CJCC shall seek assistance from independent outside partners to enrich the council's research and evaluation efforts, especially when the council's existing research and evaluation capabilities are limited. Using external partners, both local and national, introduces new perspectives and expertise that may benefit the council's work. In addition, external partners inject objectivity that will help reduce predispositions and biases and ultimately will increase the acceptance of research findings by council members and/or other stakeholders, including the community. To ensure a diverse range of perspectives, the CJCC should consider partnering with a variety of sources, such as colleges and universities, nonprofit agencies, research organizations, consultants, and subject matter experts. Furthermore, the council should strive to avoid partnering with the same individuals or institutions each time, as doing so will help reinforce that the council values inclusivity and broader perspectives.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 10.1; Standard 11.1

Standard 11: Community Engagement and Outreach

Standard 11.1:

The CJCC shall purposefully engage the community.

Commentary:

The CJCC shall strive to create a culture of constructive engagement with the community it serves by actively sharing information with residents, such as justice trend data, and involving them in the decision-making process related to criminal justice initiatives. Doing so will ensure that the council's initiatives include the needs of the community, making them more effective and sustainable. To achieve this, the CJCC should provide residents with information about criminal justice initiatives and create opportunities for them to participate in and influence the decision-making process. Furthermore, the CJCC should take community feedback into account when developing and implementing initiatives. By doing so, the CJCC will foster a culture of meaningful engagement with the community and ensure that its initiatives are tailored to the needs of the community.

Opportunities for community engagement may take many forms. The two most common choices are to dedicate time for public comment on the CJCC agenda and to include community members on the council, committees, and workgroups. The CJCC, however, should strive for deeper and broader community participation beyond these two approaches. Other methods for engaging the community may include conducting community surveys or focus groups, hosting community forums and town halls, producing social media content, and participating in local community events. Although opportunities for community engagement may take many forms, it is essential the CJCC be intentional and transparent. When asking the community to engage in a particular event or process, the CJCC needs to be thoughtful, clear, and transparent about expectations and follow through accordingly. Deliberative community engagement done well can foster effective communication, mutual understanding, and improved relationships.

Community engagement should be a key component of the CJCC's strategic plan. To ensure that the plan reflects the community's needs and priorities, the council should actively involve the community in the planning process. This step could include conducting surveys and hosting workshops to gain insight into the

community's perspectives and to develop effective policies and programs.

When engaging the community, it is important to seek the involvement of diverse individuals and groups from across the jurisdiction. Natural alliances for the CJCC often exist with social and justice organizations dedicated to improving the community, including organizations that represent victims of crime and justice-involved individuals and their families. These alliances are often powerful and successful, but the CJCC should expand inclusion efforts to reach other segments of the community — such as underrepresented populations, religious and business leaders, neighborhood associations, and concerned citizens — to ensure diverse perspectives are being shared. By engaging with a wide range of stakeholders, the CJCC can ensure that all voices are heard, and that the community is working together to create a safe and just environment.

Some CJCCs form a standing committee composed solely of community representatives. These committees are often tasked with providing feedback on initiatives developed by the council and creating their own set of proposals for the CJCC to consider. To ensure that the community's voice is heard in the CJCC's decision-making process, it is beneficial to have one or more representatives from the community committee serve as voting members on the CJCC. Doing so allows the representatives to serve as a liaison between the council and community committee, and it empowers the community committee to have a direct influence on the CJCC's decisions.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 3.4; Standard 6.2; Standard 9.1(b); Standard 11.2

Standard 11.2:

The CJCC shall proactively work to educate and inform the public about the progress and challenges in the criminal justice system.

Commentary:

The CJCC shall make it a priority to educate and inform the public about the council and the criminal justice system via community outreach. Whereas community engagement (see Standard 11.1) emphasizes two-directional participation between the CJCC and the community, community outreach focuses on one-way communication from the CJCC to the community to inform about challenges, opportunities, and decisions. The most significant

benefit of community outreach is that it allows the CJCC to proactively educate residents about justice and safety matters. For example, the CJCC can share recidivism data with the community, provide examples of how the council has been working to lower the re-arrests, and invite the community to a workshop for discussing next steps. Forms of community outreach may include social media messages, website posts, public announcements, and news releases.

As part of its outreach efforts, the CJCC should publish its strategic plan and annual reports. Doing so will ensure that the community is aware of the council's vision for the criminal justice system and can track the progress and challenges of the strategic plan initiatives. Furthermore, the CJCC should host public forums and meetings to discuss the strategic plan and annual reports, allowing for open dialogue and feedback from the community.

In approaching community outreach, the CJCC should seek to build a relationship with the local media to amplify messaging about the council, system trends, and progress and/or challenges. The local media can be a useful mechanism for increasing the community's knowledge of the CJCC and the council's efforts to improve the criminal justice system. Local media may include print (newspaper/magazine), broadcast (television/radio), and digital-based (websites/social media/podcasts) options. The CJCC should be intentional and strategic about sharing information with these media sources, with seven objectives in mind: 1) heightening awareness, 2) increasing engagement, 3) providing access, 4) enhancing transparency, 5) reinforcing credibility, 6) educating the public, and 7) fostering trust. By engaging with the local media, the CJCC can ensure that the community is informed about their efforts and that their message is heard.

The CJCC should develop a comprehensive communication plan that outlines how the council will strategically convey information to the public and media. The plan should include the CJCC's communication goals, core messaging principles, methods for communication outreach, and target audiences. It should also include a strategy for responding to any potential crises that may arise. The plan should be designed to ensure the council's message is coordinated, consistent, and effectively communicated to the public.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 1.1; Standard 9.1(a); Standard 11.1; Standard 11.3; Standard 11.4

Standard 11.3:

The CJCC shall make spokespersons available for community outreach.

Commentary:

The CJCC shall routinely provide knowledgeable and experienced spokespersons for pertinent community events (e.g., town halls, forums, seminars, and association meetings). These events offer a platform for sharing and receiving information and, more importantly, for building a meaningful and lasting relationship between the criminal justice system and the public. The use of spokespersons for community engagement and outreach efforts will help to increase public trust in the CJCC and its members and will help to ensure that the CJCC is seen as a reliable source of information and support.

The primary spokesperson for the CJCC is the chair, or the vice-chair in the absence of the chair (preferably in consultation with the chair). The chair may designate other council members or the CJCC director to serve as a spokesperson or presenter for specific community outreach efforts. CJCC members and staff shall refrain from speaking on behalf of the council to the community without authorization from the chair or the steering committee. To ensure that the CJCC is accurately represented, the CJCC shall assist the chair and/or any spokesperson in developing talking points prior to an event. Doing so will help to ensure that the CJCC's message is communicated clearly and accurately to the community.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 4.3(a); Standard 11.1; Standard 11.2; Standard 13.3

Standard 11.4:

The CJCC shall maintain, at a minimum, a website that provides the community access to CJCC information and resources.

Commentary:

The CJCC shall have a dedicated website that is easily accessible by council members and the community. The CJCC website should be located within the jurisdiction's website, if possible. Content on the CJCC webpage should include, at a minimum, the following information: 1) purpose of the council; 2) vision and mission statements; 3) list of members; 4) bylaws; 5) prior meeting agendas and minutes; 6) next meeting agenda; 7) future meeting date, time, and location; 8) public speaking requirements; 9) committee details; 10) strategic plan; 11) annual report; 12) presentations or reports created by council, staff, or independent researchers; 13) upcoming events; 14) links to pertinent resources, such as council

member websites and social media accounts; and 15) contact information.

The CJCC website shall be maintained by the CJCC director (and/or CJCC support staff). The website should assist the council in complying with open meeting requirements dictated by state statute, if applicable.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 2.3; Standard 3.6; Standard 9.3; Standard 10.4; Standard 11.2; Standard 12.3

Standard 12: Administration

Standard 12.1:

The CJCC staff shall be impartial and objective, responsible for data-driven consensus building representative of the best interests of the local criminal justice system.

Commentary:

The CJCC shall have staff whose primary purpose is to support and advocate for criminal justice system improvements. The CJCC staff serves the council in pursuit of its vision and mission, but staff's true responsibility is to act as caretaker for the criminal justice system, and the CJCC is a mechanism for achieving that objective. The entire CJCC shares the caretaker responsibility with the CJCC staff, but the individual council members must ultimately honor their primary role as sheriff, judge, prosecutor, etc. and act in their agency's best interests. CJCC staff, in contrast, are neutral parties, and their loyalty shall be to the system. Staff should proceed with impartiality and objectivity in their roles and sidestep favoritism, biases, and politics. It is critical that the council understand the primary purpose of CJCC staff and trust and respect the role staff serve.

Operating as caretaker of the criminal justice system, CJCC staff shall focus on the "big picture" and think systemically while being cognizant of the intangible things, such as maintaining professional relationships. In guiding the council and justice system in a desired direction, CJCC staff shall rely heavily on data and research, and especially evidence-based solutions. Utilizing data and research reinforces staff's impartiality and objectivity. It is also valuable in shaping consensus on the CJCC and, ultimately, in positioning the council to make informed decisions for the good of the system.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 1.1; Standard 4.1(b); Standard 8.1; Standard 12.2; Standard 12.2(c); Standard 13.1

Standard 12.2(a):

The CJCC shall have a dedicated director who is accountable to the CJCC's steering committee.

Commentary:

The CJCC shall have a dedicated director position responsible for the council, steering committee, subcommittees and workgroups, and all related initiatives. Other important duties of the director shall include, but not be limited to, organizing meetings, analyzing data and information, conducting legal and scientific research, producing annual reports and other documents, facilitating execution of the strategic plan, leading community engagement

efforts, pursuing and managing grants, building support for the council and its projects, overseeing the council's budget (if applicable), and representing the CJCC and its members at meetings and other functions. The director shall report to the CJCC's steering committee so that the position can be responsive to the direction of the steering committee without any conflicts or competing expectations. A critical role of the director is to support the CJCC officers and the steering committee members in leading the council, given that their time is limited due to their primary obligations as an elected official, administrator, etc. Because the director works for the CJCC, the position shall not serve as a member or officer of the council, although the director may actively participate in meetings.

If a jurisdiction is unable to have the CJCC director report to the steering committee for any reason, then the jurisdiction should create a memorandum of agreement (MOA) that clearly specifies the director's chain of command and official responsibilities. The MOA shall be between the organization supervising the CJCC director and the agency leaders serving on the steering committee. An MOA is necessary to avoid any discrepancies in the role and responsibilities of the CJCC director and the possibility of placing the CJCC director in the middle of conflicting directives from the supervising organization and the steering committee.

Funding for the CJCC director position (and any support staff) should come from local government. In many jurisdictions, the county bears the cost of the position because of the value it brings in increasing efficiencies in the criminal justice system, thereby reducing the system's overall cost and improving a primary concern of many county residents: public safety. In some jurisdictions, the county and city (or cities) share the cost of the director position, whereas other jurisdictions fund the position by requesting that each CJCC member agency contribute a small portion of its annual budget to cover the director position and any additional CJCC staff.[v] The symmetry of the co-funding approach is that it reinforces both the commitment of parties to the council and its primary purpose of better collaboration. If this arrangement is not practical or attainable, then the county should assume responsibility, considering the potential return on investment by keeping long-term justice expenses down, such as jail/detention center costs, which are greatly influenced by system inefficiencies.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 3.1(b); Standard 12.1; Standard 13.1; Standard 13.3

Standard 12.2(b):

The CJCC director shall be selected and approved by the CJCC's steering committee.

Commentary:

It is imperative that the CJCC director be selected through a hiring process that includes direct input from the steering committee members. Steering committee members should help to review the job description before it is posted, develop criteria for screening applicants, and interview candidates. The steering committee shall then select and formally approve, by vote, the candidate they deem best suited to the position.

Intensive involvement of the steering committee is required because the director will be working closely with the steering committee, and the steering committee's support and approval will be critical to the position's success. In addition, the director will be representing the steering committee (and the CJCC) at meetings and other events.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 5.1(a); Standard 12.1

Standard 12.2(c):

The CJCC and its director shall have appropriate staff to support the CJCC's operations, goals, and objectives.

Commentary:

The lead organizer and facilitator of the council is the CJCC director. Responsibilities assigned to the CJCC director are typically diverse, complex, and time-consuming, depending on the size of the jurisdiction and/or the breadth of the CJCC's initiatives. For the council and CJCC director to be highly effective in reaching goals and objectives, incorporating additional support staff members may be necessary to assist with the council's operation. Examples of additional support staff positions may include, but are not limited to, executive assistant, project manager, management analyst, grants manager, and/or information technology specialist. The CJCC director, in consultation with the steering committee, shall determine which positions are needed.

All CJCC support staff shall report to the director to ensure continuity in managing the council's operations. The CJCC, steering committee, and officers should avoid assigning work directly to the CJCC support staff members without conferring with the director.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 5.1(a); Standard 12.1; Standard 13.2

Standard 12.3:

The CJCC shall have sufficient and sustainable resources to manage its operations and accomplish its goals and objectives.

Commentary:

The CJCC shall have a sufficient operating budget to accomplish its duties and responsibilities. Although many CJCCs do not require substantial resources beyond those associated with staffing (e.g., salary and benefits, computer, mobile device, office supplies, and office space), additional funds may be necessary for meeting support (e.g., printing, food and drinks, and parking) and initiative coordination (e.g., software licenses, rental fees, and local travel). Some councils also have supplemental budgets for project development, research studies, technical assistance, training and conferences, advertising, etc. The financial needs of a CJCC will vary but, at a minimum, the council shall have the basic resources it needs to be effective, and those resources should be sustainable.

As noted previously, CJCC operations may be funded by one primary entity (e.g., a county), an interlocal agreement between a county and city (or even multiple counties or cities), or a collaboration between the primary council members and the agencies they represent. Some jurisdictions also seek grant funding to assist with operating costs, especially project development and implementation, whereas a handful of councils operate as a quasi-independent local nonprofit agency. The latter usually involves the nonprofit agency receiving a service contract from a local government and/or foundation. Sustainability of the CJCC is a significant concern for grant-funded or contractual councils, and the overwhelming preference is for local governments to incorporate the operating costs of a CJCC into their annual budget.

A helpful way to think about funding for a CJCC is to consider the amount of government funds required to fund the jurisdiction's criminal justice system overall (e.g., law enforcement, courts, jail, and programs). Then, dedicate a small percentage of the overall figure (e.g., 1%–3%) to support the CJCC. In return, the CJCC can help ensure effective stewardship of taxpayer dollars throughout the local system.

For jurisdictions with limited resources, the CJCC and staff may need to be creative in securing resources for the council's operations. For example, council meetings could be held in public locations that do not require a meeting room fee or paid parking. Collaborations with local colleges and universities may also provide access to interns and affordable research partners. In addition, CJCC members and their agencies may be willing to share access to

photocopiers, printers, and office supplies. Pursuing creative options may help get the council started until full sustainability can be realized.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 12.2(a); Standard 12.2(c)

Standard 12.4:

The CJCC shall seek internal and external funding opportunities to initiate or enhance CJCC goals and objectives.

Commentary:

The primary funder of the CJCC is typically the jurisdiction(s) that the council serves. The CJCC should routinely advise the jurisdiction's funding decision-makers (i.e., county managers, county commissions, mayors, city councils) on opportunities to improve the criminal justice system, especially those that align with the council's goals and objectives (i.e., the strategic plan). The CJCC shall not, however, engage in reviewing the annual budgets of offices and agencies in the justice system to avoid conflict between council members. Exceptions may exist under special circumstances, such as during severe economic downturns.

In alignment with the guiding principles of CJCCs, the CJCC and staff shall explore a variety of funding strategies to advance their goals and objectives. These strategies may include, but are not limited to, the following:[vi]

- *Funding shifts* – reducing or eliminating funding for underperforming or underutilized programs and services in favor of more promising and productive strategies.
- *Piloting* – implementing a pilot program to test a strategy without fully committing financially until the strategy demonstrates potential outcomes.
- *Savings reinvestment* – introducing measures that reduce current costs and then reinvesting the savings in new opportunities.
- *Resource leveraging* – using existing resources, such as school and behavioral health systems, to forge collaborative partnerships on new initiatives.
- *Interlocal partnerships* – forming alliances with other government entities or agencies (i.e., city, county, state, and/or federal) to pool or share resources for justice system improvements.
- *Outside funding* – pursuing grants and technical assistance dollars available through public and private sources to help develop and implement strategies.

It should be noted that the funding strategies listed above are limited by the CJCC's advisory role. In most jurisdictions, the CJCC can provide recommendations to funding decision-makers only on potential opportunities for improving the criminal justice system. Despite this limitation, the CJCC may strongly influence budget decisions given the composition of the council's membership and their expertise.

Finally, it is worth noting that the presence of a functioning CJCC can be extremely beneficial in securing funding for a local criminal justice system. Many funding decision-makers, whether public or private, favor investing in criminal justice systems that have a well-defined vision and mission, a history of collaboration between justice system leaders, a data-driven approach, and a proven record of implementing initiatives.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 8.1; Standard 9.1

Standard 13: Director and Staff

Standard 13.1:

The CJCC director shall be a professional, executive-level position that serves the vision and the mission of the CJCC.

Commentary:

The CJCC director shall be a professional, executive-level position in the jurisdiction.[vii] The position must be an elevated leadership role in an organization because of its responsibility to coordinate the criminal justice system through the CJCC and to work across numerous justice agencies and partner systems (e.g., behavioral health, education, social services, and housing). Furthermore, for the position to be effective, the CJCC director must have good standing with elected officials and top administrators. These individuals need to view the CJCC director more as a partner than a subordinate so that the director can assertively yet tactfully advocate for justice system improvements.

The CJCC director position often derives its "power" from the connection and influence it has with elected officials and top administrators. Given this symbiotic relationship, it is imperative that the CJCC director embody certain qualities that are highly valued, such as being knowledgeable, dependable, competent, trustworthy, and principled. These qualities are especially important when the CJCC director is pursuing the vision and mission of the council. Making the criminal justice system better is the primary responsibility of the director's position.

A successful CJCC director is often one who works diligently behind the scenes to advance the council and its initiatives. The director's efforts may not always be seen or acknowledged, but the director's impact is felt through the accomplishments of the council.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 12.1; Standard 12.2(a)

Standard 13.2:

CJCC staff shall be selected by and accountable to the CJCC director.

Commentary:

The CJCC director shall select individuals to hire for any staff positions supporting the council. The support staff positions shall report directly to the CJCC director, or a supervisor under the CJCC director, without interference from the officers, steering committee, or council. A chain of command is necessary to ensure clarity of 1) roles and responsibilities, 2) decision-making authority, and 3) lines of communication. A well-defined chain of command

empowers the CJCC director to effectively manage the organization, and it is often important to the morale of the director and staff. For the CJCC officers and steering committee, the presence of a chain of command provides direct accountability for the council's operations vis-à-vis the CJCC director.

Exceptions to this standard may exist. Special circumstances may include, for example, when the CJCC director is on medical leave or under disciplinary action, or when the director position is vacant.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 12.2(c); Standard 13.1; Standard 13.4; Standard 13.5

Standard 13.3:

The CJCC director and staff shall have knowledge and experience commensurate with their roles and responsibilities.

Commentary:

The CJCC shall employ a highly qualified director and support staff possessing the necessary knowledge and experience to properly perform the roles and responsibilities of their positions. The positions shall be open to all qualified applicants and selected through a competitive process that is fair, transparent, and objective. The CJCC director and support staff shall be chosen on merit, and not as political patronage, because these positions require a special skill set and will be required to work with a wide array of elected officials, administrators, and stakeholders.

The CJCC director position commonly performs professional and technical work that is complex and diverse. The work typically involves systems coordination in the adult and juvenile justice systems; facilitation of the CJCC, steering committee, committees, and workgroups; statistical and policy analyses; legal and scientific research; oral and written presentation of reports and materials; policy and procedure development; long- and short-term project management; strategic planning; budgeting and cost analyses; grant procurement and management; consultation with elected officials and entities in the local criminal justice system; public relations; and community engagement. Given the extensive duties of the CJCC director position, it is essential that the director have, at a minimum, the following knowledge, skills, and abilities:

- Knowledge:
    - State and local criminal justice systems (i.e., prosecution, defense, judiciary, law enforcement, and corrections) and state, county, municipal government

- Legal and evidence-based practices in criminal justice; emerging case laws; and principles of effective interventions for justice-involved individuals
- Government budgeting, outside funding resources (e.g., federal and state grants), and public/private partnerships
- Social services, public health, behavioral health, substance abuse, education, and housing
- Basic scientific research design and methods, especially those for the social or behavioral sciences
- Evidence-based practices in case processing, corrections, prevention and treatment of violence, risk and needs responsivity, and criminogenic factors

- Skills:
  - Building consensus between groups with diverse needs
  - Conducting qualitative and quantitative research, including program evaluations and performance measurements
  - Developing and implementing strategic plans and a wide variety of initiatives
  - Using software applications to generate reports, presentations, and statistical information
  - Writing clear and concise reports and preparing complex databases or spreadsheets
  - Improving processes to maximize existing resources and improve service delivery for the public
  - Engaging the community to elicit constructive feedback on initiatives and support for short- and long-term objectives

- Abilities:
  - Cultivate relationships and establish a high level of dependability and trust
  - Tactfully manage the concerns of policymakers who sometimes have competing priorities
  - Think independently, analytically, critically, and systemically

- Address the public and professional groups
- Communicate effectively, verbally and in writing
- Integrate and align strategy, people, and activities across functions, processes, and teams
- Translate vision and strategy into clear, actionable goals
- Analyze administrative and organizational problems and identify appropriate solutions
- Prepare and maintain complex reports and records
- Establish and maintain effective working relationships with employees, other agencies, and the public
- Perform duties with minimal level of supervision

The CJCC director's education and work experience should correlate with the expectations of a professional, executive-level position and the necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities. At a minimum, the director shall have a bachelor's degree in an appropriate field (e.g., public administration, criminology, sociology, or political science) from an accredited college or university, with an advanced degree preferred. The CJCC director shall also have several years of transferable work experience in the criminal justice system, governmental agencies, and/or justice-oriented community-based organizations.

The qualifications and work experience for CJCC support staff positions will vary depending on the nature of the work. The CJCC director shall help define the requirements for the support positions.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 12.3; Standard 13.1; Standard 13.2; Standard 13.4

Standard 13.4:

The CJCC director and staff shall have job descriptions that clearly articulates the roles and responsibilities of the position.

Commentary:

The CJCC director and staff shall have written job descriptions that accurately capture the job duties; necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities; and education and experience requirements. The job description should align with those of other executive-level positions in the jurisdiction. It is critical that the job description be accurate, comprehensive, and clearly stated. Well-written job descriptions will help ensure that qualified applicants are recruited and that new employees are properly informed of expectations. Job

descriptions should also be used as the foundation for evaluating the performance of the CJCC director and staff.

In addition to a job description, a new CJCC director and staff should be given an initial 90-day work plan. The work plan should outline expectations for the first 30, 60, and 90 days of employment with the goal of successfully integrating the new hire into the local criminal justice system. For the CJCC director, the onboarding activities shall include meeting face-to-face with each CJCC member as well as with county and city officials, justice system administrators, and community partners. It is also advisable that the CJCC director spend significant time at local justice agencies to learn the general workflow of the system. This time may include police ride-alongs; touring facilities; shadowing staff at jail, pretrial, probation, etc.; observing court proceedings; and participating in various staff meetings and events.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 5.1(a); Standard 13.3; Standard 13.5

Standard 13.5:

The CJCC director and staff shall have performance reviews commensurate with their job duties.

Commentary:

The CJCC director and staff shall have annual performance reviews that reflect the requirements and duties of their respective positions. Performance reviews provide valuable recognition for accomplishments and useful feedback on areas for growth. They also provide an opportunity to ensure that the director and/or staff are aligned with the goals and expectations of the council and to set clear, actionable goals for the year ahead. The steering committee, through the officers, shall be responsible for conducting the performance review of the CJCC director. If the jurisdiction elects to not have the CJCC director report to the steering committee, then, at a minimum, the steering committee and/or officers shall be consulted on the director's performance review. Performance reviews for CJCC staff shall fall under the purview of the CJCC director.

The performance reviews shall be written and presented to the CJCC director and staff face-to-face so that a meaningful dialogue can occur.

Beyond a "top-down" review (i.e., a supervisor reviewing an employee), it may be beneficial to consider a 360-degree performance review. This type of review, usually conducted as a survey, incorporates perspectives from a broader group of stakeholders, such as CJCC or committee members, strategic

partners, and/or justice agency personnel. A 360-degree review of the CJCC director is particularly valuable given the position's responsibility to collaborate with multiple stakeholders.

Standard Cross-References: Standard 5.1(a); Standard 13.2; Standard 13.3; Standard 13.4

Helpful Resources

Robert's Rules of Order

- Roberts, Henry Martyn. *Robert's Rules of Order*. Berkley Publishing Corporation, 1998.

CJCC Publications and Resources

- Cushman, Robert S. "Guidelines for Developing a Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee." U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections, 2002. NIC Accession #017232. https://nicic.gov/guidelines-developing-criminal-justice-coordinating-committee
- Eberly, Thomas, Aimee Wickman, and Spurgeon Kennedy. "National Survey of Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils." National Institute of Corrections, 2022. NIC Accession #033618. https://nicic.gov/national-survey-criminal-justice-coordinating-councils
- Eberly, Thomas, Aimee Wickman, and Spurgeon Kennedy. "Perceptions of Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils." National Institute of Corrections, 2022. NIC Accession #033617. https://nicic.gov/perceptions-criminal-justice-coordinating-council
- Jones. Michael R. "Guidelines for Staffing a Local Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee." U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections, 2012. NIC Accession #026308. https://nicic.gov/guidelines-staffing-local-criminal-justice-coordinating-committee
- Guidelines for Developing a Criminal Justice Coordinating Council. NIC microsite. https://info.nicic.gov/cjcc/

S.M.A.R.T. Goals

- University of California. "SMART Goals: A How to Guide." https://med.stanford.edu/content/dam/sm/s-spire/documents/How-to-write-SMART-Goals-v2.pdf

Evidence-Based Practices

- Crime and Justice Institute at Community Resources for Justice. *Implementing Evidence-Based Policy and Practice in Community Corrections*. 2nd ed. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections, 2009. https://s3.amazonaws.com/static.nicic.gov/Library/024107.pdf
- *An Introduction to Evidence-Based Practices*. Justice Research and Statistics Association, April 2014. https://www.jrsa.org/projects/ebp_briefing_paper_april2014.pdf
- EBDM. "Tools and Resources." National Institute of Corrections, Center for Effective Public Policy, n.d. https://ebdmoneless.org/new-tools-and-resources-pages/
- U.S. Department of Justice. *A Framework for Evidence-Based Decision Making in State and Local Criminal Justice Systems*, 4th ed. National Institute of Corrections, June 2017. https://s3.amazonaws.com/static.nicic.gov/Library/033067.pdf

Community Engagement and Outreach

- *Community Justice Today: Values, Guiding Principles, and Models.* Bureau of Justice Assistance, Center for Court Innovation, November 2022. https://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/media/document/2022/Guide_CCI_TA_CommunityJusticeToday_pageview_11012022_1.pdf

Planning/Facilitating Groups

- *Getting It Right: Collaborative Problem Solving for Criminal Justice*. National Institute of Corrections, June 2006. https://s3.amazonaws.com/static.nicic.gov/Library/019834.pdf
- *City Hall Innovation Team Playbook: The Innovation Delivery Approach to Develop and Deliver Bold Innovation*. Bloomberg Philanthropies, March 2015. https://www.bbhub.io/dotorg/sites/2/2014/08/Innovation-Team-Playbook_2015.pdf

Endnotes

[i] Robert S. Cushman, *Guidelines for Developing a Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee* (U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections, 2002), NIC Accession #017232.

[ii] Thomas Eberly, Aimee Wickman, and Spurgeon Kennedy, *National Survey of Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils* (U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections, 2022), NIC Accession #033618.

[iii] Eberly et al., *National Survey*.

[iv] George T. Doran, "There's a S.M.A.R.T. Way to Write Management's Goals and Objectives," *Management Review* 70 (November 1981): 35–36.

[v] In some instances, a CJCC director position may be funded by multiple counties. This is more common in rural areas with small populations and shared courthouses, jails, etc.

[vi] Thomas Eberly and Aimee Wickman, *County Elected Officials Guide to Criminal Justice Decision Making* (Bureau of Justice Assistance, September 30, 2016).

[vii] Michael R. Jones, *Guidelines for Staffing a Local Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee* (U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections: 2012), NIC Accession #026308.

www.nicic.gov

National Institute of Corrections • 320 First Street, NW • Washington, DC 20514 • 800 995 6423