

Race and the Criminal Justice System Task Force
Second Meeting
Room C-1, Seattle University School of Law
December 2, 2010

Agenda

- I. Brief introductions and summary of first meeting (10 minutes)
- II. Progress report + articulation of next steps (10 minutes)
- III. Formalizing participation of organizations (15 minutes)
- IV. March 2 meeting with Washington Supreme Court (10 minutes)
- V. Set next meeting, adjourn general meeting, and convene working groups (45 minutes)

Supplemental information

Agenda Item III: Participation

Premise: Success with this project will be enhanced by having organizations be formally affiliated with the task force.

Toward this end, we've worked to ask groups if we can list them as having attended the first meeting. We'd like to work toward formalizing participation. Broad participation provides legitimacy to the effort off this task force, which is not the official body that has any official power. Its power stems from broad participation and the strength of its findings and recommendations. Participation also provides a place at the table for discussions at the general meetings as well as on working groups.

What would formal affiliation look like?

Proposal: We would ask groups if they would agree to being listed as a participant of the task force.

What would this mean: An organizational or institutional participant would agree to participate actively in the dialogue and to participate in at least one working group. An organizational or institutional participant would agree that the organization's name can be included in Task Force materials, including on the Task Force web site.

By agreeing to be a participant, an organization or institution would not be endorsing in advance the findings, recommendations, or implementation plans of the Task Force. Participants will be given the opportunity to review and endorse each report that includes findings, recommendations, or implementation plans. The Task Force endeavors to seek consensus for each report but anticipates that in certain circumstances, participants will be unable based on their institutional limitations or unwilling to endorse a particular report. As the Task Force is not an official body, this model of participation is deemed to be a pragmatic choice for moving forward.

Open meetings. Meetings would be open. Agenda and meeting notes are public documents.

Question: attendees at each meeting public? Should we include in our public documents a list of attendees/organizations?

Agenda Item V: Working Groups

Assessment: There are too many working groups, with some having overlapping functions.

Proposed solution: Combine original working group 2 (plan dialogue among interested participants) with working group 7 (community outreach) and relabel as Working Group 2: Community Engagement.

Combine original working group 4 (develop preliminary recommendations) with working group 6 (refine recommendations for structural reform) into new Working Group 4: Recommendations and Implementation

Included below are folks/organizations that have communicated their interest in being on a particular working group. We invite others, in advance of the Dec. 2 meeting, to express their interest in participating on particular working groups. Parenthesis (u) indicates unconfirmed. We've included placeholders for organizations that might especially consider active involvement with particular working groups.

Revised working group	Tasks	People
1. Oversight	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General oversight 2. Resource development 3. Develop metrics for assessing progress 4. Work with Group 3: Research to write up at appropriate times progress reports 5. Export model to other states Time horizon: 2 years	Judge Gonzalez (ATJ Board) Robert Chang (Korematsu/SU Law) Jason Gillmer (GU Law) Chach Duarte White (WSBA) Tracy Flood (WSBA) _____ (AOC) (u) _____ (UW) (u) _____ (FLOW)
2. Community engagement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Engage in community outreach efforts to ensure that we are listening to interested/affected communities 2. Plan dialogue among the interested parties involved in the criminal justice system 3. Specifically, this will include public events that might be planned at each of the 3 law schools Time horizon: 2 years	Jamila Taylor (LMBA) Diana Singleton (SU Law ATJI) Fe Lopez (LBAW/SU Law) _____ (FLOW) _____ Other MBAs (u) _____ WSBA (u)
3. Research	General: Develop informational resources and preliminary findings <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pull together the research and findings that exist that is specific to WA; where this doesn't exist, pull together national stats (could include state specific if demographics and other social 	Taki Flevaris (Korematsu) Mary Fan (UW Law) Carl McCurley (WSCCR) Katherine Beckett (UW) Chach Duarte White (WSBA) Tracy Flood (WSBA)

	<p>conditions justify comparison)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Assess the research, including identifying strengths and weaknesses 3. Develop abstracts and executive summaries (if they don't already exist) 4. Identify areas where further work is necessary or beneficial; interface with working group 1 to assess feasibility of follow up research, and follow through 5. Make this work accessible to the public—the three law schools, web presence? 6. Develop in a publishable form the findings, and working with Group 4, the recommendations and implementation plan. Work to get all 3 law school's law reviews to co-publish this material. In order to emphasize collective work that went into this, rather than individual authors, publish as the work product of Working Groups 3 and 4. 	<p>Law schools take lead on this, coordinating with other groups? Real value in having the research findings come from educational institutions; broaden beyond law schools to bring in WA universities and colleges? Who will take on coordinating function?</p>
4. Recommendations and Implementation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop recommendations that flow from Working Group 3's work product 2. Refine recommendations for structural reform targeted at institutional actors within system 3. Develop implementation plan 4. Interface with Working Group 1: Oversight to assess progress 	<p>Judge Mary Yu Lisa Daugaard (TDA) Anita Khandelwal (TDA) Mark Larson (King C. Pros.) _____ (FLOW) _____ (WAPA) (u) _____ (WASPC) (u) _____ (WACDL) (u)</p>
5. Education	<p>General: develop educational programming for the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bench 2. Bar 3. Law enforcement 4. Public 5. Law schools 6. Colleges 7. High schools and below 	<p>Jason Gillmer (GU Law) _____ (FLOW) Law schools take lead, with WSBA, WAPA, WASPC?</p>

Race and the Criminal Justice System Task Force website:

http://www.law.seattleu.edu/Centers_and_Institutes/Korematsu_Center/Race_and_Criminal_Justice.xml

Meeting notes:

<http://www.law.seattleu.edu/Documents/korematsu/race%20and%20criminal%20justice/meeting%20notes%20nov.%204%20final.pdf>

MBA approval to list as attending first meeting: MELAW, KABA, FLOW, QLaw, WWL, VABAW, LBAW