

the federal regulations. In addition, we are starting to conduct a regular training program both with staff and IRB members regarding the risks to human subjects, IRB procedures and confidentiality.

Director Goetten made a motion to adopt the Institutional Review Board rules and file them with the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules. Mr. Piland seconded the motion.

Mr. Piland asked if the criteria through which the executive director or Authority officials would or would not approve a project are set out as broad policy or guidelines in order to avoid questions of improper consideration a plan. He also asked if Mr. Boehmer would anticipate needle exchange programs or methadone treatment programs as part of a research project. Mr. Boehmer responded he did not; the IRB is limited to Authority sponsored or supported research. When we contract with a university we would defer to the procedures of their IRB, but also reserve the right to have our IRB also look at it. He said our IRB has already considered studies in the juvenile area, disproportionate minority confinement and implementation of the Juvenile Court Act. Research proposals have changed somewhat based on the IRB's input and discussion.

{The motion to adopt the Institutional Review Board rules to be filed with the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules was made by Director Goetten; seconded by Mr. Piland; and passed by unanimous voice vote.}

Director Kane said the review process for the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules involves a very closely scrutinized review by members of the legislative staff and then we will be called in to fine tune and clarify. The Committee has very strong feelings about not allowing too much discretion. The intent is to let members of the public know exactly what's going to be done, how it's going to be done, why it's going to be done, and who's going to do it.

Chairman Bensinger then asked Mr. Spence to give the report of the Research and Policy Committee.

Planning and Research Committee Report

Mr. Spence stated the Committee met on January 30, 2001 to review and discuss the draft Criminal Justice Plan for the State of Illinois and a draft Authority Action Plan developed to articulate priorities for the use of the Authority's resources in the areas of research, legislation, policy and funding.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend that the full Authority approve the Criminal Justice Plan for the State of Illinois. Mr. Spence referred to Proposed Authority Resolution #1, as amended, for adoption of the Criminal Justice Plan at members' places and pointed out that it includes proposed language that was not included in the proposed resolution sent to members in February. The additions acknowledge that the plan is part of an on-going process of evaluating the continually changing resources and needs of the criminal justice system in Illinois.

Regarding the Action Plan, Mr. Spence said the committee decided to convene a joint meeting with the Authority's Budget Committee to review the document and discuss funding priorities in the issue areas identified in the plan. He said the committee is most interested in considering a comprehensive portrait of current funding in the issue areas identified in the plan as part of the discussion.

Mr. Spence complimented Authority staff on behalf of the committee for their work in drafting the State Criminal Justice Plan and suggested that the Authority also extend its congratulations and appreciation to all of those who participated in developing the plan.

Mr. Piland stated that victims of violent crime ought to be given high priority and appropriately addressed in our state plan. He expressed concern that while we do need to do more for victims, the plan's objective to develop a system of recourse for victims who feel their rights have been

violated is not consistent with where we really are in this process.

Currently the Attorney General is in the process of trying to get an automated victim's notification system developed in the State of Illinois; it is being supported and funded by the Authority. Today the Authority provided funding for transportation for victims of crime in rural southeastern Illinois. Mr. Piland said he thinks that we are jumping ahead of ourselves in terms of our ability to provide recourse when victims don't know what their rights are and they aren't being given services that they ought to be provided. He welcomed comments, and added he would like to have the recourse objective either deleted or sent back to the budget/policy committee to rework that specific objective.

Mr. Spence stated there was some discussion of a victim ombudsman, and that may be problematic if resources aren't there for victims. He said that perhaps we should somehow reword or take a second look at the objective.

State's Attorney Devine said much of prosecutors' emotional commitment stems from and results from feelings for victims. He said that in a general sense prosecutors are all for everything that enhances the rights and powers and involvement of victims. He expressed caution about trying to set up a structure that can end up being almost adversarial when there is no adversarial feeling.

Chairman Bensinger asked for further comments or suggestions as to how this might be better phrased, or, whether members would prefer to adopt the plan and later make changes to this objective.

State's Attorney Devine said he thinks the wrong message would be sent if we adopt the plan and amend it later. He said if we go ahead with the plan, that section should be held out for now. He added that he thinks we can come up with something that is positive and gets the sense of what we want to do without creating potential problems.

Director Kane requested that the revised resolution be held over until the June meeting. She said that while the language included in the plan right now may not be the best way of expressing the need for accountability, people should have an opportunity to express concerns without engaging in an adversarial relationship. She said she'd like an opportunity for members of the victims advocacy community and service providers to sit down with people in law enforcement and prosecutors' office and recraft this objective so that it can be included in the plan.

Chairman Bensinger asked whether there is any advantage of adopting the plan today as compared to June. Director Kane responded she does not think there is harm in waiting. State's Attorney Devine stated he has no problem with what Director Kane suggested, adding that we're all trying to get to the same end.

Director Kane expressed concern about adopting the plan today without this objective. She said she doesn't not want this board to be viewed as taking what some might perceive as an anti-victim stance when it's actually the opposite. Mr. Piland agreed.

{Mr. Apa made a motion to send the draft Criminal Justice Plan for the State of Illinois back to the Planning and Research Committee to take steps needed to have it prepared for the June meeting. Ms. Josh seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous voice vote.}

In the absence of Information Systems Committee Chair Waller, Chairman Bensinger asked Ken Bouche, Vice Chair Nolen's designee, to give the committee report.

Information Systems Committee Report

Mr. Bouche said the Governor's Integrated Justice Strategic Planning Workgroup was one agenda item at the January 25th meeting of the Information Systems Committee. The ability for us to apply for up to a million-dollar grant to help with integration came out of a seminar many of the members of the workgroup attended. Mr. Bouche asked Mr. Prisco to

pg1.jpeg

pg2.jpeg