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Dear Mr. Johnson:

It has been a pleasure conducting extensive research on methods to increase member participation on the Circuit 2 Juvenile Justice Board and Councils. I personally understand the importance of collaborations and over the past few months, have conducted extensive research including interviewing community members, JJCRISP Coordinators, DJJ Staff; and studying best practices across the nation to formulate three distinct, yet interrelated, options for increasing member participation.

My conclusion is that strategies from all three options should be implemented, with a special focus on providing a full-time position for the JJCRISP Coordinator. If his/her time is maximized, the impact this individual could make, with the support of DJJ and its constituents, will be significant. Also, I have learned that the Department has been very supportive of prevention efforts over the past year, and this appears to be an optimal time to request such a change. The Coordinator may consider implementing methods to enhance the Board and Councils infrastructure; and provide avenues for the relationship between DJJ and formal members to be reinvigorated as well.

Thanks for your hard work and dedication to the Department, and I do hope that you find the information contained herein helpful as we all strive to make Florida a safer place.

Sincerely,

Brook M. Eneas
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Executive Summary

Historically, churches, benevolent groups, social networks, and families worked together to cultivate and develop the youth that lived in their neighborhoods (Fagan, 1987, p. 55). It was with this belief that in 1993, the Florida legislature made extensive changes to the organization of the juvenile justice system by creating the juvenile justice boards and councils (boards and councils), which presently operate under the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ or the Department) (FCC, 2001). Since the inception of boards and councils, DJJ has undergone many drastic modifications. Changes in administration have led to multiple structural reorganizations, and the Department as a whole has endured severe scrutiny regarding its delivery of services. These changes, coupled with the proliferation of organizations, have caused “duplication, intergroup conflict and dissipation of the energy of citizens who are willing and able to be involved [in boards and councils], and they have retarded the development of indigenous leadership” (Stenberg, 1972, p. 194).

This report addresses the growing problem of lack of attendance on the Circuit 2 (Circuit) Juvenile Justice Board and Councils (Board and Councils), which is comprised of Gadsden, Leon, Franklin, Wakulla, Liberty, and Jefferson counties, and offers three options that may assist these localities in expanding their prevention efforts through evidence-based studies and research. The first option is to appropriate funding to hire a full-time Juvenile Justice Community Relations and Information Sharing Program (JJCRISP) Coordinator, which is currently a part-time position. The Coordinator’s role is vital in the success of the Board and Councils because he/she is tasked with advocating; recruiting, educating, and training members; and serving as the liaison between the
Department and the stakeholders. The second option is to increase capacity through infrastructure development. This can be accomplished through a number of methods including hosting high-quality meetings and implementing productive committee structures. Finally, the last option is to restore the relationship between DJJ and the Circuit 2 Board and Councils members, which has been frayed due to lack of communication, misconceptions, and a lack of tangible appreciation from the Department.

I believe the first approach of appropriating funding to hire a full-time JJCRISP Coordinator directly aligns with the overall goal of increasing membership and has a high probability of sustainability. Not only is the Coordinator charged with executing strategies to help resolve the attendance issue, but this person may also focus on implementing the other two options, which were common strategies found in other successful councils. In short, these options are logical steps toward enhancing and maximizing local action protocols, with an overarching goal of decreasing juvenile delinquency.
Problem Statement

Dating back at least 70 years ago, the world of juvenile justice prevention has had issues regarding coordinating service delivery, which has resulted in an unhealthy competition to see who can accumulate the most funds, continuously serve the same “at-risk population,” or receive the most praise and recognition.

The lack of coordination in our efforts to deal with the problem of juvenile crime is notorious. A large number of public and private organizations have entered into the juvenile delinquency realm with their own independent policies, goals, and funds and with no regard for what already exists. Incoordination of effort is not merely a matter of wastage of efforts and funds but a certain proportion of juvenile disorganization can probably be directly charged to the resulting inefficiency of the institutions concerned (Young, 1935, p.34).

In response to these issues, in 1993, the Florida legislature created an avenue for community stakeholders, elected and appointed officials, and citizens to serve on juvenile justice boards and councils, which presently operate under the auspices of the Department of Juvenile Justice. The members on the boards and councils were charged with “assessing community needs, analyzing existing services, and making recommendations for the improvement of the juvenile justice continuum in their local area” (FCC, 2001).

According to section 985.4135 of the Florida Statutes, boards must be established in each circuit throughout the State, and councils must be established in each county. The membership of the board may not exceed 18 members and must include 15 members from the county councils, within that circuit, along with the state attorney, public defender and chief judge of the circuit. The council’s membership is determined by the individual councils bylaws, and may include representatives from the school district,
county commissioners, law enforcement agencies, faith community, interested citizens, Department of Corrections, and other stakeholders (2005, s. 985, ch. 2000-135).

For purposes of this discussion, I will focus on the Board and Councils located in Circuit 2, which is comprised of Leon, Gadsden, Franklin, Wakulla, Jefferson and Liberty counties. In the Circuit, the recruitment and retention of members has been a daunting task. According to the Annual Board and Council Reports\(^1\) for 2004-2005 and 2005-2006, the membership rates have been consistent, but the turnover rate for members has been exceptionally high (Community Trust, 2005 & 2006). Furthermore, when considering the large number of public, private, non-profit, and faith-based organizations that are located in each county, the membership composition does not properly reflect the local community (Figure 1).

The number of members on the Circuit Board remained consistent from 2004-2005; however, the public defender only attended 50 percent of the meetings, and there was no representation from the state attorney or chief judge (Community Trust, 2005 & 2006). In the past two years, three out of the six counties experienced a decrease in

\(^1\)Annually, DJJ requires that the board and Circuit members assist the JICRISP Coordinator in completing an Annual Board and Council Report, which includes reporting membership composition and attendance rates. Efforts were made to accumulate the data for the circuit’s membership since 1993, but that information is not currently available (M. McGuire, personal communication, June 18, 2006).
council membership, Wakulla County remained constant, and two counties increased in membership. In Gadsden, Liberty, and Franklin counties, the average membership decreased by approximately 30, 25, and 10 percent, respectively, whereas in Leon and Jefferson counties, the average membership increased by approximately 33 and 20 percent, respectively (Community Trust, 2005 & 2006). Increased membership in Leon County may be contributed to the productivity of the council, and the “heated” juvenile justice issues over the past year may have captured local resident’s attention in Jefferson County.

The JJCRISP Coordinator and the Board and Councils members have gone to great lengths to increase participation, such as contacting stakeholders, hosting membership drives, and even attending other coalition meetings within the Circuit. However, efforts to increase membership have not been efficient. In light of this issue, I will analyze the following methods to rectify this problem: appropriating funding to hire a full-time JJCRISP Coordinator to assist with recruitment tasks; enhancing the infrastructure of the Board and Councils; and restoring the relationship between the Department and Board and Council members.

Boards and councils are vital in cultivating community support, providing the Department advice with legislation, improving citizen involvement in delinquency prevention methods, and in forming collaborations between local organizations. When these objectives are not met due to lack of attendance, this significantly impacts the well-being of the community. To this end, I believe our work environment, homes, and children will all benefit from taking a closer look at the options discussed in this analysis.
Background

According to the Florida Corrections Commission 2001 Annual Report, “House Bill 1927 established Juvenile Justice as a separate operational program office within HRS, and elevated its status within the agency by separating juvenile justice services from the Children and Family Services Program Office, which also provided dependency services” (FCC, 2001). The Governor appointed as the first Deputy Secretary of the Department, Calvin Ross, who provided oversight to over 15 juvenile justice managers located in HRS service districts. According to the report, “The purpose of direct line authority was to streamline juvenile justice decisions and increase accountability, which was enhanced by the creation of juvenile justice county councils and district boards” (FCC, 2001). The councils addressed local issues and the boards provided support to the entire circuit by:

- Providing advice and direction to the Department in the development and implementation of juvenile justice programs and working collaboratively with the Department in seeking program improvements and policy changes to address the emerging and changing needs of Florida’s youth who are at risk of delinquency;

- Developing a juvenile justice prevention and early intervention plan for both the county and the circuit and helping to facilitate interagency cooperation and information sharing;

- Applying for and receiving public or private grants to be administered by one of the community partners that support one or more components of the county or circuit plan; and

- Providing an annual report describing the activities of the circuit board and each of the county councils contained within the circuit (2005, s. 985, ch. 2000-135).

Over the past decade, the boards and councils have become the vehicles used to achieve the purposes of the Juvenile Justice Community Relations and Information
Sharing Program. The mission of the program is to “enable the juvenile and criminal justice system, schools, social service and community-based organizations to make more informed decisions regarding the early identification, control, supervision, and treatment of juveniles who repeatedly commit serious delinquent acts” (DJJ, 2006).

According to Florida Statutes, there must be a board established in each of the 20 judicial circuits and the membership must not exceed 18 members. For circuits without councils, the composition of that board is reflective of a county council (Appendix A). However, in circuits where councils exist, the membership of the boards must include the public defender, state attorney and chief judge (or their designees) from the judicial circuit, and the remaining 15 members must be appointed by the county councils in that circuit to reflect:

- the geographic and population diversity of the circuit;
- juvenile justice partners, including, but not limited to representatives of law enforcement, the school system, the Department of Children and Family Services; and

The membership of the councils may include “representatives from the local school district, board of county commissioners, governing bodies of local municipalities, corresponding circuit or regional entity of the Department of Children and Family Services; county sheriff or designee; local law enforcement agencies; judicial system; business community; other interested officials, groups, or entities; faith community; victim-service programs and victims of crime; and the Department of Corrections” (2005, s. 985, ch. 2000-135). Collaboratively, the councils are tasked with developing individual bylaws, which dictate the parameters for membership.
As the first Deputy Secretary of DJJ, Calvin Ross had a vested interest in boards and councils and believed that they served as the Department's direct link to the local community. His belief translated well in the communities, which was evidenced by the number of stakeholders involved in the effort throughout the State. In fact, the Secretary mandated that local issues and concerns be directly communicated to him (Wanda Jackson, personal communication, June 12, 2006). When William Bankhead assumed Ross’ position in the late 90s, he opted to reorganize the Department in hopes of increasing efficiency. One pivotal change he made was in the Department’s delineation of the State, which evolved from a 15 District framework into a 20 circuit model (Appendix B) and additional personnel were added throughout the State to assist in prevention efforts locally.

Consequently, the boards and council’s method of transmitting information directly to the Secretary changed. The boards and councils were placed under the purview of The Office of Prevention and Victim Services, a bureau of the Department, and each circuit was staffed with a Chief Probation Officer\(^2\), Delinquency Prevention Specialist\(^3\), and a JJCRISP Coordinator.

The JJCRISP Coordinator position was created to enhance the mission of the boards and councils by:

- providing coordination and support for the board and councils through arranging meetings, maintaining membership and mailing lists, scheduling meeting rooms, etc.;

- responding to questions and requests from the members;

---

2 The Chief Probation Officer/Circuit Manager supervises juvenile probation and community corrections efforts in that circuit.

3 A Prevention Specialist plans for services that meet the identified needs of juveniles and families within the local community.
facilitating and compiling local Legislative Budget Requests;

assisting the Department in the dissemination of its annual budget;

preparing draft correspondence;

providing assistance in the development of the comprehensive community juvenile justice prevention and early intervention plan;

facilitating and coordinating community relation activities; and

assisting in the recruitment of volunteers (DJJ, 2006).

After the reorganization, the amount of participation from stakeholders dwindled (Wanda Jackson, personal communication, June 12, 2006). This may indirectly be related to a number of reasons; including the lack of direct access to the Secretary, the influx of local delinquency prevention councils, or the increased number of “mishaps” in the juvenile justice system. As a result, efforts have gone uncoordinated and there has been an alarming rate of juvenile delinquent acts within the State.

In fact, nationally, juvenile justice policy has moved to the center of public attention and political debate in recent years.

The increasingly violent nature of contemporary youth crime and the escalating number of young people involved with the juvenile justice system have challenged established beliefs guiding policy and practice with offender’s years. In the past, there was a fine balance between rehabilitating and punishing offenders, yet recently, youth have begun to receive stricter punishments for delinquency (Jensen and Howard, 1998).

With the influx of stricter punishments, DJJ has received severe criticism for several disturbing occurrences in the system. Earlier this year, a surveillance camera captured a youth in a Panama City Boot Camp being beaten to death by the camp staff (GNN, 2006). In February of 2004, a youth passed away because his complaints of stomach pains were ignored by facility personnel (No Spank, 2004). In the same month,
females in a residential facility filed a grievance for being injured and sexually abused by detention staff (Talk Left, 2004). Hence, the perception of juvenile justice in the local communities has not been favorable over the past few years.

Howell, Krisberg, and Jones (1995) contend that, “Increases in youth crime, stories of frustrated parents seeking help for their troubled children, and criticisms of juvenile justice programs have led to demands for change in the way young offenders are charged, punished, and treated” (p. 10). It is vital that we address the issue of participation. By strengthening the juvenile justice boards and councils, numerous public administrators (school administrators, prevention agencies, community organizations, law enforcement, State Attorneys, etc.) will benefit tremendously, resources will be preserved, efforts will be enhanced, and services will be well spent. When these objectives are not met due to lack of attendance, the safety of the community is significantly impacted.

**Literature Review**

In years past, The Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency and Prevention (OJJDP) has promoted that “the best way to respond to juvenile justice issues in communities across the United States is to develop comprehensive strategies” (Hsia, 1997, p. 1). In light of this methodology, there have been several prevention councils that have reported and demonstrated success on how to mobilize the juvenile justice community, dating back to nearly 70 years ago. Each report highlights both the strengths and weaknesses endured throughout their journey to “replace the community's fragmented response to juvenile violence with a collaborative and coordinated approach” (Hsia, 1997, p. 2). It is my hope to identify recurring themes throughout the literature in an effort to address the issue of lack of attendance in Circuit 2.
Kenneth Beam, a special field agent with the National Probation Association, conducted extensive research on the characteristics of prevention councils scattered across the nation from Bellingham, Washington to Durham, North Carolina (Beam, 1936, p. 1). From 1981 to 1986, federal funding was awarded to neighborhood-based organizations in the Bronx, Chicago, Dallas, Los Angeles, New Orleans, and San Diego with the goal of reducing crime, strengthening neighborhood cohesion, and making local institutions more responsive through resident mobilization (Fagan, 1987, p. 54). A few years later, Alleghany County, located in Pennsylvania, initiated a Youth Crime Prevention Council (YCPC), which was a comprehensive antiviolence mobilization effort that involved the law enforcement community, public and private agencies, grassroots organizations, and individual citizens (Hsia, 1997). Throughout the implementation and studies of these efforts, there appears to be several common denominators for success; sufficient staffing and/or leadership; educational trainings and workshop opportunities for the members; effective council infrastructure, i.e., committees; public support and bureaucratic responsiveness toward members; and funding for prevention efforts.

The first theme that was addressed by each council was the need for staffing and strong leadership, which Fagan found to be essential for mobilizing council members (Fagan, 1987, p. 56). In fact, in each site, there were at least one or two community organizers, a project data collector, and a project director, who were first educated on the principles of “social control” and “social learning” (Fagan, 1987, p. 58). The staff was tasked with recruiting members, educating residents, providing ongoing assessments,

---

4 Social control is defined as those major influences of self-development from childhood to adulthood, such as family, peers, and community.
5 Social learning is the notion of peers and neighborhood social norms contributing to the likelihood of juvenile delinquency.
developing and modifying strategic plans, organizing community events, and assisting the resident councils with current initiatives. Fagan (1987) indicated, “Community organizing was an essential element and program activities could not be conducted without large cadres of residents volunteering their efforts” (p. 58). He noted that recruiting members became the most difficult task in the development of the councils because many of the leaders already had high demands on their time or were committed to other neighborhood issues (Fagan, 1987, p. 61).

Beam (1936) found that “citizen organizations and churches are not in the position to accept sole responsibility for the coordinating of a council type organization” (Beam, 1936, p. 27). In fact, he states that a requisite for success is hiring a full or part time field worker who is available to render assistance when needed (p. 28). While Hsia (1997) did not report that the YCPC had full-time staff, he did indicate the need for strong leadership (p. 2). According to Hsia, the council served in an umbrella leadership capacity to countless public agencies (Hsia, 1997, p. 2). Hsia (1997) reported, “It requires a great deal of energy and perseverance to bring so many people and organizations to the table to reach consensus and to implement key initiatives” (p. 17).

Another common trend among the reports was the need for education and training opportunities for council members. The YCPC holds the education component in high regard and is committed to providing educational forums regarding juvenile delinquency to its members and the community at large (Hsia, 1997, p. 4). Hsia (1997) adds that the education is presented in such a way that it paints a realistic picture of youth crime in the county (p. 4). Beam also found that providing educational workshops on the council’s work was the main request of council members (Beam, 1936, p. 16).
Beam noted that a teacher on one of the council’s acknowledged that, “A year ago if a child created a disturbance in my room, I immediately thought of punishment or discipline. Now I make a mental note of the fact that we will have to look into this child’s problem in order to find out why he behaves that way” (Beam, 1936, p. 16). Fagan (1987) added that the “staff provided training about the levels and trends of youth crime in the target neighborhood to the members who had very little experience with organized research or evaluation, which was essential to the sustainability of the councils” (p. 58). These informative workshops were provided to “analyze school policies on discipline, suspension, and expulsion; police policies toward juveniles; employment and economic development trends; and to conduct an inventory of neighborhood resources” (Fagan, 1987, p. 59).

Beam mentions the importance for councils to have effective meetings in order to alleviate members becoming disinterested. “When attending certain council meetings, I sometimes have the feeling that I am sitting in a car, but it isn’t going anywhere. It is a good car, but it isn’t going anywhere. …some councils are like that” (Beam, 1936, p. 23). He adds that when meetings are “not geared for action”; members decide to stop attending (Beam, 1936, p. 23). From the studies, this furthers the need for councils to have a quality infrastructure. In addition to effective meetings, other qualities of successful councils included the need for evidence-based delinquency and intervention plans, useful committee structures, and strategic meeting schedules.

A safe assumption regarding the YCPC in Alleghany County was that they hosted effective meetings, which was evidenced by the retention of their members. Sand (2002) contends that “an important technique for improving board meetings is to do as
much planning before the meeting” (p. 44). This includes sending members notices prior to the meeting and follow-up reminder notices closer to the meeting, creating a policy that mandates members to provide advanced notification if they cannot attend a meeting, providing agendas and minutes before the meeting date, and contacting committee chairs prior to the meeting to ensure that they are prepared to present (Sand, 2002, p. 44).

Beam contends that one of the leading causes of failure are when councils meet and have interesting discussions, but adjourn with no formative action steps (Beam, 1936, p. 23). Sand (2002) adds that, “If meetings are unproductive then board members tend to be unproductive” (p. 44). In the research, a trademark of successful councils was those whose members had a clear understanding of the mission of the council and had action steps to achieve the overall objective. For instance, during each YCPC meeting, the members worked on jointly developing a prevention plan, assessing the communities needs, and developing strategies to address local juvenile crime, emphasizing tough law enforcement and community-driven prevention efforts (Hsia, 1997, p .6).

A goal of the councils in Fagan’s study was to conduct an ongoing needs assessment every six months (Fagan, 1987, p. 61). The assessments allowed the staff to give feedback to the council on their progress and allowed the program to be modified as needed, which became the foundation for setting priorities and reaching objectives (Fagan, 1987, p. 54). Directly correlated to the successful implementation of the plan is the development of committee structures, also termed “task forces.” Sand contends that giving board members specific projects is a means of increasing productivity and accountability (Sand, 2004, p. 40).
In Allegheny County, an element of their success was based on effectively mobilizing the law enforcement community and the community at large to serve on the council and its committees, which were formed of collaborating agencies that coordinated resource-seeking and program development efforts (Hsia, 1997, p. 5). Hsia noted that “Members are encouraged by the reported progress provided during the monthly reports by the leaders of their initiatives and task forces” (Hsia, 1997, p.6). In Fagan’s studies, he indicates that each site formed task forces which tested violent crime intervention, institutional mediation, family support networks, and youth skills development (Fagan, 1987, p. 59). Therefore, meetings were strategically arranged to best accommodate the stakeholders and to respect the time of the members.

A strategic meeting schedule was also a trademark in quality infrastructures among the councils. Hsia mentioned that many of his stakeholders were leaders in the community; however, they invested time in the council by attending monthly meetings (Hsia, 1997, p. 2). Fagan’s study noted that one of the frustrations council members experienced was that visible leaders already had high demands on their schedules, and were not able to attend council meetings (Fagan, 1987, p. 61).

The final theme found in the councils was the need for establishing a good partnership between public agencies and its constituents. Over the course of history, Stenberg records that the concept of citizen participation has been an age old conflict, dating back to the mid-twentieth century (Stenberg, 1972, p. 160). Kweit and Kweit (1980) hypothesized that participation from community members will be effective only to the extent that bureaucrats themselves consider participation an important component of decision-making and only if there is a high tolerance for participation (p. 651). Some
critics have added that “there are political limitations placed on citizen involvement embedded with class bias and unwillingness among elected officials and bureaucrats to share their power” (Kathlene and Martin, 1991, p. 47).

In analyzing the successes and challenges of the councils, trust and understanding between the citizens and public administrators was a common factor. In Alleghany County, Hsia argues that many of the turf issues associated in the county have been reduced through the means of information-sharing and, in part, to a unified front to reduce youth violence (Hsia, 1997, p. 5). In addition, the U.S. Attorney’s Office took a vested interest in the effort after realizing the dire need for the initiative and the clout of the organization attracted leaders to not only attend the meetings, but to contribute toward its success. Hsia reports that they used a “top down, bottom up” method and strategically recruited members who “could get things done with their power of persuasion and position” (Hsia, 1997, p. 12).

On a smaller scale, Fagan notes the importance of receiving support from local public agencies. In fact, toward the completion of the initiative, he emphasizes that one of the resident councils was endorsed by the city and became a part of the citywide reduction strategy while another received funding for its resident committee (Fagan, 1987, p. 64). In the end, Hsia recorded decreases in juvenile delinquency while juvenile crime in Fagan’s study fluctuated. Notwithstanding, analyzing and implementing key themes such as staffing, training, enhanced infrastructure, and administrative relationships has proven to increase the likelihood of having support from key stakeholders, leaders, and local citizens and may ultimately decrease juvenile delinquency.
Research Methodology and Evaluative Criteria

The information for this report was obtained through the following:

- analysis of academic literature utilizing library databases, such as JSTOR 1997-to date, think tank publications, and popular media;

- review of the Florida Statutes;

- personal interviews with DJJ staff and stakeholders, such as Wanda Jackson, Prevention Specialist, Office of Prevention & Victim Services, DJJ; Donnie Read, Chair of Circuit 2 Board & Liberty County, CEO of Wilderness Quest, a non-profit organization; Captain Robert Murray, Franklin County Chair & Law Enforcement Officer; Jennifer Edwards, Co-Chair of Franklin County council and Program Coordinator for Capital City Youth Services, a non-profit organization; Joe Thomas, Chair of the Leon County council and Director of Visions of Manhood, a non-profit organization; Marquita McGuire, Chief of Prevention, Office of Prevention and Victim Services, DJJ; Jason Welty, Legislative Affairs Analyst, DJJ; and JJCRISP Coordinators throughout the State of Florida.

Research provided through contact with Wanda Jackson was intended to provide a historical perspective on the development of boards and councils. This was conducted via phone for approximately 30 minutes. Marquita McGuire and Jason Welty were both contacted via phone to gain greater insight into the perceptions of the councils regarding legislation and funding. The researcher hosted a meeting with the Circuit 2 Board and Council Chairpersons. The group discussion lasted for two-hours and provided first-hand insight into their perception of the Board and Councils.

In Circuit 2, members were urged to complete a Board and Council survey (Appendix C). In total, 42 surveys were disseminated during the Board and Council meetings and members were given two months to complete the survey. To make the process as convenient as possible, the members were given three options to return the survey, including via fax, mail, or to hand deliver it during the next Board or Council meeting. In addition, there was a follow-up reminder e-mail sent to members.
approximately four weeks after distribution and verbal announcements were made at each Board and Council meeting. Twenty-five percent of the surveys were returned.

The survey posed 10 statements regarding the member’s perception of the Board/Council’s effectiveness and also provided an area for comments. The responses were measured on a Likert scale ranging from one to five. A value of “one” indicated that the member strongly agreed with the statement and “five” signified that the member strongly disagreed with the statement. Although the tool was not a scientific study, the input received was helpful in determining appropriate alternatives to the problem of participation. Lastly, the researcher attended a Quarterly Meeting hosted by the Office of Prevention and Victim Services in Orlando, Florida, where JJCRISP Coordinators from across the State discussed issues regarding their boards and councils. This discussion allowed Coordinators to collaborate and exchange helpful strategies in an open setting, and assisted in the development of this report.

To evaluate the feasibility of each option, we analyzed cost, political feasibility, and administrative feasibility. Cost is the financial burden accrued by each of the three sectors of the economy (public, private, and non-profit) in relation to the proposed alternatives, and it is the dollar amount that will be spent to implement the proposed options. This data was obtained using past JJCRISP contracts and perspectives of DJJ staff. Political desirability refers to the attractiveness of the option to politicians, administrators, and private institutions. This data was obtained from the interviews with policymakers and DJJ Personnel.

Administrative feasibility encompasses the implementation process and the administrative success rate. The government and the participating stakeholders must be
able to utilize their current resources, such as staff, collaborations, and technical knowledge, to successfully effectuate change. Each criterion was measured using one to five as the ranking value and was placed on a decision matrix. The value of “one” was prescribed to policy options that did not meet the criterion and “five” was assigned to those policy options that met the criterion to the fullest extent possible. The respective numbers were summed and a total score was assigned to each policy option.

The validity of the study could be compromised if the responses given during the interviews and on the surveys understated or overstated the efficiency of the Board and Council. These factors may include the stakeholders attitude; workload and focus on that particular day; the influence of other member’s perceptions; fear of retaliation for candidness, etc. New members completing the survey and members who never experienced a productive board or council may also affect the validity of the study because they have no basis on which to support their evaluation. The reliability perhaps could be controlled if time permitted a re-test to be administered.

**Policy Options**

This section examines the three alternatives that are most likely to increase citizen involvement in Circuit 2 Board and Councils, including:

a. Appropriate funding to hire a full-time JJCRISP Coordinator

b. Enhanced infrastructure of the Board and Councils

c. Restored relationship between DJJ and members

**Option One: Appropriate Funding to Hire a Full-time JJCRISP Coordinator**

Hiring a full-time JJCRISP Coordinator may be one of the strongest
stimuli to increasing participation on the Circuit 2 Board and Councils. Currently, the Coordinator is tasked with an enormous workload that is inundated with tactics and strategies that could increase participation, such as advocacy, providing training and information sharing, assisting in the development of a county/circuit wide delinquency plan, and a host of other tasks. The primary problem is that the Coordinator is a part-time position, which does not allow the devotion of time and effort necessary to maximize essential job tasks for increasing participation. The most practical solution to this problem is to appropriate funding to transform the position to full-time, thereby increasing the amount of time to perform the desperately needed services.

The first major provision found in the Coordinator’s scope of services is to provide coordination and support for juvenile justice circuit boards and their affiliated county councils (Appendix D). This involves:

- “Coordinating juvenile justice meetings (regularly scheduled, specially called, and executive meetings);"

- maintaining membership and mailing lists, scheduling meeting rooms, developing agendas, recordings minutes, etc.;

- responding to questions and requests for information from members;

- facilitating and compiling local stakeholders’ Legislative Budget Requests input;

- assisting the Department in the dissemination and sharing of its annual budget;

- preparing draft correspondences, maintaining organizational by laws, and assisting with the development of required reports;

- assisting the circuit board and county councils in developing a comprehensive community juvenile justice plan;

- facilitating the distribution and sharing of information with members; and
participating in meetings of the councils” (DJJ, 2006).

The second provision is to facilitate and coordinate community relationships, partnership development, and information sharing activities and strategies. This includes:

- “Attending other designated meetings on behalf of the Department, gathering and disseminating current juvenile justice data and statistics that will be used by the members;
- ensuring consistent and on-going communication between the Department and members; educating and assisting local communities regarding data;
- promoting and advocating community support for targeting resources to address the needs of high risk neighborhoods and youth;
- assisting the members in developing and strengthening community partnerships between youth, schools, local businesses, faith-based organizations, local governments, individuals, and other traditional and non-traditional community stakeholders; and assisting in identifying strength based approaches and strategies for the development and provision of programs and services to prevent juvenile crime and delinquency” (DJJ, 2006).

The list of services expected by the Department is very extensive and nearly impossible to perform efficiently in six individual counties as a part-time position. Beam (1936) mentioned that in individual councils he surveyed, full or part-time employees were essential and Fagan argued that staffing is a crucial step in the implementation of the councils he researched (Fagan, 1987, p. 58). On a survey, one of the Circuit members expressed their concern of the viability of the councils:

The council is drifting because of poor attendance, no budget, and no staff to do anything other than notify members of meetings…The role of the Coordinator needs to be expanded. All of the members are too busy and do not have the time to do comprehensive plans and other similar tasks.

At a glance, this member’s sentiment may appear justifiable; however, when considering the duties of the Coordinator, these are items that should already be addressed. The focal issue is simply having the time to dedicate to each responsibility. In comparing the
JJCRISP functions to the staff’s roles mentioned in Fagan’s study, the responsibilities are very parallel. Recruitment, training and educating members, and conducting ongoing assessments are the trends that appeared to be crucial to the other councils’ successes in membership.

Fagan and Hsia argue that recruitment of members is an extensive task, and the demand placed on recruitment is the same in Circuit 2. According to the Florida Statutes, the council may be comprised of representatives from over thirteen public, private and non-profit agencies. As a full-time employee, methods to increase recruitment efforts may be to attend additional meetings within the Circuit that are not DJJ-based more often, meet individually with stakeholders, and provide continuous follow-up with members who are absent from meetings. This tactic may elicit a better response from the stakeholders and possibly allow even greater collaborations to ensue.

Secondly, providing training and education to both new and existing members appears to be vital to retaining members; and can be enhanced by a full-time Coordinator. The Circuit 2 chairs expressed their concern for new recruits who are not familiar with the “prevention vernacular.” There are numerous acronyms that are used during the course of the meeting, which may sound foreign to someone who does not have a background in the prevention system (C2 Chairs, personal communication, June 9, 2006). According to Fagan, “Many of the council members were uneducated regarding juvenile delinquency and a great amount of stress was placed on educating the members about basic functions of stakeholders and prevention” (Fagan, 1987, p. 59). To resolve this issue, a basic orientation regarding the boards and councils should be applied as described in Fagan’s study.
Moreover, existing members need to be provided with continuing education regarding existing diversion programs, effective programming, and latest juvenile delinquency policy development (Hsia, 1997, p.12). Training and educating local law enforcement officials, prevention and education officials, members of community coalitions, and parents on local pertinent juvenile issues, such as teen pregnancy, truancy, underage drinking and gang awareness, may ultimately help the members to craft more informed policy to the Department and become proactive versus reactive regarding delinquency. By hosting trainings and workshops, the Board and Councils can also strategically address “the disconnect” that exists in the service continuum with other entities and develop a comprehensive approach to juvenile justice.

One final component regarding full-time staff was the importance of conducting ongoing assessments. In Fagan’s study, the ongoing assessment provided a benchmark for the members and assisted them in analyzing their proficiency and productivity. In the Circuit, this is not a responsibility on the current scope of services, but could be added if time permitted. In Fagan’s study, it appears that the assessment was extremely helpful in determining if the overall objective of the councils were met and allowed for continuous modifications to improve efforts. The assessment method may contribute to retaining members by helping them feel a “sense of accomplishment” and productivity, as noted by Sands (2002).

When funding is appropriated for a full-time Coordinator, he/she can dedicate the time needed to fulfill his/her responsibilities well. This option may help to increase the efficiency of the Board and Councils, rekindle the motivation of the stakeholders, and inevitably increase member participation.
Cost: Presently, the Department subcontracts out the JJCRISP Coordinator position for a fixed-price of $20,000. For a full-time Coordinator, the Florida legislature would be responsible for appropriating $40,000 for the contract (M. McGuire, personal communication, June 18, 2006). According to Welty, the deciding factor in the funding would be based on the priority of the Department. The Department’s administration works closely with the Governor’s office to shape public policy, and if the administration is a proponent of boards and councils, then funding would not be a problem (J. Welty, personal communication, June 19, 2006). A full-time position will allow the Coordinator to enhance local collaborative efforts, which would in turn strengthen the effort against juvenile delinquency and save the State potentially millions of dollars. Based on the Department’s budget for 2005-2006, $551,743,550 was received from the Legislature for Probation/Community Corrections and Detention and Residential services (DJJ Legislative Wrap Up, 2006, p. 19).

Political Desirability: Since the creation of boards and councils, there have been several legislators who have volunteered as members in their local vicinity. According to Welty, the Senate Criminal Justice Committee and Appropriations committee members are very supportive of prevention efforts and may be supportive of this option (J. Welty, personal communication, June 19, 2006). In the OPVS strategic plan, a perceived strength is that there appears to be more support for prevention programs among key policymakers than in recent years, so now may be an optimal time to make such a request (OPVS Strategic Plan, 2006, p.3).

Administrative Feasibility: There is reasonable certainty that the administrative services associated with a full-time designation would be absorbed in the current tasks of
the Coordinator, and not greatly augment his/her current workload. Likewise, the Department currently has a full-time staff person who is responsible for providing oversight to the project; thus a full-time Coordinator position would not create additional tasks.

In summary, for this option, the cost criterion scores high when compared to the political and administrative criterions. The legislators may be hesitant to increase the Coordinator’s compensation because prevention is difficult to measure. An evidence-based approach, including conducting an ongoing assessment and completing an Annual Report cataloging the Board and Councils accomplishments, would be substantial tools to justify the need for a full-time position. The political feasibility criterion scores in the middle range because it is contingent upon the legislator’s perceptions of the importance of boards and councils. Due to budget constraints, the legislative analysts and administration would need to dedicate ample time to lobbying on behalf of the effort. Finally, the administrative feasibility yields a low score because the workload would not be much greater than what is already expected for both the Coordinator and DJJ staff.

**Option Two: Enhance the Infrastructure of the Boards and Councils**

The second option for increasing member participation is to enhance the infrastructure of the Board and Councils. This may be achieved by hosting effective meetings, developing an evidence-based delinquency and intervention plan, implementing useful committee structures, and strategically scheduling meetings. In Circuit 2, some of the council meetings last well beyond the slated agenda time, which neglects the importance of the stakeholders time and energy. Oftentimes, the members are engaged in healthy conversations, but fail to develop formative action steps to resolve
the issues discussed. As one might imagine, this directly influences the membership of community leaders and interested citizens who have high demands on their time.

Sand contends that “an important technique for improving board meetings is to do as much planning before the meeting” (Sand, 2002, p. 44). He described the importance of several tactics that, if implemented, could enhance the quality of meetings in Circuit 2. The first tactic Sand mentions is sending notices, follow-up reminders, minutes, and agendas to members before the meeting date. In Circuit 2, notices are sent to the members in compliance with the Sunshine Law, which requires that the public receive notification of meetings at least seven days in advance (Attorney General, 2006). However, in an effort to strengthen the service delivery, furnishing a follow-up notice, agenda, and minutes would be beneficial to the stakeholders.

As a result, the stakeholders would not waste valuable time reviewing the agenda and the minutes during the meeting. Also, it will indirectly remind members of the last meeting, and it will maximize the time needed to focus on more significant issues. Sand also recommends creating a policy that mandates members to provide advanced notification if they cannot attend a meeting. In Gadsden and Franklin County, this is a pressing issue. Too often members do not make others aware if they will be absent, which affects the quorum standards and alleviates business from being voted upon. The result is that members become disgruntled at the lack of accountability and productivity.

Untimely meetings is another flaw that is exhibited during all of the Circuit 2 Board and Council meetings. Oftentimes, the Chair will delay the meeting in hopes of accommodating late attendees, which inadvertently causes several consequences. First, members who arrive on time either become upset, frustrated, or begin to imitate the same
tardy behavior. Next, the meetings inevitably run over or agenda items are tabled until the following month. Finally, it deters committed members from attending the meetings. Sand contends that meetings should start on time because once members know that it will start on time, they are more likely to be prompt (Sand, 2004, p. 45).

Across the nation, developing an evidence-based delinquency and intervention plan and committee structures were also common in the councils. Fagan calls the plan “a blueprint” that helped members navigate through the process (Fagan, 1987, p.59 ). Hsia stated that community leaders came to the meetings with anticipation, anxious to learn what progress committees had taken toward the achievement of the overall goals (Hsia, 1997, p. 2). Applying a greater emphasis on the implementation of a delinquency plan and committees in Circuit 2 may increase the attendance rates.

In Circuit 2, Leon County is the only Council with established standing committees that meet in between meetings to carry out the work of the Council. This structure may be directly related to the increase in attendance experienced over the past two years. In Gadsden, Liberty, Wakulla and Jefferson counties, delinquency prevention plans have been developed, but each council is struggling to achieve the objectives of the plan. The Circuit 2 Board and Franklin County members are in the process of developing prevention plans.

In Gadsden County, the Chair has made several attempts to form subcommittees based on the targeted goals outlined in the five-year strategic plan, but a major impediment is the inconsistency of membership. In Liberty, Wakulla, and Jefferson counties, ad hoc committees, such as grant review and nominating, are formed when needed and the prevention plans have not been executed. By implementing a strategic
committee structure, I believe it would be most helpful in achieving the overall goal of the Board and Councils, attracting additional providers to the meetings, and emphasizing the importance of coordinating activities (Beam, 1936, p. 37).

The second advantage to the formation of committees is time maximization. Members who are, by statute, required to attend the board and council meetings are cross-sections of government agencies, judicial representatives, law enforcement, etc. “Typically, highly recognized leaders in communities already have high demands on their time or are committed to other neighborhood problems that do not include juvenile delinquency” (Fagan, 1987, p. 61). On the survey completed in Circuit 2, one member indicated that they attend up to five similar coalition meetings in their county; and another noted that “I think the Board /Council could be combined with other groups already meeting on the same issues. Those of us that are involved in the “system” attend so many meetings that it seems repetitive.” This leads us into the final component for enhancing the infrastructure of the Board and Councils, which is strategically scheduling meetings.

A JJCRISP Coordinator from another circuit shared that “holding meetings before or after and in the same place as a group whose participants have a similar mission has helped to mobilize membership. For example, the Workforce Development Board’s First Jobs/First Wages Council has many of the same types of participants as juvenile justice councils/boards” (JJCRISP Coordinator, personal communication, June 15, 2006).

Locally, Leon County altered their meeting schedule to meet after another delinquency council targeting another population, which may have also contributed to increasing attendance on the council. In Wakulla County, they recently voted to collaborate with the Shared Services Coalition, which provides a greater opportunity to address delinquency
issues and increase their membership. Thus, implementing quality infrastructure techniques would help to resolve the issues associated with low attendance.

**Cost:** There is no cost associated with enhancing the infrastructure of the Board and Councils in the Circuit, so this criterion is not a factor for this option.

**Political Desirability:** From the political perspective, legislation is not directly impacted, so this criterion is not a factor for this option.

**Administrative Feasibility:** Enhancing the infrastructure of the Board and Councils would create additional work for the JJCRISP Coordinator and Board and Council members. This includes implementing stricter policies regarding meeting procedures, providing assistance to councils who have not executed a strategic plan and committee structures, and researching other councils and meetings in the county to strategically schedule meetings. This option may not be as feasible for the JJCRISP Coordinator to implement due to the amount of responsibility already assigned.

In summary, the feasibility of cost and political desirability both scored low for enhancing the infrastructure of the Board and Councils. The final criterion of administrative feasibility yields a high score because the Coordinator will be challenged to assist the Board and Councils due to time restraints and the amount of work currently expected already in the scope of services.

**Option Three: Restore Relationship Between DJJ and Members**

The final issue surrounding participation is the relationship that exists between the Department and the members. Jackson stated when boards and councils were originally formed in 1993, memberships flourished throughout the State. She believes that the attendance rates were a direct correlation to Secretary Ross’ vested interest in the boards
and councils. She went on to say that the administration of the Department plays a major role in the perception of the importance of boards and councils (W. Jackson, personal communication, June 12, 2006). Over the past couple years, this sentiment has changed. In fact, Laura Davisson adds that “members have expressed that they often feel that the Department uses ‘top-down’ leadership tactics which undermines their authority. As a result, many members become disenchanted with the Department, and no longer retain their memberships” (L. Davisson, personal communication, June 14, 2006).

In order to improve the relationship between the Department and the members, we must first analyze the willingness of the Department to support the effort. Kathlene and Martin (1991) stated that some critics have added that “there are political limitations placed on citizen involvement embedded with class bias and unwillingness among elected officials and bureaucrats to share their power” (p. 47). Earlier this year, the current DJJ Secretary, Anthony Schembri, stated his allegiance to the efforts of the board and council members during the Statewide Prevention Conference held in Orlando, Florida. His public verbalization of support was then emphasized by him traveling statewide to attend local board meetings.

Locally, Greg Johnson, the Assistant Secretary of Prevention and Victim Services, expressed his loyalty to the members by attending the annual Circuit 2 Awards Ceremony, which honored the members’ efforts. The glow on the faces of the members was priceless. In order to restore the bond between the Department and the members, events such as these, coupled with empowerment and effective communication, are paramount.
In Circuit 2, members are asked to complete annual Legislative Budget Requests (LBRs) which provide recommendations to the Department’s Legislative Affairs Analysts regarding local issues that they perceive need funding for the fiscal year. The rationale of the provision is based on the belief that citizens are close to problems and therefore able to provide insight into local issues. Examples of LBRs may include funding for additional prevention programs in the Circuit or increased funding for probation officers. Typically, during the LBR process, members oftentimes express concern in the legitimacy of the process.

Once the LBR is submitted to the analysts, the analysts determine if the local request(s) aligns with the priorities of the Department. If so, the request may be honored, but if not, the request is disregarded. When the latter action is chosen, the members often feel ignored and at a loss to the authority of the Board and Councils. A basic solution to the problem may be for the Department to provide feedback explaining the strategy behind the budget requests that were selected. In addition, the Department may consider engaging the members in the decision making processes where their sentiments can be addressed more directly.

Another option for increasing membership is for the Department to provide publicity on the successes of the boards and councils. The YCPC received open support from the U.S. Attorney’s office, which gave them publicity and aided them in garnering support from lead agencies across the County (Hsia, 1997, p. 2). Every month, the Department publishes a document called “What Works,” which provides an overview of initiatives that have proven to be effective. To show support for the board and councils efforts, the Department may opt to highlight the work of a board or council in the
publication. Not only may it help to restore the relationship between the sectors, but it may help to increase attendance as well.

**Cost:** There is no cost associated with restoring the relationship between DJJ and members of the Board and Councils, so this criterion is not a factor for this option.

**Political Desirability:** Kathlene and Martin contend that “some elected officials and bureaucrats don’t desire to share their power with citizens” (Kathlene and Martin, 1991, p. 47). If this mentality is shared amongst the legislators, then it may place undue pressure on the Department’s administration and ultimately influence the feasibility of this option. However, support for prevention programs among key policymakers appears to be a strength, according to the OPVS strategic plan (DJJ, 2006, p. 3).

**Administrative Feasibility:** From the administrative feasibility perspective, this option may require additional work by the Legislative Affairs Analysts in responding to the stakeholders, and for the JJCRISP in disseminating the responses. It would also require a staff person to develop criteria for choosing a board or council to highlight in the newsletter. Lastly, if the Department decided to include members in the decision-making process, this could become controversial if the recommendations made by the members are not implemented.

In summary, cost scored low on the decision matrix because it will not have a great affect on this option. Political desirability scored in the middle range because the legislatures may have influence on the administration, which may affect their perception of citizen initiatives. The administrative feasibility yields a high score because the options posed would require more work from the administration, Legislative Analysts, DJJ staff, and JJCRISP Coordinator.
Conclusion

This report analyzed three options to provide methods to increase membership on the Circuit 2 Board and Councils and took careful consideration of the cost, political desirability, and administrative feasibility associated with each to formulate a total score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Alternatives</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Political Desirability</th>
<th>Administrative Feasibility</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hire Full-time Coordinator</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Organizational Infrastructure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Decision Matrix

My recommendation to the Department is to solicit funding for a full-time Coordinator and require that he/she focus on implementing the other two options. The options provided in this analysis are all viable ways to increase membership; however I believe that the Coordinator would be most useful in sustaining the goal. The Coordinator has his/her finger on the “pulse” of the boards and councils and is tasked with responsibilities that will logically enhance and maximize their purposes. Furthermore, when considering the evidence-based strategies presented by other councils and the sentiments of the members in Circuit 2, the importance of staff and strong leadership is a common trend that was reiterated.

Although the second option scored lower on the decision matrix and would also help to improve the participation of members, the JJCRISP is already at full capacity, so the success of this option is jeopardized. The final option—to mend relationships
between DJJ and stakeholders—would require more administrative actions from DJJ staff who may or may not have a vested interest in boards and councils. In the final analysis, increasing member participation will help to effectuate change in the local communities, which I believe can best be achieved through a full-time Coordinator.
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Appendix A

985.4135  Juvenile justice circuit boards and juvenile justice county councils.--

(1) There is authorized a juvenile justice circuit board to be established in each of the 20 judicial circuits and a juvenile justice county council to be established in each of the 67 counties. The purpose of each juvenile justice circuit board and each juvenile justice county council is to provide advice and direction to the department in the development and implementation of juvenile justice programs and to work collaboratively with the department in seeking program improvements and policy changes to address the emerging and changing needs of Florida's youth who are at risk of delinquency.

(2) Each juvenile justice county council shall develop a juvenile justice prevention and early intervention plan for the county and shall collaborate with the circuit board and other county councils assigned to that circuit in the development of a comprehensive plan for the circuit.

(3) Juvenile justice circuit boards and county councils shall also participate in facilitating interagency cooperation and information sharing.

(4) Juvenile justice circuit boards and county councils may apply for and receive public or private grants to be administered by one of the community partners that support one or more components of the county or circuit plan.

(5) Juvenile justice circuit boards and county councils shall advise and assist the department in the evaluation and award of prevention and early intervention grant programs, including the Community Juvenile Justice Partnership Grant program established in s. 985.415 and proceeds from the Invest in Children license plate annual use fees.

(6) Each juvenile justice circuit board shall provide an annual report to the department describing the activities of the circuit board and each of the county councils contained within its circuit. The department may prescribe a format and content requirements for submission of annual reports.

(7) Membership of the juvenile justice circuit board may not exceed 18 members, except as provided in subsections (8) and (9). Members must include the state attorney, the public defender, and the chief judge of the circuit, or their respective designees. The remaining 15 members of the board must be appointed by the county councils within that circuit. The board must include at least one representative from each county council within the circuit. In appointing members to the circuit board, the county councils must reflect:

(a) The circuit's geography and population distribution.
(b) Juvenile justice partners, including, but not limited to, representatives of law enforcement, the school system, and the Department of Children and Family Services.

(c) Diversity in the judicial circuit.

(8) At any time after the adoption of initial bylaws pursuant to subsection (12), a juvenile justice circuit board may revise the bylaws to increase the number of members by not more than three in order to adequately reflect the diversity of the population and community organizations or agencies in the circuit.

(9) If county councils are not formed within a circuit, the circuit board may establish its membership in accordance with subsection (10). For juvenile justice circuit boards organized pursuant to this subsection, the state attorney, public defender, and chief circuit judge, or their respective designees, shall be members of the circuit board.

(10) Membership of the juvenile justice county councils, or juvenile justice circuit boards established under subsection (9), must include representatives from the following entities:

(a) Representatives from the school district, which may include elected school board officials, the school superintendent, school or district administrators, teachers, and counselors.

(b) Representatives of the board of county commissioners.

(c) Representatives of the governing bodies of local municipalities within the county.

(d) A representative of the corresponding circuit or regional entity of the Department of Children and Family Services.

(e) Representatives of local law enforcement agencies, including the sheriff or the sheriff's designee.

(f) Representatives of the judicial system.

(g) Representatives of the business community.

(h) Representatives of other interested officials, groups, or entities, including, but not limited to, a children's services council, public or private providers of juvenile justice programs and services, students, parents, and advocates. Private providers of juvenile justice programs may not exceed one-third of the voting membership.

(i) Representatives of the faith community.

(j) Representatives of victim-service programs and victims of crimes.
(k) Representatives of the Department of Corrections.

(11) Each juvenile justice county council, or juvenile justice circuit board established under subsection (9), must provide for the establishment of an executive committee of not more than 10 members. The duties and authority of the executive committee must be addressed in the bylaws.

(12) Each juvenile justice circuit board and county council shall develop bylaws that provide for officers and committees as the board or council deems necessary and shall specify the qualifications, method of selection, and term for each office created. The bylaws shall address at least the following issues: process for appointments to the board or council; election or appointment of officers; filling of vacant positions; duration of member terms; provisions for voting; meeting attendance requirements; and the establishment and duties of an executive committee, if required under subsection (11).

(13) Members of juvenile justice circuit boards and county councils are subject to the provisions of part III of chapter 112.

History.--s. 50, ch. 2000-135.
Appendix B

Circuit Offices

Residential Region Offices
Northwest Region: Pensacola - Circuits 1, 2, 3 and 14
Northeast Region: Jacksonville - Circuits 4, 5, 6 and 8
West Central Region: Bartow - Circuits 6, 10, 12, 13 and 20
East Central Region: Ft. Pierce - Circuits 9, 18 and 19
Southern Region: West Palm Beach - Circuits 11, 15, 16 and 17

Detention Region Offices
North Region: Tallahassee* (West), Ocala (East)
Circuits 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 14
Central Region: Tampa* (West), Orlando (East)
Circuits 6, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 18
South Region: Ft. Myers (West), Miami* (East)
Circuits 11, 15, 16, 17, 19 and 20

Probation Region Offices
North Region: Gainesville - Circuits 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 14
Central Region: St. Petersburg - Circuits 6, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 18
South Region: Ft. Lauderdale - Circuits 11, 15, 16, 17, 19 and 20

*Detention Region Managers Offices

Florida Department of Juvenile Justice
### TRAINING EVALUATION

1: Strongly Agree    2: Agree    3: Neutral    4: Disagree    5: Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL QUESTIONS</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The council has made a positive difference in the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The council meetings are helpful in cultivating networking opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The council has a workable strategic plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The council has broad, diverse membership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The council has strong, continuing leadership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The council needs to host a training for its members to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Identify problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Develop or re-develop a vision and a strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Establish clear steps to achieve goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Monitor progress and measure outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Due to council membership, I am well aware of the juvenile justice issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have utilized the funding sources and have applied to at least one funding opportunity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I have been effective in recruiting members to the council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I have utilized the Boards and Councils website.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PARTNERSHIP COORDINATOR RATINGS

How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the partnership coordinator?

1: Good    2: Average    3: Needs Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the partnership coordinator?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Follow through and follow up on issues, problems, assignments, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organization and preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Style and delivery (level of communication)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Responsiveness to members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Delivery of meeting and public notices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Patience level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please complete the back side of this form.
Specific Comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

What items would you like to see in a Boards and Councils Notebook?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

What day of the week is best for board/council meetings?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

What time is best for board/council meetings?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

How many similar coalition meetings do you attend:
per month?_______ per week? ____

What is the purpose of these meetings?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Appendix D

Juvenile Justice Community Relations and Information Sharing Program
(JJCRISP)

I. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

A. The purpose of the JJCRISP project is to enable the Department to maintain its community relations and interagency information sharing program enabling the juvenile and criminal justice system, schools, social service and community-based organizations to make more informed decisions regarding the early identification, control, supervision, and treatment of juveniles who repeatedly commit serious delinquent acts.

B. The primary vehicle used by the Department for its interagency information-sharing program and for obtaining community input and participation is the Juvenile Justice Boards and County Councils as authorized under section 985.4135, Florida Statutes.

II. SCOPE OF WORK

A. The Provider shall provide coordination and support for nine (9) juvenile justice circuit boards (as designated in the Contract, Section I.) and their affiliated county councils, including the responsibility to:

1. Shall coordinate juvenile justice circuit board meetings, to include regularly scheduled, specially called, and executive committee meetings. Tasks related to this provision shall include, but not be limited to:
   a. Maintaining membership and mailing lists;
   b. Scheduling meeting rooms and related logistics;
   c. Developing meeting agendas in consultation with the chair or designee;
   d. Developing and distributing meeting notices and agendas in a timely manner in coordination with the chair;
   e. Completing any support work necessary to facilitate the conduct of the meeting, including ensuring meeting related materials are copied and available at each meeting; and
   f. Recording and distributing official meeting minutes or notes, including specially called and executive committee meetings.

2. Respond to questions and requests for information from circuit board and county council members.

3. Facilitate and compile local stakeholders' Legislative Budget Requests (LBR) input, using the juvenile justice circuit boards and county councils as the primary conduit and provide the input to the
Department for use in developing its own proposed Legislative Budget Requests.

4. Shall disseminate and share the department’s annual budget and related information with local stakeholders and other interested parties.

5. Prepare draft correspondence, maintain organizational by-laws, and assist with the development of required reports, including but not limited to the circuit board annual report.

6. Shall support the circuit boards and county councils in developing a comprehensive community juvenile justice prevention and early intervention plan consistent with Title V of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP).

7. Shall facilitate and coordinate the distribution and sharing of information with the juvenile justice boards and county councils on behalf of the Department.

8. Shall participate in all juvenile justice county councils and circuit board meetings.

9. Shall organize any additional circuit board or county council related activities, as approved by the contract manager.

B. The Provider shall facilitate and coordinate community relations, partnership development, and information sharing activities and strategies, that shall include, but not be limited to:

1. Community relations, information sharing and distribution activities and strategies, that shall include, but not be limited to:
   a. Attendance at other designated meetings on behalf of the Department and as approved by the contract manager;
   b. Dissemination of current juvenile justice data and statistics and other research materials to the juvenile justice circuit boards and county councils and other community stakeholders and partners on behalf of the Department;
   c. Ensuring consistent and on-going communication between the Department and the juvenile justice circuit boards, as well as, the county councils;
   d. Education and support of local communities, primarily through the boards and councils, in understanding the benefits of identifying and using data related to community risk and protective factors;
   e. Promotion and advocation of community support for the targeting of resources to address the needs of high-risk neighborhoods and youths;
   f. Support of the board and councils in developing and strengthening community partnerships between youth, schools, local businesses, faith-based organizations, neighborhood associations, “grass-roots” community-based organizations, local governments, individuals and other
traditional and non-traditional community stakeholders; and

g. Assistance with laying the foundation for local communities, through the boards and councils, to identify strength-based approaches and strategies for the development and provision of programs and services to prevent juvenile crime and delinquency.

2. Partnership development activities and strategies that shall include, but not be limited to:
   
a. Working in conjunction with other Departmental core service areas in their recruitment and management of volunteers and mentors, provide training and technical assistance; and

   b. Encouraging the maintenance of the Faith Community Network within each circuit by:
      1) Attending meetings and activities of existing Faith Community Networks within the circuits.
      2) Collaboration with and support of meetings of faith-based partners, organizations, and other volunteers dedicated to establishing and maintaining a Faith Community Network.
      3) Cultivation and maintenance of a close relationship with the key leadership of the Faith Community Network.
      4) Identification and recruitment of potential faith partners.
      5) Supporting and informing Faith Community Network members and faith partners through the sharing of information and data regarding juvenile justice programs and services and how they may get involved.
      6) Providing technical assistance, coaching and support services to the Faith Community Network.

   c. Provide information and support services to the Office of Prevention and Victim Services as required by that office.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

A. The Department will make every effort to provide administrative support to the Provider by providing Department provided office-space, telephone, and access to basic office equipment and technology (computer, copy machine, fax, etc.) and a mobile telephone.

B. The Provider may periodically, however, carry out work under this Contract from his or her personally provided office space as an ancillary office. The Department shall incur no expense nor assume any responsibility related to the use of said space.
IV. DELIVERABLES

A. Administrative Deliverables

The Provider shall submit, on a monthly basis, an invoice for payment in a format and form as provided by the Department’s Contract Manager accompanied by a monthly status report of all activities for each month for which payment is being requested.

B. Work Deliverables

The Provider shall complete the requirements of the Scope of Work as evidenced by:

1. A monthly status report in a format and form as provided by the Department’s Contract Manager. The report shall be submitted to the contract manager on or before the 10th of the month following the month covered by the report.

2. Minutes (in electronic format), for each of the following meetings attended during the month for:
   a. Juvenile justice circuit board and county council regular meetings;
   b. Juvenile justice circuit board and county council specially called meetings, if any;
   c. Juvenile justice board or county council executive committee meetings;
   d. Other juvenile justice board or county council committee meetings, such as grant review committee or planning committee meetings;
   e. Faith Community Network meetings or meetings of faith-based partners dedicated to establishing and/or maintaining a Faith Community Network; and
   f. Other meetings as related to partnership development or Departmental special initiatives.

3. Public notices and meeting agendas for each of the following meetings seven days prior to the meeting, during the month, including
   a. Juvenile justice circuit board and county council regular meetings;
   b. Juvenile justice circuit board and county council specially called meetings,
   c. Juvenile justice board or county council executive committee meetings,
d. Juvenile justice board or county council committee meetings, including grant review committee or planning committee meetings; and

e. Faith Community Network meetings or meetings of faith-based partners dedicated to establishing and/or maintaining a Faith Community Network.

4. Reports, including:

a. A final circuit board annual report covering the fiscal year in a form and format, as provided by the Department’s Contract Manager, by the last working day of the fiscal year, with the final invoice.

b. A copy of each completed comprehensive juvenile justice delinquency and early intervention plan for each county council and circuit board in accordance with section 985.4135, Florida Statutes, which assesses community risk and protective factors consistent with the Title V, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention program to be submitted by the last working day of the fiscal year.

5. Other Required Deliverables, including:

a. Submission of regular updates of circuit board and county council officers, as they change, to the contract manager.

b. Quarterly updated membership roster for each board and council within the circuit.

c. Quarterly reports of new contacts made within the quarter, with a minimum of eighteen (18) contacts per circuit per year.

d. Collection and submission of the Legislative Budget Request (LBR) input from each circuit board and county council within the assigned circuits in the format and form specified by the Department.

e. Mandatory attendance at staff meetings and trainings.

f. Other services as required by the Office of Prevention and Victim Services.

6. Other Related Duties, including:

a. Quarterly training for the boards and councils. The Provider shall attend other community involved meetings (outside of the regular board and council meetings), producing an agenda, minutes and description if each meeting.

b. Organizing circuit and/or county events to promote juvenile justice and community relations.

c. Establishing new county councils where none exist.