

**STORAGE NAME:** h2223.jj

**DATE:** April 3, 2000

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
COMMITTEE ON  
JUVENILE JUSTICE  
ANALYSIS**

**BILL #:** HB 2223 (PCB JJ 00-04A)

**RELATING TO:** Juvenile Prevention Services

**SPONSOR(S):** Committee on Juvenile Justice and Representative Merchant

**TIED BILL(S):** SB 2248

**ORIGINATING COMMITTEE(S)/COMMITTEE(S) OF REFERENCE:**

(1) JUVENILE JUSTICE YEAS 13 NAYS 0

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

---

**I. SUMMARY:**

In March 1998, The Florida Commission on Governmental Accountability to the People ("GAP") published a report entitled, "Building the Road to Results: State Agency Impacts on Preventing Juvenile Crime," ("GAP Report"). The GAP Report described Florida's juvenile crime-fighting efforts as "a fragmented array of nearly 200 activities spread across 23 state entities." GAP determined that 77 of the programs were prevention services, designed to prevent youth from entering the criminal justice system. These 77 prevention services operated out of 20 separate agencies. The report revealed that agencies other than the Department of Juvenile Justice ("DJJ") operated 71 (92%) of the state-funded juvenile delinquency prevention services. In 1997, Florida spent \$1.25 billion on prevention services. Nearly \$1.21 billion was appropriated outside DJJ. Nearly half of those programs provide no measurable results to the state.

There is no single decision-making body overseeing Florida's juvenile delinquency prevention efforts. According to the GAP Report, "accountability for results faces obstacles of dispersed authority, lack of shared goals and a failure to measure common outcomes. Decisions about service design, resource allocation and priority setting cannot be soundly made without comparable outcome information." Ultimately, GAP concluded its report by suggesting that the complexity of the juvenile justice system leaves more questions than answers.

The bill answers the lingering questions raised in the GAP Report. Accountability for results should be accomplished by the provisions of the bill creating an Office of Statewide Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Coordination ("the Office"). Each state-funded juvenile prevention service must submit a description of the priority considerations targeted, the performance measures and methodology utilized, and the outcome data collected to the Office on an annual basis. In turn, the Office must use this information to prepare an annual report to the Legislature that describes the number and types of juvenile delinquency prevention services operating in the state and assesses each service relative to priority considerations, performance measures and methodology, and outcome data collected. Through these provisions, the bill is anticipated to facilitate decisions about juvenile delinquency prevention service design, effective and efficient allocation of limited state resources, and setting priorities based upon comparable outcome information. There may be a significant indirect economic impact associated with more efficient and effective spending of the state's prevention dollars.

The bill takes effect July 1, 2000.

II. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS:

A. DOES THE BILL SUPPORT THE FOLLOWING PRINCIPLES:

- |                                   |                              |                             |   |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| 1. <u>Less Government</u>         | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. <u>Lower Taxes</u>             | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. <u>Individual Freedom</u>      | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. <u>Personal Responsibility</u> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. <u>Family Empowerment</u>      | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

For any principle that received a "no" above, please explain:

B. PRESENT SITUATION:

The Florida Commission on Governmental Accountability to the People ("GAP") is tasked to evaluate the impact of state agency actions upon the well-being of Florida citizens. Paragraph (b) of s. 286.30(10), F.S., directs GAP to make recommendations which "could enhance the productivity of agencies, encourage continued agency improvement, ensure achievement of adopted performance standards, and assist state government in improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the services and products it provides." Pursuant to s. 286.30, F.S., GAP receives public testimony, assesses agency progress, and prepares annual reports summarizing the activities and findings of its assessments. GAP's essential mission is to identify state agency contributions to outcomes of critical state importance.

In March 1998, GAP published a report entitled, "Building the Road to Results: State Agency Impacts on Preventing Juvenile Crime," ("GAP Report"). The GAP Report was undertaken as an effort to identify a single outcome that is affected by multiple agency programs. GAP Report, p. 3. Upon receiving public input, GAP determined that juvenile crime is a matter of critical importance to Florida's citizens. Id. Based on this determination, GAP opted to assess state agency efforts relative to the outcome of juvenile delinquency. Id.

The GAP Report described Florida's juvenile crime-fighting efforts as "a fragmented array of nearly 200 activities spread across 23 state entities." Id., p.1. According to GAP, juvenile crime-fighting is everybody's business, but no one's responsibility. Id. Although Florida spent nearly \$1.25 billion on prevention programs, the GAP Report revealed that nearly half of those programs provided no measurable results to the state. Id.

In 1997, GAP surveyed 31 state government entities to gather data for assessment. Id. GAP sought to identify potential or actual duplication of efforts, breaches in services, or conflicts in approaches associated with juvenile delinquency programs. See id. at p. 4. GAP learned that 23 state entities provided services designed to impact children (ages up to 17) who are at risk of committing crimes, who have been arrested, or who have been convicted of crimes. Id. at p. 3. The survey revealed that there were a total of 195 separate state-funded programs aimed at reducing juvenile crime. Id.

GAP determined that 77 of the 195 programs were prevention services -- programs designed to prevent youth from ever entering the criminal justice system. Id. These 77

prevention services were operated out of 20 separate agencies. Id. at p. 4. The GAP Report revealed that agencies other than the Department of Juvenile Justice ("DJJ") operated 71 (92%) of the state-funded juvenile delinquency prevention services. Id. at p. 5.

In 1997, Florida spent nearly \$1.25 billion on prevention services. See id. at p. 4. Of the total state dollars spent on juvenile delinquency prevention services, nearly \$1.21 billion was appropriated outside DJJ. See id. Agencies other than DJJ expend nearly 97% of the state's juvenile delinquency prevention dollars. See id.

In preparing the report, GAP collected an inventory of all agency activities aimed at juvenile crime-fighting. The activities included in the inventory are prevention, intervention, detention, commitment, and rehabilitation. See Building the Road to Results: State Agency Impacts on Juvenile Crime -- Inventory of Activities, March 1998. A review of the inventory confirms that there are 77 prevention activities operated in twenty separate state agencies. See id. There are outcome measures associated with each of the 6 DJJ prevention activities. See id. However, there are no outcome measures associated with 36 of the 71 prevention activities operated by agencies other than DJJ. See id. This translates to nearly half of the state's juvenile prevention services expending \$473 million with no measurable results. See id. at p. 2.

The GAP Report also assessed the focus of each of the state's juvenile delinquency prevention services. Of the 77 total state-funded prevention services, 24 were identified by GAP as "targeted activities" aimed primarily at reducing juvenile crime. Id. at p. 4. The remaining 53 juvenile delinquency prevention services were identified by GAP as "general activities" with an indirect impact on juvenile crime reduction. Id. Only 10% of the state's total prevention dollars were expended on "targeted" prevention activities. Id. Only 2% of prevention dollars are expended by DJJ. Id. at p. 5.

GAP noted that there is no single decision-making body overseeing Florida's juvenile delinquency prevention efforts. Id. at p. 2. Although agencies cooperate on individual programs, no one coordinates statewide goals for Florida's juvenile delinquency prevention services. See id. at p. 1. According to the GAP Report:

[A]ccountability for results faces obstacles of dispersed authority, lack of shared goals and a failure to measure common outcomes. Decisions about service design, resource allocation and priority setting cannot be soundly made without comparable outcome information.

Id. Ultimately, GAP concluded its report by suggesting that the complexity of the juvenile justice system leaves more questions than answers. Id. at p. 5.

#### C. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

The Florida Commission on Governmental Accountability to the People ("GAP"), in its March 1998 report entitled, "Building the Road to Results: State Agency Impacts on Preventing Juvenile Crime" ("GAP Report"), concluded that the complexity of Florida's juvenile justice system leaves more questions than answers. GAP Report, p. 5. The bill seeks to provide much-needed answers about the state's efforts to prevent juvenile delinquency.

The GAP Report identified several features of Florida's juvenile delinquency prevention efforts that present obstacles to statewide multi-agency coordination. See id. at p. 1. According to the GAP Report, one obstacle is dispersed authority and responsibility for juvenile delinquency prevention. See id. The bill addresses this issue by directing the Department of Juvenile Justice ("DJJ") to administer an Office of Statewide Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Coordination ("the Office"). The Office will serve as a clearinghouse for information concerning all state-funded juvenile delinquency prevention services. The bill defines a "juvenile delinquency prevention service" to mean any program, grant, appropriation, or activity that is designed to prevent juvenile crime, delinquency, gang membership, or status offense behaviors, or that is designed to prevent a child from becoming a "child in need of services," as defined in ch. 984.

The Gap Report identified a lack of shared goals and a failure to measure common outcomes as additional obstacles to coordinated juvenile delinquency prevention. Id. The bill provides common goals for state-funded juvenile delinquency prevention services. The Office is directed to develop and annually update a coordinated multi-agency prevention policy and to specify priority considerations for the prevention of juvenile delinquency. All state-funded juvenile delinquency prevention services must be administered to further one or more of the specified priority considerations.

The bill also specifies common outcomes for juvenile delinquency prevention services. To provide uniformity, the Office will develop and publish model performance measures with model methodology for collecting the specified outcome data. The bill encourages all state-funded juvenile delinquency prevention services to identify and track outcomes for any additional considerations that may be relevant to juvenile delinquency prevention.

A description of the priority considerations targeted, the performance measures and methodology utilized, and the outcome data collected from each state-funded juvenile prevention service administered by the agency or entity must be submitted to the Office on an annual basis. This information shall inform the annual update of the coordinated multi-agency prevention policy. This information shall also be the basis for an annual report by the Office to the Legislature. The report will describe the number and types of juvenile delinquency prevention services operating in the state. The report will include an assessment of the services relative to their priority considerations, performance measures and methodology, and outcome data. Upon delivering this information, the Office will also receive legislative recommendations concerning the coordinated multi-agency prevention policy.

The bill should provide the components that the GAP Report revealed to be missing in Florida's juvenile crime fighting efforts. The bill provides for an Office of Statewide Prevention Coordination to oversee Florida's juvenile delinquency prevention efforts and serve as a clearinghouse for information. The bill should finally inform the state's understanding of its juvenile delinquency prevention services with measurable results of common outcomes. Accountability for results should be accomplished by the provisions of the bill which require each state-funded juvenile prevention service to annually submit a description of the priority considerations targeted, the performance measures and methodology utilized, and the outcome data collected to the Office on an annual basis. In turn, the Office must use this information to prepare an annual report to the Legislature that describes the number and types of juvenile delinquency prevention services operating in the state and assesses each service relative to priority considerations, performance measures and methodology, and outcome data collected. Through these provisions, the bill is anticipated to facilitate decisions about juvenile delinquency prevention service

design, effective and efficient allocation of limited state resources, and setting priorities based upon comparable outcome information.

The bill takes effect July 1, 2000.

**D. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS:**

Please refer to the analysis of the "Present Situation," at Paragraph II-B and the "Effect of Proposed Changes," at Paragraph III-C, above.

**III. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT:**

**A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:**

1. Revenues:

Please refer to "Fiscal Comments," at Paragraph III-D, below.

2. Expenditures:

Please refer to "Fiscal Comments," at Paragraph III-D, below.

**B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:**

1. Revenues:

None.

2. Expenditures:

None.

**C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:**

None.

**D. FISCAL COMMENTS:**

The Department of Juvenile Justice expects that it will need funding for four staff positions to carry out the provisions of the bill -- one Senior Management Analyst II positions, two Operation and Management Consultant II positions, and one Staff Assistant position. DJJ estimates the annual cost for these positions at \$263,577. DJJ has indicated it's intent to absorb any additional costs to the agency associated with the bill. The provisions of the bill authorizing DJJ to administer an Office of Statewide Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Coordination are consistent with DJJ's reorganization plans.

The bill is not expected to have a significant direct fiscal impact. However, the bill is expected to inform the state's spending decisions with measurable results of common outcomes for each of the juvenile delinquency prevention services it funds.

In 1997, Florida spent nearly \$1.25 billion on prevention services. See GAP Report at p. 4. Of the total state dollars spent on juvenile delinquency prevention services, nearly \$1.21

billion was appropriated outside DJJ. See id. Agencies other than DJJ expend nearly 97% of the state's juvenile delinquency prevention dollars. See id.

In preparing the report, GAP collected an inventory of all agency activities aimed at juvenile crime-fighting. The activities included in the inventory are prevention, intervention, detention, commitment, and rehabilitation. See Building the Road to Results: State Agency Impacts on Juvenile Crime -- Inventory of Activities, March 1998. A review of the inventory confirms that there are 77 prevention activities being operated in twenty separate state agencies. See id. There are outcome measures associated with each of the 6 DJJ prevention activities. See id. However, there are no outcome measures associated with 36 of the 71 prevention activities operated by agencies other than DJJ. See id. This translates to nearly half of the state's juvenile prevention services expending \$473 million with no measurable results. See id. at p. 2.

The GAP Report also assessed the focus of each of the state's juvenile delinquency prevention services. Of the 77 total state-funded prevention services, 24 were identified by GAP as "targeted activities" aimed primarily at reducing juvenile crime. Id. at p. 4. The remaining 53 juvenile delinquency prevention services were identified by GAP as "general activities" with an indirect impact on juvenile crime reduction. Id. Only 10% of the state's total prevention dollars were expended on "targeted" prevention activities. Id. Only 2% of prevention dollars are expended by DJJ. Id. at p. 5.

The GAP Report sought to identify potential or actual duplication of efforts, gaps in services, or conflicts in approaches associated with juvenile delinquency programs. See id. at p. 4. The report revealed that there is no single decision-making body overseeing Florida's juvenile delinquency prevention efforts. Id. at p. 2. Although agencies cooperate on individual programs, no one coordinates statewide goals for Florida's juvenile delinquency prevention services. See id. at p. 1. According to the GAP Report:

[A]ccountability for results faces obstacles of dispersed authority, lack of shared goals and a failure to measure common outcomes. Decisions about service design, resource allocation and priority setting cannot be soundly made without comparable outcome information.

Id. Ultimately, GAP concluded its report by suggesting that the complexity of the juvenile justice system leaves more questions than answers. Id. at p. 5

To the extent that the bill answers the lingering questions raised in the GAP Report, there may be a significant indirect economic impact associated with more efficient and effective spending of the state's prevention dollars. Accountability for results should be accomplished by the provisions of the bill which require each state-funded juvenile prevention service to annually submit a description of the priority considerations targeted, the performance measures and methodology utilized, and the outcome data collected to the Office of Statewide Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Coordination ("the Office") on an annual basis. In turn, the Office must use this information to prepare an annual report to the Legislature that describes the number and types of juvenile delinquency prevention services operating in the state and assesses each services relative to priority considerations, performance measures and methodology, and outcome data collected. Through these provisions, the bill is anticipated to facilitate decisions about juvenile delinquency prevention service design, effective and efficient allocation of limited state resources, and setting priorities based upon comparable outcome information.

**STORAGE NAME:** h2223.jj

**DATE:** April 3, 2000

**PAGE 7**

IV. CONSEQUENCES OF ARTICLE VII, SECTION 18 OF THE FLORIDA CONSTITUTION:

A. APPLICABILITY OF THE MANDATES PROVISION:

The bill does not require counties or municipalities to spend funds or to take action requiring the expenditure of funds.

B. REDUCTION OF REVENUE RAISING AUTHORITY:

The bill does not require counties or municipalities to spend funds or to take action requiring the expenditure of funds.

C. REDUCTION OF STATE TAX SHARED WITH COUNTIES AND MUNICIPALITIES:

The bill would not reduce the percentage of a state tax shared with counties or municipalities. Therefore, it would not contravene the requirements of Article VII, Section 18 of the Florida Constitution.

V. COMMENTS:

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

None.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

None.

C. OTHER COMMENTS:

None.

VI. AMENDMENTS OR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES:

None.

VII. SIGNATURES:

COMMITTEE ON JUVENILE JUSTICE:

Prepared by:

Staff Director:

---

Lori Ager

---

Lori Ager