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Discussion Topics

• Overview of JJSIP
• The Disposition Matrix
• Continuum of Services Mapping
• Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)
• CPACT, RPACT & PAT Assessments
• On-Going DJJ Research
The Juvenile Justice System Improvement Project (JJSIP): Application in Florida
Matching Services...
Overview of JJSIP

- Grant sponsored by Georgetown University: Center for Juvenile Justice Reform
- 4 sites chosen out of over 150 applications:
  - Florida
    - Initial pilot site: Pinellas County
  - Arizona
  - Pennsylvania
  - Connecticut
JJSIP Components

- Comprehensive Strategy
- Evaluation
  - Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)
- Structured Decision Making
Tiers of Evidence

- The lowest form is anecdotal evidence; stories, opinions, testimonials, case studies, etc.
- The highest form is empirical evidence – research, data, results from controlled studies, etc.
- We do not want to norm an entire system on anecdotal outliers...
Serious, Violent & Chronic Youth

What is the definition of a serious, violent and chronic offender?

- **Serious** = (1) or more felony offenses
- **Violent** = (1) or more “violent” felony offenses
- **Chronic** = (4) or more separate arrest events

**Serious, Violent, Chronic Youth**

- **SERIOUS** = 55%
- **VIOLENT** = 29%
- **CHRONIC** = 15%
- **SVC** = 8.9%
- **NOT SVC** = 43%

Note: FY=fiscal year; SVC= Serious, Violent, and Chronic; Not S, V, or C are youth that do not meet any of the three categories; For ANOVA, F-statistic reported with p-value in parenthesis.
### Serious, Violent & Chronic Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Chronic</th>
<th>SVC</th>
<th>Not S, V, or C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007-08</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>9.2% (N=7,747)</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008-09</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>9.0% (N=7,253)</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009-10</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>8.9% (N=6,464)</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010-11</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>8.7% (N=5,701)</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-12</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>8.7% (N=5,203)</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-13</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>8.6% (N=4,651)</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-14</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>9.2% (N=4,441)</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [Analysis of Serious, Violent and Chronic Delinquency in Florida](#). Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Bureau of Research and Planning.
SVC Youth: Why does it Matter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Youth</th>
<th>Not S, V, or C</th>
<th>Not SVC</th>
<th>SVC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recidivism Rates</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Association</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Over 50% of SVC youth were 12 or under at age of first referral

*Note: Data from the FY 2009-10 sample*
A Larger Percentage of Very Young Offenders Have SVC Careers

First Offense 13 or Over

- Violent = 22%
- Serious = 45%
- SVC = 4%
- Chronic = 8%

245,726 “Aged-out” Juvenile Offenders

First Offense 12 or Under

- Violent = 42%
- Serious = 66%
- SVC = 21%
- Chronic = 32%

51,928 “Aged-out” Juvenile Offenders

Source: Analysis of 297,654 juveniles in Florida’s Juvenile Justice system who have turned 18
The Comprehensive Strategy
Why a Comprehensive Strategy?

- Unbalanced emphasis on “deep end” graduated sanctions v. prevention and early intervention
- Overreliance on detention and residential placement
- Poor targeting of SVC youth
- Poor matching of youth to appropriate services and levels of supervision
- Use of ineffective programs
- Poor program planning
What is a Comprehensive Strategy?

- A *continuum* of services from universal prevention through residential and aftercare

- Ensures the appropriate *allocation of resources* to each level of services along the continuum

- Ensures the matching of youth to the level of services based on *assessed* risk and needs (C-PACT, R-PACT, Prevention Assessment Tool)

- Promotes prevention: Targets *at-risk youth*; prevents youth from becoming delinquent by focusing prevention programs on at-risk youth

- Incorporates Interventions and Graduated Sanctions: Target *delinquent youth*; Improve the juvenile justice system’s response to delinquent offenders within a continuum of treatment and service options and a system of graduated sanctions
A Graduated Sanctions Model

- Residential Placement
  - Redirection
    - Day Treatment
      - Intensive PS
        - Probation
          - Teen Court
            - Diversion
          - Probation
            - Redirection
              - C/R Day Treatment
                - Intensive PS

## Targeting High-Risk Offenders

### Risk Level and Treatment Recidivism Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Level of Treatment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Donnell et al. (1971)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baird et al. (1979)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonta et al. (2000)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recidivism Rate for all Low Risk to Re-offend Youth by Placement Type

Note: Data from 2012 Comprehensive Accountability Report (CAR) final files
Recidivism rate for IDDS significantly lower than all other placement types for the low risk sample. Diversion and IDDS significantly lower than Probation Supervision. Probation Supervision, CBIS, Probation Enhancement rates statistically equivalent. Probation, CBIS, and Probation Enhancement rates significantly lower than Day Treatment, Redirection, Residential, and PCP. Day Treatment, Redirection, Residential, and PCP recidivism rates are statistically equivalent.

Recidivism Rate for Low Risk Youth by "Needs" Level by Placement Type

Note: Data from 2012 Comprehensive Accountability Report (CAR) final files
"High Needs" defined as youth greater than 1 standard deviation above the mean on the Social History Score subcomponent of the PACT. Statistically significant differences found in the recidivism rates for low risk "high needs" youth versus youth not identified as such for the following Placement Types: Diversion, IDDS, Probation Supervision, with low risk "high needs" youth having significantly higher recidivism rates. Differences in recidivism rates for Probation Enhancement, Day Treatment, Redirection, Residential, and Post Commitment Probation were not significant.

Common Risk Factors Predict Delinquency (The Big Eight)

1. Antisocial Attitudes
2. Antisocial Peers
3. Antisocial Personality Patterns (impulsivity, low self-control, risk taking)
4. History of Antisocial Behavior
5. Problems at School/Work
6. Problematic Family Circumstances
7. Problematic Leisure Activities/use of free time
8. Substance Abuse

Dynamic Factors?  Static Factors?
Key Implications

- Most youth enter the system with minor offenses and low recidivism risk. Few are on pathways to serious, violent, or chronic offending.

- Risk assessment instruments (PACT) measure risk accurately enough to guide the allocation of resources.

- Needs assessment (PACT Full) identify criminogenic needs well enough to guide selection of appropriate services.

- To be effective, evidence-based services should address priority criminogenic needs.

- Matching of youth to appropriate levels of service targeted to prioritized needs is critical.
• Dispositional Guidelines:
  Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice
Disposition Recommendation Matrix

- Is a structured decision making tool that assists with matching youth to the appropriate level of service/supervision
- Is based on a matrix of risk to reoffend (PACT) and the presenting offense
- Consists of graduated sanctions – The intensity of services increases as the risk level and offense severity increases
Key Points of the Disposition Matrix

- Low-risk offenders remain in the community with minimal supervision
- Moderate-risk offenders typically placed in more structured community programs, with intensive probation supervision for higher risk youth
- Residential placement reserved for the highest risk offenders after community-based alternatives have been exhausted
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Serious Presenting Offense</th>
<th>PACT Risk Level to Re-Offend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-Risk to Re-offend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st TIME MISDEMEANOR¹</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor²</td>
<td>Level 2 or 3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious³</td>
<td>Level 2 or 3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent⁴</td>
<td>Level 2 or 3a-b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ - First time misdemeanor offenders with no history of arrest or participation in alternatives to arrest. Under Section 985.12, Florida Statutes, all first time misdemeanants are eligible for civil citation. Youth deemed ineligible for civil citation (based on community standards) should be reviewed under the “Misdemeanor” category based on their PACT Risk Level to Reoffend.

² - All misdemeanor offenses.
³ - Felony offenses that do not include violence.
⁴ - Violent felony offenses (does not include misdemeanor assault/battery, which is captured under “minor”).

*Level 1 - Alternatives to Arrest
Level 2 - Diversion & Non-DJJ Probation
Level 3 - Community Supervision
   (3a) - Probation supervision
   (3b) - Probation enhancement services (ART, LifeSkills, etc.)
   (3c) - FFT, MST, Day Treatment, Minimum-Risk Residential, etc.
Level 4 - Non Secure Residential Commitment (Low & Moderate-Risk Programs)
Level 5 - Secure Residential Commitment (High & Maximum-Risk Programs)
Disposition Matrix Validation

- **38,117** youth released in FY10-11.

- Below (n=691)
  - Optimum (n=27,916)
  - Appropriate (n=7,322)
  - Above (n=2,188)

- Holds true for males, females, across race/ethnicity, and for all risk levels of youth.

Delinquency Arrests - Statewide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Delinquency Arrests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009-10</td>
<td>121,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010-11</td>
<td>110,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011-12</td>
<td>97,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012-13</td>
<td>85,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013-14</td>
<td>78,447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remember...Tiers of Evidence

- The lowest form is anecdotal evidence; stories, opinions, testimonials, case studies, etc.

- The highest form is empirical evidence – research, data, results from controlled studies, etc.

- We do not want to norm an entire system on anecdotal outliers...
Continuum of Service Mapping
Continuum Mapping

- Identify the available services within each county
- Map the identified available services according to service category within each county
- Identify the target population for each categorized service according to levels of the Disposition Recommendation Matrix
# Data Collection

## Continuum of Services - At a Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County: Leon</th>
<th>Last Updated: 7/21/2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Services &amp; Structures Categories</th>
<th>Available Program/Services</th>
<th>Prevention</th>
<th>Graduated Delinquency Sanctions</th>
<th>Capacity/Slots</th>
<th>Waiting List?</th>
<th>Average Wait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Youth</td>
<td>Youth at Greatest Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternatives to Arrest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Probation Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Secure Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secure Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aftercare Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camelot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Big Bend Hospice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bethel Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Healing Transitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Magellan Behavioral Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>Must have Magellan insurance</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS Connections</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medicaid and Transitional Youth</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Marie Guilford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISC Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
County Service Mapping Report

http://www.djj.state.fl.us/research/delinquency-data/services-continuum-report/

Services Continuum Report

Leon County Programs - All Youth

- Group Counseling/Job-related Counseling: 14
- Individual Counseling/Job-related Counseling: 13
- Family Counseling: 17
- Other Programs: 12
- Skill Building/Stated Activities: 7
- Reentry Academic Programs: 6
- Residential: 6
- Residential: 5
- Cognitive Behavioral Interventions: 4
- Risk Management/Intensive Counseling: 4
- Community Planning and Intervention Counseling: 3
- Specialized Assessments: 3
- Skill Building/Stated Activities: 2
- Specialized Clinical Treatment: 2
- Reentry Academic Programs: 2

Circuit: 2 Leon County

Click on Counties to filter data
Monitoring Quality & Availability

- Community services come and go...
- Waiting Lists
- Routine updates will be necessary
Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP)

Laura Moneyham
Assistant Secretary for Residential Services
Florida Department of Juvenile Justice
EBP Mantra

- The right service
- For the right kid
- At the right time
- In the correct dosage
### Standardized Program Evaluation Protocol (SPEP) for Services to Juvenile Offenders

#### Points Possible vs Points Received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Points Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary and Supplemental Service Types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Service Type for Program Being Rated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 services (5 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 services (10 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 services (15 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Service Type</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Service Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated quality of services delivered:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration (Target number of weeks specified for each service type)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Hours (Target number of hours specified for each service type)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Level of Youth Served</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider’s Total SPEP Score</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Insert Score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© Copyright held by Mark W. Lippay, Peabody research institute, Vanderbilt university. Not to be copied or used without explicit permission.
• Research & Data Integrity:
  Bridging the Gap Between Research and Practice
Delinquency in Florida’s Schools (FY 2013-14)

Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity

- 10,340 arrests
- 15% of cases processed by DJJ involved a school-related offense
- 65% were for a misdemeanor
- 52% involved black youth
Briefing Sheets

http://www.djj.state.fl.us/research/fast-facts/delinquency-briefings

- Gang Activity for DJJ Involved Youth
- Domestic Violence Placements
- Obstruction/Resisting Arrest Analysis
- R-Pact Change Score Analysis
- Adhering to the Risk Principle
- General Delinquency Briefings
- Serious, Violent and Chronic Offenders
- And more....
Coming Soon…

- Prevalence of Domestic Violence
- Incompetent to Proceed Cases
- Civil Citation vs. Traditional Diversion
- All Things Crossover…
- Impact of Economic Sanctions
- Family Engagement
- Timeliness of Case Processing
- Special Cases: 12 and Under
Agency Priority Scorecards

http://www.djj.state.fl.us/research/reports/djj-monthly-accountability-scorecard/

---

**Legend:**
- A green arrow indicates improvement in a measure compared to the same month of the previous year.
- A green circle indicates no change from the same month of the previous year.
- A red arrow indicates that, compared to the same month of the previous year, an improvement is needed.

**Note:** For civil citation, the number shown represents a percentage point change compared to the same month of the previous year. For example, the 8 reported for January 2013 indicates that the percentage of eligible youth who received civil citation increased by eight percentage points from 25% to 33% since January 2012. For all other measures, percentages are a percentage change compared to the same month during the previous fiscal year. For example, the -3% reported for “Number of Delinquency Arrests” for January 2013 indicates a reduction by 3% from January 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Eligible First Time Misdemeanants Issued Civil Citation by Law Enforcement* (% Poin. Change)</th>
<th>Number of Delinquency Arrests</th>
<th>Number of Felony Delinquency Arrests</th>
<th>Number of Misdemeanor Delinquency Arrests</th>
<th>Number of “Other” Delinquency Arrests</th>
<th>Number of First-Time Misdemeanor Arrests (Impacted by Use of Civil Citation and Delinquency Dropping)</th>
<th>Number of School Arrests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2012</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2013</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2013</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>-26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2013</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2013</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2013</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2013</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2013</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2013</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2013</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2013</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-23%</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Current Program Performance Dashboards

http://www.djj.state.fl.us/research/reports/current-performance-measurement-reports

Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
The Delinquency Profile

http://www.djj.state.fl.us/research/delinquency-data/delinquency-profile

Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Analytics and Interactive Dashboarding

IBM SPSS Modeler

Florida Department of Juvenile Justice

Stata

Tableau Public

SPSS Premium Statistics
Predictive Analytics

Source: Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Office of Research and Data Integrity
Discussion & Feedback

Mark A. Greenwald, M.J.P.M
Mark.Greenwald@djj.state.fl.us

Please visit the Department’s Website for a copy of the presentation and more information:

www.djj.state.fl.us