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Justice Sheryl Gordon McCloud began her service on the Washington Supreme Court in January, 2013. As a Justice, she serves as Vice-Chair of the Washington State Supreme Court Gender & Justice Commission, as a member of the Supreme Court’s Rules Committee, and as the liaison to the Supreme Court’s Pattern Instructions Committee (on which she previously served as a lawyer-member). She is also the Supreme Court’s representative on the Washington State Bar Association’s Council on Public Defense. She speaks regularly at legal and community events throughout the state on topics ranging from ethics to indigent defense. In 2015, Washington Women Lawyers King County Chapter honored her with its President’s Award.

Justice Gordon McCloud brought with her a wealth of appellate experience; she handled hundreds of cases before the Washington Supreme Court and other appellate courts. Her law practice showed a record of commitment to communities of color and a long history of providing legal assistance to those who lack the ability to pay. In one of her first volunteer cases, she helped successfully defend a woman’s right to pregnancy disability leave in the United States Supreme Court.

Her legal expertise was recognized by her peers; they have awarded her the Washington Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers’ highest award, the William O. Douglas Award, for “extraordinary courage” in the practice of law. She was also an invited member of the American Association of Appellate Lawyers and was a founding member of the Washington Appellate Lawyers Association, both of which limit membership to the most accomplished appellate lawyers.

In addition, she was an adjunct Professor at Seattle University School of Law, teaching classes on a variety of topics including appellate advocacy. She has also taught practicing lawyers and published articles on appellate advocacy, criminal defense, constitutional law, and post-conviction work.

Simmie Baer currently serves as a public defender and juvenile justice consultant. A nationally renowned juvenile defender, she served as the Litigation Director for The Children and Family Justice Center at Northwestern University School of Law from 2005-2011, and prior to that appointment, she served as attorney-supervisor of the Juvenile Division of The Defender Association in Seattle for 16 years. She is a founder of Teamchild, a national model for educational and juvenile justice advocacy with offices in five counties in Washington. She is also a board member of the Public Defender Trial Advocacy Program of the National Defender Training Project. Baer’s passionate advocacy as a juvenile defender has earned her several awards, including the Livingston Hall Award of the American Bar Association (1995), the Paul Robeson Peace and Justice Award from Mothers for Police Accountability, and the William O. Douglas Award of the Washington Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers (2002).
Karen Yazmajian is an Assistant Attorney-in-Charge of the Juvenile Rights Practice of the Legal Aid Society (JRP) in New York City where she supervises the juvenile delinquency practice in the Brooklyn office. Karen has been with Legal Aid since 1998. Prior to that she worked at the New York City Department of Juvenile Justice where she worked on initiatives to decrease the over reliance on juvenile detention facilities. Karen serves on various borough-wide and city-wide committees, including the New York City Task Force on Reducing Juvenile Girls’ Confinement. She has conducted trainings for outside agencies and has done presentations at the National Juvenile Defender Center. Karen received the Orison S. Marden Award recognizing the outstanding service and dedication to The Legal Aid Society and its clients. She received her J.D. from the University of Southern California Law Center and her B.A. from Wesleyan University.

Mary Ann Scali is the Acting Executive Director of National Juvenile Defender Center (NJDC) where she manages the programmatic work of NJDC to grow the community of juvenile defender specialists and to establish effective systems of juvenile defense. Mary Ann joined NJDC in 2000 after working in the juvenile division of the Office of the Public Defender in Baltimore City, Maryland. Mary Ann coordinates and conducts juvenile indigent defense training programs, assessments of juvenile defense, and the provision of technical assistance related to juvenile defense to communities across the country. After completing her undergraduate degree at the College of the Holy Cross, she taught English and math at a boys’ trade school in Pohnpei, Micronesia. She also worked for a year for the Jesuit Refugee Service in Rome, Italy and for a year as a social worker and math teacher with boys from Baltimore City at the Baraka School in Nanyuki, Kenya. Mary Ann received her J.D. and M.S.W. from Loyola University Chicago where she was a Civitas ChildLaw Scholar.
DEFEND CHILDREN

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
A BLUEPRINT FOR EFFECTIVE JUVENILE DEFENDER SERVICES
America criminalizes childhood, particularly for children of color.1

Youth Still Don’t Get Lawyers

Fair and reasonable treatment of children in delinquency courts is virtually impossible without the availability of specialized and highly skilled counsel advocating for the expressed legal interests of the child client. Yet, few children in this country actually receive meaningful access to qualified defense counsel, as constitutionally required in delinquency proceedings.

Too Many Barriers Prevent Effective Juvenile Defense

In most federal, state, local, and tribal jurisdictions, existing juvenile defense delivery systems are inadequate or wholly lacking. Insufficient access to counsel early enough in the process, and problems with the timing and appointment of counsel, in addition to burdensome and lengthy indigence determinations, contribute greatly to the high rates of waiver of counsel. Further, many children languish in costly out-of-home placements due to a lack of post-disposition access to counsel.

Court Practices Are Not Developmentally Appropriate

Many current juvenile court practices and policies criminalizing normative adolescent conduct are inconsistent with positive youth development. Research shows that without any intervention most delinquent behavior desists by early adulthood.6
A CALL TO ACTION
THE BLUEPRINT FOR REFORM

01 Champion, Uphold, and Fund Children’s Right to Counsel

02 Ensure Meaningful Access to Counsel Throughout the Delinquency Process

Every child who faces arrest, prosecution, or sanctions imposed by the state should be represented by counsel until the child is no longer under the supervision of the justice system.

03 Implement Strong, Well-Resourced, and Specialized Juvenile Defense Systems

All juvenile defense systems should be sufficiently funded, due process-based, technologically equipped, developmentally sound, and respectful of and responsive to cultural differences.

04 Eliminate Racial and Ethnic Disparities

The over-inclusion and disproportionate treatment of children of color in our juvenile justice system is undeniable. It is critical to address this disproportionality and combat implicit and explicit bias throughout the justice system.

05 Attract and Retain New and Diverse Talent to the Field of Juvenile Defense

Specific attention must be paid to developing a corps of excellence and attracting a diverse body of talent, expertise, and leadership to the juvenile defense field.

06 Protect the Rights of Youth Who Face Additional Discrimination and Violation of Their Constitutional Rights

Children who face additional risks and barriers to fair treatment require specialized attorneys who are trained to recognize, monitor, and uphold their rights.

07 Fund and Implement Mechanisms to Collect Data, Conduct Assessments and Court Observations, and Initiate Evaluation and Research

Dedicated juvenile defense research, evaluation, and data collection must be established in order to create a baseline, measure progress, and sustain effective juvenile defense systems.
The National Juvenile Defender Center (NJDC) is a non-profit, non-partisan organization dedicated to promoting justice for all children by ensuring excellence in juvenile defense. NJDC provides support to public defenders, appointed counsel, private counsel, law school clinical programs, and non-profit law centers to ensure quality representation in urban, suburban, rural, and tribal areas. NJDC also offers a wide range of integrated services to juvenile defenders as well as other decision-makers and advocates, including training, technical assistance, advocacy, networking, collaboration, capacity building, and coordination. To learn more about NJDC, please visit www.njdc.info.

This project was supported in part by Grant #2013-MU-FX-K004 awarded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this guide are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of Justice.

2 Id. at 7.
6 Laurence Steinberg, Elizabeth Cauffman & Kathryn C. Monahan, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Dept of Justice, Psychosocial Maturity and Desistance From Crime in a Sample of Serious Juvenile Offenders (2015).
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DEDICATION

This Blueprint is dedicated to Patricia Puritz, founding executive director of the National Juvenile Defender Center, for her leadership, vision, perseverance, and grace in building a juvenile defense community and a home base for its support at the National Juvenile Defender Center. This Blueprint would not exist but for her unwavering commitment to establishing effective systems of juvenile defense for children.
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CONCLUSION
The National Juvenile Defender Center (NJDC) is a non-profit, non-partisan organization dedicated to promoting justice for all children by ensuring excellence in juvenile defense. NJDC provides support to public defenders, appointed counsel, private counsel, law school clinical programs, and non-profit law centers to ensure quality juvenile defense for youth in urban, suburban, rural, and tribal areas. NJDC gives juvenile defense attorneys a permanent and enhanced capacity to address practice and policy issues, improve advocacy skills, build partnerships, exchange information, and participate in national and local conversations about juvenile defense and juvenile justice.

NJDC offers a wide range of integrated services including: training, technical assistance, assessment and evaluation, policy development and analysis, and opportunities for leadership, collaboration, and innovation. NJDC also regularly provides information, advice, and assistance regarding juvenile defense issues to governmental and non-governmental organizations at the federal, state, local, and tribal levels.

NJDC’s website, www.njdc.info, is a comprehensive clearinghouse of information on juvenile defense practice and policy issues, accessible to the general public, stakeholders, and juvenile defenders.

NJDC’s initiatives emanate from the field through its network of Regional Juvenile Defender Centers. Each Center coordinates activities within and among states in its region, including: compiling and analyzing juvenile indigent defense data; facilitating opportunities for juvenile defenders to organize and network; offering tailored, regional, and state-based training and technical assistance; and providing targeted case support specifically addressing the complexities of juvenile defense practice.

NJDC participates in a range of collaborative reform efforts led by the federal government, private foundations, and local and state justice partners.

May 15, 2017, marks the 50th anniversary of the In re Gault decision holding that the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution guarantees children a right to counsel in juvenile court. More information on this historic United States Supreme Court decision and commemorative events can be found at NJDC’s Gault at 50 website, www.gaultat50.org.
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The goal for *Defend Children: A Blueprint for Effective Juvenile Defender Services* is rooted in the United States Constitution: to ensure the right to counsel is fulfilled for every child. The National Juvenile Defender Center and many others who work in the justice field recognize the need for better and more consistent delivery of defense services for children who are arrested. We seek a comprehensive and system-wide approach to ensure this fundamental right is realized for children, regardless of race, ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, zip code, or ability to pay. We must draw from a wide range of strategies, including legislation, funding, and research, to improve the provision of counsel and achieve justice for children in the juvenile and criminal justice systems.

**HISTORY**

The first delinquency court was founded on the notion that “kids are different” from adults and should therefore be treated differently in the justice system. On April 21, 1899, the State of Illinois created a juvenile court as part of a legislative act establishing the Juvenile Court Division of the Circuit Court for Cook County. The landmark legislation codified a more progressive way to treat “wayward” youth. Instead of showing them the error of their ways through punishment, the state aimed to help youth correct their course and become productive, law-abiding citizens. The early juvenile court applied the English common law *parens patriae*—or state-as-parent—philosophy and was afforded broad discretion to provide individually tailored guidance to youth to steer them toward a life as responsible adults. The system required only cursory legal proceedings with no focus on due process and no role for a juvenile defense attorney.

The fundamental purpose and function of the first juvenile court embodied the public’s interest in rehabilitating youth—regardless of their behavior or delinquent conduct—for the betterment of society. Social workers and behavioral scientists advised the court on the most appropriate outcomes for cases, and, for the first time, detained youth were separated from adults and placed in training and industrial schools, as well as private foster homes and institutions. This type of juvenile court was quickly replicated across the country. By 1925, some form of juvenile court existed in all but two states.

The stated mission of these new juvenile delinquency courts was to help youth become productive citizens through treatment and rehabilitation. While this mission was rooted in compassion, it led to striking procedural and substantive differences between the juvenile delinquency and adult criminal court systems.
INTRODUCTION

“(The juvenile) requires the guiding hand of counsel at every step in the proceedings against him.”


Despite growing concerns regarding the lack of substantive and procedural safeguards and the disparate treatment of individual youth in the juvenile justice system, constitutional challenges to juvenile court practices and procedures were consistently overruled until the 1960s. While case law held that juvenile proceedings were civil in nature and were meant to be rehabilitative as opposed to punitive, research began to show the pitfalls of a system without due process: juvenile court judges often lacked legal training; probation officers were undertrained and their heavy caseloads often prohibited meaningful social intervention; children were regularly housed in secure, adult correctional facilities; and juvenile correctional institutions were often overcrowded and violent, serving as little more than breeding grounds for further criminal activity.

Beginning in 1963, a series of landmark decisions by the United States Supreme Court bolstered numerous rights for defendants. The Court held in Gideon v. Wainwright that the Sixth Amendment right to counsel requires that adults charged with a felony offense who are unable to afford an attorney be appointed one at public expense. Although the decision applied only to adults, it was critical in paving the way for the In re Gault decision that affirmed children’s right to counsel a few years later. In Gideon, a unanimous Court wrote that any person too poor to hire a lawyer cannot be assured a fair trial unless counsel is provided for him, explaining that “lawyers in criminal courts are necessities, not luxuries.”

In the wake of Gideon, the Supreme Court began extending the right to counsel and other bedrock elements of our modern justice system to youth facing delinquency proceedings. In 1966 in Kent v. United States, the Court held that the transfer of a child from juvenile court to adult criminal court requires certain legal protections: “[T]here is no place in our system of law for reaching a result of such tremendous consequences without ceremony—without hearing, without effective assistance of counsel, without a statement of reasons.”

In 1967, the Supreme Court ruled in In re Gault that youth in delinquency court have the right to counsel under the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution, applied to the states through the Fourteenth Amendment. The Court observed that youth in juvenile court were receiving “the worst of both worlds,” explaining that they had “neither the protections accorded to adults nor the solicitous care and regenerative treatment postulated for children.”
"A child’s age is far more than a chronological fact. It is a fact that generates commonsense conclusions about behavior and perception."


The Court concluded that no matter how many court personnel were charged with looking after the child’s best interests, any child facing “the awesome prospect of incarceration” needed “the guiding hand of counsel at every step in the proceedings against him” for the same reasons that adults facing criminal charges need counsel.19

The Gault decision required the introduction of defense lawyers and affirmed the critical need for constitutional protections in what had become a dangerously informal juvenile court process.20 Significantly, it was the Supreme Court’s intention that youth accused of delinquent acts were to become participants, rather than spectators, in their court proceedings.21 In addition to the right to counsel, Gault affirmed children’s right to notice of the charges against them,22 the privilege against self-incrimination,23 the right to compulsory process of witnesses,24 and the right to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses.25 In condemning the harms of the early system, the Court famously stated, “The condition of being a boy does not justify a kangaroo court.”26

The Supreme Court’s call for fundamental fairness for youth resonated beyond the steps of the courthouse and was answered by federal and state policymakers. In 1974, Congress passed the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA),27 legislation that sought to regulate the function of the juvenile justice system and its treatment of children. It still stands as the country’s primary federal legislation regulating juvenile justice. In 1988, Congress made addressing disproportionate minority contact a core requirement of the JJDPA.28 In 1992, when Congress reauthorized the JJDPA, it affirmed the importance of the role of defense counsel in delinquency proceedings.29 Also in the 1992 reauthorization of the JJDPA, Congress charged OJJDP with establishing and supporting advocacy programs and services that protect due process rights of youth in juvenile court and called for an improvement of the quality of legal representation for youth in delinquency proceedings.30

The JJDPA has served as the foundation for federal leadership and support for the juvenile justice community across the nation for the past 40 years. A reauthorized, reinvigorated, and well-resourced Act focused on promoting positive outcomes for youth is essential to implementing developmentally informed juvenile courts and guiding the community of juvenile justice professionals forward.

Today, there is a renewed focus on reforming our nation’s juvenile justice systems grounded in adolescent behavioral and neuroscience research as well as overwhelming evidence of racial disparities. The dual injustices imposed by violating the civil rights of youth through disparate treatment coupled with violating the due process rights of youth through denial of access to effective counsel cannot be tolerated. Bipartisan initiatives should decriminalize adolescence, eliminate racial disparities, and ensure systems of effective juvenile defense. As this nation considers, implements, and enhances juvenile justice reform, children’s access to juvenile defense
counsel and the quality of representation provided must be a central component of every initiative. It is our hope that Defend Children: A Blueprint for Effective Juvenile Defender Services will serve as a pathway to achieving that reality.

**INTRODUCTION**

**CHALLENGES**

Tackling systemic juvenile defense issues, understanding gaps, measuring progress, educating stakeholders about emerging trends, supporting courtroom advocacy, initiating true partnerships with communities, and ensuring professional and ethical management is not possible without consistent data collection, assessment and evaluation, court observation, and research on existing juvenile defense systems. Unfortunately, most states lack a process for collecting data and evaluating juvenile defense performance at a statewide level.\(^3\) Research on current juvenile defense practices are scarce, hindering efforts to better identify and reform inadequate practices in juvenile court. Unlike the child welfare system, which has benefitted from decades of U.S. Department of Health and Human Services support through the Court Improvement Program,\(^3\)\(^2\)\(^)\(^\)\(^\) no such comparable resources have ever existed for the delinquency side of juvenile court.

The data that we do have, however, shows that racial and ethnic disparities deeply pervade the juvenile justice system.\(^3\)\(^3\) Decades of delinquency prevention policies focused on control and enforcement, rather than on positive youth outcomes, have resulted in legally sanctioned mass incarceration of youth of color.\(^3\)\(^4\) Systemic reform efforts must target implicit and explicit bias in delinquency court and promote bias-free juvenile defense systems and training for juvenile defenders on how to effectively raise issues of disparities and overrepresentation throughout a child’s involvement in the justice system. Existing best practices and resources should be reviewed and expanded to address how to effectively remove bias and disparities in the juvenile court system.

The dual injustices imposed by violating the civil rights of youth through disparate treatment coupled with violating the due process rights of youth through denial of access to effective counsel cannot be tolerated.

Concerns regarding the inadequacy of juvenile defense systems are heightened in rural, remote, and underserved communities. Juvenile defense stakeholders in these communities lack resources and support and feel disconnected from the broader juvenile defense community. In addition, rural communities often lack specialized juvenile defenders, support staff, disposition alternatives for clients, and resources for effective representation.\(^3\)\(^5\) Defenders who represent children in these communities face unique challenges that make it difficult to provide client-centered and expressed-interest representation for youth.

---


32 See generally Court Improvement Program, Child Welfare Information Gateway, https://www.childwelfare.gov/topics/systemwide/courts/reform/cip/ (last visited Sept. 22, 2016) (The highest court of each State and territory participating in the Court Improvement Program (CIP) receives a grant from the Children’s Bureau aimed at, for example, improving the timeliness and quality of hearings, reducing attorney and judicial caseloads, enhancing the quality of legal representation, and using computer technology and management information systems.).

33 While racial and ethnic minority children make up 46% of the general population of children in the United States, they are overrepresented in residential placements, comprising 68% of the children in residential placement facilities (which includes pre-adjudicatory detention, post-disposition commitment, and placement in facility in lieu of adjudication as part of a diversion agreement). See Charles Puzzanchera, Anthony Stadiky & Wei Kang, Easy Access to Juvenile Populations: 1990-2015, Nat’l Ctr. for Juvenile Justice (2016), http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapop/ (narrowed by those under age 18 in 2014, with row variable set to race and column variable set to ethnicity); Melissa Sickmund et al., Easy Access to the Census of Juveniles in Residential Placement: 1997-2013, Nat’l Ctr. for Juvenile Justice (2015), http://www.ojjdp.gov/ojstatbb/ezapip/ (narrowed by narrowed by those under age 18 in 2013, with row variable set to race and column variable set to placement status general).


Across the country, juvenile indigent defense is burdened by a scarcity of resources. As such, there are few dedicated or stand-alone juvenile defense offices. In the vast majority of states, indigent defense resources pale in comparison with the resources of other entities, such as law enforcement and prosecutors. Further, the limited resources that do exist for indigent defense are often managed by larger adult defense systems that do not provide juvenile defense with the necessary specialization, expertise, and leadership the field needs.

Overcoming these barriers, including the research gap, racial and ethnic disparities, challenges in rural areas, and insufficient funding, will require close and thoughtful review of the statutory framework for the funding and administration of juvenile defense at the state and local levels. Over the past decade, the JJDPA has not been reauthorized, and total funds appropriated to OJJDP have decreased significantly. Raising the appropriation level for juvenile indigent defense, as proposed in the President’s 2016 and 2017 Budgets, will provide additional resources to help states move in the right direction.

The vast differences in the provision of juvenile defense services across state and local jurisdictions make clear that only a truly comprehensive and systemic approach to reform can achieve significant progress in the field. Such an approach requires increased investments at all levels of government and significant stakeholder collaboration at the local and state levels.

**Children’s access to juvenile defense counsel and the quality of representation provided must be a central component of every initiative.**

This Blueprint provides the case for reform and offers recommendations for solutions, highlighting innovations and promising practices from around the country. With national, state, local, and tribal leadership, healthy and developmentally sound juvenile defense systems can emerge to fulfill the promise of *Gault* for our children.

---

36 See generally NJDC Assessments, supra note 32.
Appearing throughout the report are special sections that feature “Innovations.” Each innovation provides examples of successful programs and practices in the topic area of the section in which it appears. While the obstacles to reform are real, these working solutions demonstrate they are not insurmountable. We hope reformers will use the innovations to inform and inspire future work to uphold children’s rights in juvenile court.
**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**01 Champion, Uphold, and Fund Children’s Right to Counsel**

**02 Ensure Meaningful Access to Counsel Throughout the Delinquency Process**

Every child who faces arrest, prosecution, or sanctions imposed by the state should be represented by counsel until the child is no longer under the supervision of the justice system.

**03 Implement Strong, Well-Resourced, and Specialized Juvenile Defense Systems**

All juvenile defense systems should be sufficiently funded, due process-based, technologically equipped, developmentally sound, and respectful of and responsive to cultural differences.

**04 Eliminate Racial and Ethnic Disparities**

The over-inclusion and disproportionate treatment of children of color in our juvenile justice system is undeniable. It is critical to address this disproportionality and combat implicit and explicit bias throughout the justice system.

**05 Attract and Retain New and Diverse Talent to the Field of Juvenile Defense**

Specific attention must be paid to developing a corps of excellence and attracting a diverse body of talent, expertise, and leadership to the juvenile defense field.

**06 Protect the Rights of Youth Who Face Additional Discrimination and Violation of Their Constitutional Rights**

Children who face additional risks and barriers to fair treatment require specialized attorneys who are trained to recognize, monitor, and uphold their rights.

**07 Fund and Implement Mechanisms to Collect Data, Conduct Assessments and Court Observations, and Initiate Evaluation and Research**

Dedicated juvenile defense research, evaluation, and data collection must be established in order to measure progress and sustain effective juvenile defense systems.
Cook County, Illinois establishes first juvenile court, recognizing youth are not simply small adults and thus deserve a distinct court system.

Haley v. Ohio
U.S. Supreme Court recognizes that youth are more susceptible to coercion during an interrogation.

The Court notes, “[t]hat which would leave a man cold and unimpressed [during an interrogation] can overawe and overwhelm a lad in his early teens.” 332 U.S. 596, 599 (1948).

Gallegos v. Colorado
Building on Haley, the Court again recognizes that youth are more susceptible to coercion and notes that a youth “would have no way of knowing what the consequences of his confession were without advice as to his rights — from someone concerned with securing him those rights....” 370 U.S. 49, 54 (1962).

Kent v. United States
The Court holds that youth are entitled to procedural due process protections at transfer hearings.

“The same considerations that demand extreme caution in factfinding to protect the innocent adult apply as well to the innocent child.” 383 U.S. 541, 554 (1966).

In re Gault
The Court holds the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment guarantees youth the right to counsel. The Court also finds that due process requires youth have the right to notice of charges against them, the right to confront and cross-examine witnesses, and the privilege against self-incrimination.

“Juvenile Court history has again demonstrated that unbridled discretion, however benevolently motivated, is frequently a poor substitute for principle and procedure.” 387 U.S. 1, 18 (1967).

In re Winship
The Court finds that juvenile adjudications require proof “beyond a reasonable doubt.”

“[T]he same considerations that demand extreme caution in factfinding to protect the innocent adult apply as well to the innocent child.” 397 U.S. 358, 365 (1970).

McKeiver v. Pennsylvania
The Court fails to extend the constitutional right to a trial by jury to juveniles. 403 U.S. 528 (1971).
The Court holds that the Double Jeopardy Clause of the Fifth Amendment applies to youth in delinquency court. 421 U.S. 519 (1975).

**Breed v. Jones**


**Schall v. Martin**

The Court rules that a child’s age must inform the Miranda custody analysis by law enforcement during juvenile interrogations. The decision includes underpinnings to support a “reasonable child standard” in legal contexts. The Court recognizes that “a reasonable child subjected to police questioning will sometimes feel pressured to submit when a reasonable adult would feel free to go.” 564 U.S. 261, 272 (2011).

**J.D.B v. North Carolina**

The Court abolishes the death penalty as applied to minors based on the Eighth Amendment prohibition against “cruel and unusual punishment.” In eliminating the juvenile death penalty the Court relies on developmental research highlighting “general differences between juveniles under 18 and adults ....” 543 U.S. 551, 569 (2005).

**Roper v. Simmons**

“The differences between juvenile and adult offenders are too marked and well understood to risk allowing a youthful person to receive the death penalty despite insufficient culpability.” Id. at 572-73.

**Graham v. Florida**

The Court holds it is unconstitutional to impose the penalty of life imprisonment without the possibility of parole on juveniles (JLWOP) for non-homicide offenses.

“As compared to adults, juveniles have a ‘lack of maturity and an underdeveloped sense of responsibility’; they ‘are more vulnerable or susceptible to negative influences and outside pressures, including peer pressure’; and their characters are ‘not as well formed.” 560 U.S. 48, 68 (2010) (internal citations omitted).

**Miller v. Alabama**

The Court, again citing developmental science, holds that juveniles cannot be sentenced to a mandatory life without parole sentence, even for homicide offenses.

“Our decisions rested not only on common sense—on what ‘any parent knows’—but on science and social science as well.” 132 S.Ct. 2455, 2464 (2012) (internal citations omitted).

**Montgomery v. Louisiana**

The Court reinforces that children are constitutionally different from adults and holds that Miller’s prohibition of mandatory juvenile life without parole is a substantive rule of constitutional law and is therefore retroactive.

“In light of what this Court has said in Roper, Graham, and Miller about how children are constitutionally different from adults in their level of culpability...[children sentenced to mandatory life without parole] must be given the opportunity to show their crime did not reflect irreparable corruption....” 136 S.Ct. 718, 736 (2016).
More than a million times a year, children in America are charged with crimes in juvenile court. Most children are accused of non-violent property offenses (35%), drug law violations (13%), and public order offenses (26%)—adolescent misconduct that is developmentally normative but unequally prosecuted among poor youth and youth of color. In fact, Black youth are nearly five times more likely to be confined than white youth, and Latino and American Indian and Alaska Native youth are two to three times more likely to be confined. Though the total number of juvenile cases has decreased since the mid-1990s, the inclination to criminalize childhood continues and the racial and economic disparities remain the same.

The outlawing of adolescence causes real and lasting harms in the lives of youth. All too often, juvenile court becomes the default response when other systems fail to provide developmentally appropriate support, saddling young people with enduring juvenile records—and potentially putting them on a pathway into the adult criminal justice system—on the basis of perceived needs rather than safety concerns. Juvenile court involvement cannot be a social service.

For children in the justice system, access to justice at its very core requires access to counsel. It is an open secret in America’s justice system that countless children accused of crimes are prosecuted and convicted every year without ever seeing a lawyer.

It is an open secret in America’s justice system that countless children accused of crimes are prosecuted and convicted every year without ever seeing a lawyer.

It is the child’s lawyer—the juvenile defender—who is required to insist upon fair and lawful juvenile court proceedings, to guarantee that the child’s voice is heard at every stage of the process, and to safeguard the due process and equal protection rights of the child. This role is distinct from other juvenile court stakeholders who are required to consider the “best interests” of the child; the juvenile defender is instead required to consider the

40 Id. at 7.
43 See NJDC Assessments, supra note 31.
“expressed interests” of the child. The shameful fact is that few youth in this country actually receive meaningful access to constitutionally required and qualified defense counsel in delinquency proceedings. All too often, justice-involved youth enter into blind plea agreements without consulting an attorney and without having a complete picture of the lifelong, direct, and collateral impacts of juvenile court adjudications, including incarceration. A legal right has no bearing if it cannot be accessed.

A state “deprives children of their right to counsel if its courts allow them to waive that right without first consulting with competent counsel.”

The juvenile defense systems in most jurisdictions are inadequate or wholly lacking in their capacity to defend children’s rights. Youth do not have access to a lawyer early enough in the court process, and the method of appointing counsel often depends on the judge’s discretion, perpetuating the misguided but common notion that the appointment of counsel is optional. Further, many youth waive their right to counsel without ever having had the opportunity to discuss this important decision with a lawyer. This lack of access to counsel often persists through disposition and post-disposition, as too many children languish unnecessarily without lawyers in costly confinement institutions and face significant hurdles upon returning to their communities.

Children’s access to counsel is determined in large part by statutory schemes and juvenile codes that proscribe when counsel is appointed, how counsel is appointed, whether and how counsel is waived, and when counsel’s appointment terminates. Statutes that limit access on the front and back ends of the juvenile court process create barriers to representation and impede children’s access to justice. These statutory schemes are often a patchwork of laws established one at a time without comprehensive analysis to ensure children are consistently represented at all stages of the proceedings.

Overwhelming evidence now shows that detention—even minimal and short-term detention—has an enduring effect on young people that exacerbates symptoms of stress, trauma, anxiety, and mental illness. Additionally, detention prior to trial has been linked to recidivism rather than an increase in public safety. An ideal juvenile justice system works to minimize the use of detention, and to minimize the time that a youth spends in detention if it is deemed necessary. To achieve this goal, however, children appearing before the court must have the benefit of counsel not merely at a future trial date, but prior to the youth’s initial detention hearing.

Current systems allow a staggering number of justice-involved youth to appear in court without a lawyer. That is despite the fact that the United States Supreme Court established the juvenile right to counsel nearly 50 years ago. One reason youth face prosecution without a lawyer is the coercive, and often arbitrary and burdensome indigence determination process imposed in many jurisdictions before youth are able to obtain a court-appointed lawyer.

45 The juvenile defense attorney has a duty to advocate for a client’s “expressed interests,” regardless of whether the “expressed interests” coincide with what the lawyer personally believes to be in the “best interests” of the client. In re Gault, 387 US 1 (1967); see generally, Model Rules of Professional Conduct 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.8, & 1.14. “Expressed-interest” (also called “stated-interest”) representation requires that counsel assert the client’s voice in juvenile proceedings. In comparison, “best interest” representation requires advocates to assert their own opinion about what they believe is best for the child. No other juvenile court decision makers are mandated to represent the “expressed interests” of youth. If juvenile defenders do not abide by this ethical obligation to provide “expressed interest” advocacy, youth are deprived of their fundamental right to counsel. See U.S. Dep’t of Justice Statement of Interest for N.P. et al. v. Georgia, No. 2014-CV-241025 at 12-15 (Ga. Super. Ct. 2014) [hereinafter Statement of Interest in N.P.].
48 See generally NJDC Assessments, supra note 31.
51 See infra note 72.
52 See In re Gault, 387 U.S. 1, 34-43 (1967).
53 Indeed, a recent report by the U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division found that the family court in St. Louis County, Missouri systematically fails to provide adequate representation for children in delinquency proceedings, due in part to the arbitrary system of determining eligibility for public defender services. See U.S. DEP’T OF JUSTICE CIVIL RIGHTS DIV., INVESTIGATION OF THE ST. LOUIS FAMILY COURT, ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI (2015).
Juvenile waiver of counsel is as pervasive as it is troubling. Countless youth across the country are encouraged to waive their right to counsel without adequate knowledge of the benefits of legal representation. This is unacceptable.

Access to and consultation with an attorney prior to waiving the right to counsel is critical for justice-involved youth. Indeed, as the United States Department of Justice recently clarified, a state “deprives children of their right to counsel if its courts allow them to waive that right without first consulting with competent counsel.”

Children who are treated fairly in the legal system are more likely to trust their attorneys and other court personnel, actively engage in the court process, and find value—and legitimacy—in their case outcomes. Research demonstrates that this perception of fairness, known as “procedural justice,” is a significant precursor to positive behavior over time. As a child’s strongest link to the court system, high-quality juvenile defenders are critically important to guaranteeing procedural justice for youth.

This Blueprint calls for a comprehensive and systemic approach to ensure children’s right to counsel. There is no “one-size-fits-all” solution. This Blueprint was developed with a full appreciation for the existing array of juvenile defense systems across the country (e.g., county/state public and private defender offices, appointed counsel systems, and law school clinics in urban, suburban, and rural settings) and an understanding that the daily practices of juvenile defenders are greatly influenced by the type of juvenile defense system or jurisdiction in which they practice. The building of competent juvenile defense delivery systems requires the full engagement of high-level, non-defender stakeholders and decision makers, including legislators, state supreme courts, court administrators, juvenile judges, and others who work in or with juvenile court systems.
The essence of access to justice for children is access to counsel. The fate of our children facing prosecution depends in no small part on the deliberate and immediate implementation of children’s right to counsel. As decision makers look to improve outcomes for justice-involved youth, representation for children in court must be recognized as a necessary component of a developmentally appropriate juvenile justice system.

When thinking through the design, structure, and implementation of juvenile justice and juvenile defense systems, behavioral differences between youth and adults and the impact of court interventions on children must be considered. The vast majority of children involved in the juvenile justice system have endured exposure to violence and the resulting trauma of those experiences. Scientific knowledge about adolescent development, the impact of trauma on youth, and the biological immaturity of the brain, coupled with the strong legal precedent set forth by the United States Supreme Court in a line of recent cases, requires an immediate shift in policy and practice. The field must align the goals of the juvenile justice system—holding youth accountable, developing youth competencies, and protecting communities—with a developmental approach that promotes positive youth behavior. State, local, and tribal jurisdictions urgently need assistance, and practitioners urgently need guidance, on how to implement fair, developmentally sound, due-process-based, trauma-informed, juvenile defense systems for children who come into contact with the justice system.

Juvenile justice leaders should work in partnership with juvenile defense experts and juvenile defenders to establish systems that are fair, specialized, and measurable. Resources and leadership at all levels of government are required to surmount the historical minimization of juvenile delinquency practice and to promote significant reforms of juvenile defense systems across the nation.

59 See generally In re Gault, 387 U.S. 1 (1967).
60 Id. at 20.
RECOMMENDATION 2.0

ENSURE MEANINGFUL ACCESS TO COUNSEL THROUGHOUT THE DELINQUENCY PROCESS

2.1
Guarantee Early, Timely, and Meaningful Access to Juvenile Defense Counsel

2.2
Appoint Counsel for All Children Without Requiring a Determination of Indigence

2.3
Prohibit Waiver of Counsel Without Prior Consultation with a Defense Attorney

2.4
Support, Fund, and Expand Access to Counsel to Include Post-Disposition Representation and Reentry Planning
Juvenile court systems should provide children with timely access to a defense attorney in advance of their first appearance before a judge, allowing the attorney time to prepare for the hearing. Juvenile defenders appointed at the early stages of a case are better situated to help youth understand their rights, the direct and long-term consequences of juvenile court involvement, and how to navigate an increasingly complex juvenile justice system. Qualified juvenile defenders who have the opportunity to consult with youth prior to the initial hearing are essential to helping youth make informed decisions about their cases. However, in many states, there is a failure to provide adequate time for the juvenile defender to meaningfully represent the child at the first hearing. In some states or counties, the child may be entirely unrepresented at early proceedings, including the detention hearing and initial hearing. In others, counsel is appointed either during the detention hearing or immediately before the hearing, leaving the juvenile defender without an opportunity to meet and talk with the child or to prepare for the hearing.

Juvenile courts should ensure youth have meaningful access to counsel, which mandates youth be given enough time to both receive information from and share information with their lawyer. Navigating the complexities of the delinquency process and making informed decisions at all junctures of a case requires meaningful opportunities to interact with a lawyer. Juvenile courts and indigent defense systems should acknowledge the developmental differences of youth and allow juvenile defenders to invest the proper time, care, and resources to actively engage children in the court process.

Juvenile defenders appointed early in the delinquency process can work to protect youth from the consequences of false confessions and uncounseled guilty pleas, seek diversion or case dismissal for their clients, and limit exposure to costly and harmful detention. They are also better positioned to build a strong defense strategy that includes investigations, find alternative placements, obtain discovery, file motions, and encourage clients to exercise other rights, such as the right to...

65 See Statement of Interest in N.P., supra note 45, at 12-13, 15 (“Every child who faces the loss of liberty must be represented from the time of arrest through the disposition of their case . . . . [If] the lawyers do not have the time or resources to engage in effective advocacy or if they do not receive adequate training or supervision . . . then they will inevitably fail to meet the minimum requirements of their clients’ right to counsel. These conditions lead to de facto nonrepresentation.”).
66 See NJDC Assessments, supra note 31.
67 Id.
68 Id.
69 See generally NAT’L JUVENILE DEFENDER CTR., NATIONAL JUVENILE DEFENSE STANDARDS (2012) (explaining the role of counsel throughout the process of assisting a juvenile client) [hereinafter NATIONAL JUVENILE DEFENSE STANDARDS].
Juvenile courts should forgo indigence determinations of children, at least for the purpose of appointing counsel. The indigence determination process delays a child’s access to a lawyer—even for a child in detention—and can create conflict between the child and family, putting added pressure on a child to waive their right to counsel. Whether by statute, court rule, or policy, juvenile courts should deem children eligible for indigent defense services by virtue of their legal and developmental status as children.

In most states, a child’s ability to be appointed a public defender or court-appointed lawyer hinges on a determination of eligibility for indigent defense services. Indigence determinations are usually based on a set of specific formulas that vary from state to state, but often include some percentage above the federal poverty guidelines or general “ability to pay” guidelines. The indigency process for children in delinquency court is often the same as for adult defendants; however, children typically do not have their own income or assets, so the determination rests on an investigation of the parent or guardian’s income. Indigence determinations consider assets that are not under the control of the child, and the investigation of parents’ and/or other relatives’ resources often leads to fear and concern for the family and child.

The indigence application process can impede children’s access to counsel. Parents or guardians usually have to complete an application and are typically required to provide proof of their inability to pay. Some states even charge a fee to apply for indigent defense services. Thus, the indigence determination process itself can disrupt or delay the appointment of, or one’s willingness to seek, counsel.

Parents who do not qualify for indigent defense services for their children are faced with the prospect of hiring an attorney at significant expense, which can force children to choose between their families’ financial welfare and the protection of their own due process rights. If parents incur the cost of representation, a potential conflict may develop between the parent and the child over direction of the case. All children should be deemed eligible for appointment of counsel by virtue of their status as children to avoid pressured waiver or conflicts in representation.

---

70 Id.
72 See generally WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW, CRIMINAL JUSTICE CLINIC, INDIGENCY GUIDELINES (2012).
73 See NJDC Assessments, supra note 31; Kids Without Counsel, supra note 46, 5-6.
Waiver of counsel in juvenile court is a problem nationwide. Courts should ensure, in line with the Department of Justice’s recommendations in its 2015 Statement of Interest in N.P. v. Georgia, that no child be allowed to waive his or her right to counsel unless and until that child has the opportunity to meaningfully consult with an attorney about the full implication of the waiver of that right.

Children require the advice and assistance of counsel to make decisions that carry lifelong consequences in the highly charged setting of a juvenile court proceeding. Yet, multiple systemic factors directly or indirectly encourage children to waive their right to an attorney.

The most troubling factor regarding waivers of counsel is that children are often put in the untenable position of making a decision about waiving their right to representation before they have an opportunity to speak with an attorney. At a child’s very first court date, he or she may be offered a plea bargain that will “resolve” the case that day. In this all too common scenario, a judge may conduct a “mass advisement” to inform children in the courtroom of their constitutional rights, and then accept guilty pleas and dole out sentences—all in the absence of qualified defense counsel. The lure of “resolving” the case in a single court appearance is understandably appealing to children and families; however, it grossly underestimates the direct and collateral consequences of a juvenile adjudication that can lead to years of court supervision, potential incarceration, and numerous fees. This practice also fails to provide critically important checks and balances on the juvenile court system.

State and local laws governing public defense agencies may also limit the presence of defense attorneys and induce waiver of counsel without ensuring that no child be allowed to waive his or her right to counsel unless and until that child has the opportunity to meaningfully consult with an attorney about the full implication of the waiver of that right.

74 42 Pa. Cons. Stat. Ann. § 6337.1 (West 2014) (children in delinquency cases are presumed indigent, and must be appointed counsel by the court if they arrive at any hearing without counsel).
76 Excessive waiver of counsel and lack of counsel was observed in 62 percent of the 21 states in which NJDC has conducted state-specific assessments of youth access to counsel. Though each state assessed has subsequently worked towards reform, the data cited reveals the pervasiveness of the problem nationwide. NJDC Missouri Assessment, supra note 35, at 39 (finding that “the number of youth who proceed without counsel is alarmingly high in many counties”); NJDC Colorado Assessment, supra note 35, at 40 (“Juvenile court stakeholders repeatedly estimated that as many as 75% to 90% of juveniles waive counsel and enter into uncounseled plea agreements.”); NJDC Nebraska Assessment, supra note 44, at 21 (“In many jurisdictions, large percentages of youth (up to 60 – 90%) are allowed to waive their right to counsel without first being given a meaningful opportunity to consult with an attorney”); NJDC Maryland Assessment, supra note 35, at 25 (“In four of the jurisdictions visited, at least 40 to 58% of the youth routinely waived the right to counsel.”); NJDC Florida Assessment, supra note 44, at 28 (“In many . . . counties, half or more of the youth who appear in delinquency court waive the fundamental right to counsel.”); NJDC Indiana Assessment, supra note 44, at 9 (“Approximately 50% of youth in the jurisdictions visited routinely waived their right to counsel. In two jurisdictions, it was found that as many as 80% of youth waive their right to counsel.”); NJDC Ohio Assessment, supra note 44, at 25 (“In all but two of the twelve jurisdictions reviewed . . . waiver of counsel was a common and pervasive practice, with as many as 80% of youth proceeding through the system without the benefit of counsel.”); NJDC Ohio Assessment, supra note 44, at 44 (“In spite of the law’s clear mandate for counsel and the harmful consequences of not having a lawyer . . . legal representation was waived in 11% of all delinquency dispositions involving hearings.”); NJDC Washington Assessment, supra note 44, at 27 (“In some counties, children appear without counsel up to 38% of the time.”); NJDC Virginia Assessment, supra note 35, at 2 (“Finding a “high incidence of children waiving their right to counsel without prior consultation with a lawyer or trained advocate,” estimated by some participants to be about 50 percent); NJDC Kentucky Assessment, supra note 44, at 15 (“Waiver of counsel at the detention hearing stage occurred often or very often in nearly 60% of the jurisdictions responding, and nearly 60% of jurisdictions noted waiver of counsel occurred often or very often at other stages.”); NJDC Georgia Assessment, supra note 44, at 1 (“In some jurisdictions, it is estimated that as many as 90% of the children waive counsel in delinquency proceedings, almost always without the benefit of consulting a lawyer beforehand and no warnings of the dangers of proceeding without a lawyer.”); NJDC Louisiana Assessment, supra note 44, at 60 (noting that prosecutors, defenders, probation officers, and judges approximated that children waived counsel in 50 percent to 60 percent of cases).
providing youth an opportunity to consult with an attorney. Public defenders or court-appointed counsel might be statutorily prohibited from appearing during the early stages of juvenile court proceedings because indigence determinations are not finalized or the court has not yet made the appointment. In other circumstances, public defenders’ excessive workload may precipitate agency decisions to limit attorney staffing of juvenile courtrooms. Comprehensive review of this issue must look beyond court rules or statutes about the waiver process itself and include public defender enabling statutes and the structure of delivery systems.

All children must be appointed a defense attorney prior to their first court appearance. In the event waiver of counsel is considered, the youth must have meaningful consultation with an attorney about his or her decision, and the court must find the waiver is knowing, intelligent, and voluntary.

---

**INNOVATION**

**STEMMING WAIVER OF COUNSEL**

In New York, youth may only waive their right to counsel in limited circumstances after consultation with counsel and a hearing on the record. In Kentucky, youth may only waive their right to counsel in limited circumstances after a hearing and finding of fact that the child waived the right knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily.80

The Department of Justice’s statement of interest in N.P. v. Georgia suggested: “If a child decides to waive the right to an attorney, courts should ensure that the waiver is knowing, intelligent, and voluntary by requiring consultation with counsel before the court accepts the waiver.”81

---

79 N.Y. Fam. Ct. Act § 249-a (McKinney 2011) (presuming that minors cannot waive counsel, which is rebuttable only after consultation with an attorney and a showing at a hearing that there is clear and convincing evidence that the “(a) the minor understands the nature of the charges, the possible dispositional alternatives and the possible defenses to the charges, (b) the minor possesses the maturity, knowledge and intelligence necessary to conduct his or her own defense, and (c) waiver is in the best interest of the minor”).


81 Statement of Interest in N.P., supra note 44, at 1.
Juvenile courts should provide youth access to counsel following disposition, including during appeals and reentry. Juvenile courts should identify and remedy any issues that impede access to counsel post-disposition. Federal, state, local, and tribal governments can help achieve this change by developing legislative strategies to amend the right to counsel provisions in their statutes to explicitly include both the right to and the mechanism for provision of post-disposition counsel.

As long as a child is incarcerated or otherwise under the supervision of the court, he or she needs access to counsel.

The post-disposition phase of the juvenile court process is critical to preventing deeper court involvement and ensuring successful outcomes for youth. Appellate considerations are an essential part of post-disposition practice to protect and uphold due process rights for children; however, most jurisdictions lack a system or any infrastructure for youth to pursue a writ or appeal in a delinquency case. Even where appellate offices exist, adult appeals can take precedence, because they often lack the resources or specialized personnel to take on both adult and juvenile cases.

Beyond appellate issues, post-disposition representation includes legal advocacy both in and outside of the courtroom. In court, attorneys must represent youth in post-disposition hearings, such as probation and parole review; violation and revocation hearings; modification of disposition; proceedings related to the payment of fees and fines stemming from court involvement; and pleadings and proceedings related to record expungement and deregistering as sex offenders. Out of court, attorneys should monitor conditions of confinement; ensure that probation or parole officers are providing opportunities that promote youth success; facilitate access to requested family, education, mental health services, and social service providers; and ensure successful implementation of their clients’ reentry plans, including re-enrolling in school upon return home. In systems that facilitate defense representation post-disposition, defenders contribute to the greater success of their clients, ensure their rights are protected, and promote procedural justice. Without counsel during the post-disposition stage, youth and their families are left alone to navigate the child’s success, safety, and release from the system.

As long as a child is incarcerated or otherwise under the supervision of the court, he or she needs access to counsel. Innovative mechanisms or collaborations can stimulate the provision of and capacity for post-disposition representation. Partnerships between juvenile defenders and civil legal service providers or state protection and advocacy systems can address a range of collateral delinquency issues.


83 See, e.g., Marsha Levick & Neha Desai, Still Waiting: The Elusive Quest to Ensure Juveniles a Constitutional Right to Counsel at All Stages of the Juvenile Court Process, 60 Rutgers L. Rev. 175, 191 (2007) (“[T]o the extent the state has granted juveniles . . . post-disposition review hearings, the right of the effective assistance of counsel at each mandated hearing is constitutionally protected.”).

INNOVATION

COLLABORATIONS BETWEEN DEFENDER AGENCIES AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS CAN IMPROVE ACCESS TO POST-DISPOSITION REPRESENTATION

Rutgers School of Law Post-Disposition Advocacy Project:

In partnership with the New Jersey Office of the Public Defender, clinical law students are able to fill the gap in post-Disposition services by, among other things, monitoring conditions of confinement and the delivery of education, health, and mental health services; educating and advising youth on institutional grievance procedure and parole classification; advocating on the youths’ behalf at parole hearings; assisting youth in bringing administrative appeals to disciplinary and other agency decisions; working with youth and their families to engage in reentry planning; and instituting court actions on youths’ behalf when necessary.85

INNOVATION

LAWS EXPLICITLY PROVIDING FOR A RIGHT TO COUNSEL POST-DISPOSITION

California: “A child is entitled to have the child’s interests represented by counsel at every stage of the proceedings, including postdispositional hearings. Counsel must continue to represent the child unless relieved by the court on the substitution of other counsel or for cause.”86

Idaho’s statute explicitly provides for youth to be represented post-disposition, “(a)… beginning with the earliest time and including revocation of probation or recommitment; (b) to be represented in any appeal; and (c) to be represented in any other post-adjudication or review proceeding that the attorney or the juvenile considers appropriate, unless the court in which the proceeding is brought determines that it is not a proceeding that a reasonable person with adequate means would be willing to bring at his own expense and is therefore a frivolous proceeding.”87

New Mexico: “The child shall be represented by counsel at all stages of the proceedings on a delinquency petition, including all post-dispositional court proceedings. If counsel is not retained for the child or if it does not appear that counsel will be retained, counsel shall be appointed for the child.”88

---

86 Cal. Rules of Ct. B. § 5.663(c).
87 Idaho Code Ann. § 20-514(2).
RECOMMENDATION 3.0

IMPLEMENT STRONG, WELL-RESOURCED, AND SPECIALIZED JUVENILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS

3.1 Support Autonomous Juvenile Defense Systems and Semi-Autonomous Juvenile Units

3.2 Ensure the Method of Attorney Appointment is Fair and Does Not Create Any Conflicts of Interest

3.3 Implement Juvenile-Specific Standards and Training

3.4 Develop and Fund State- or Regionally-Based Resource Centers and Provide Coordination, Training, and Support to Juvenile Defense Attorneys

3.5 Adequately Fund and Support Effective Juvenile Defense Services in Rural, Remote, and Underserved Regions
IMPLEMENT STRONG, WELL-RESOUCED, AND SPECIALIZED JUVENILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS

Given the highly specialized nature of juvenile defense practice and the unique demands that accompany the juvenile defender’s role, an autonomous juvenile defense system with a well-funded and robust early and post-disposition practice is the preferred method of service delivery. In an autonomous system, chief juvenile defenders are able to make hiring and firing decisions, determine and seek out appropriate budgetary allocations, oversee quality control and support services, and take responsibility for operating a first-rate, highly specialized law practice for children, rather than the piecemeal representation seen in most jurisdictions today.

However, few autonomous juvenile defense systems currently exist. Accordingly, opportunities for juvenile defense leadership are also scarce. Without an autonomous system that is separate from the adult criminal defense system, the representation of youth is often not prioritized. Further, when juvenile and adult defense systems are intermingled, as most are, juvenile-specific budgets may not exist, and juvenile defenders may exercise little influence over how funds are spent.

Achieving autonomy will strengthen the specialization of juvenile defense practice and cultivate greater opportunities for dedicated leadership. This structure and leadership will help to develop juvenile-specific mechanisms for oversight, as well as the coordination of training and supervision for private counsel, contract attorneys, and juvenile public defenders to ensure high-quality representation of children in delinquency proceedings.

SUPPORT AUTONOMOUS JUVENILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS AND SEMI-AUTONOMOUS JUVENILE UNITS

Funding aimed at developing effective juvenile defense systems will spark innovation and provide local leaders with the support needed to drive change. In order to reach constitutional and ethical thresholds, juvenile defense systems should have the resources to be effective, due-process-based, specialized, developmentally and procedurally sound, technologically equipped, community oriented and respectful of and responsive to cultural differences.

Leaders at all levels should develop funding strategies to support autonomous juvenile defense systems through direct and indirect approaches. Without autonomy, implementing a true developmental framework will become increasingly difficult, and juvenile defense will continue to be viewed as the lesser component of the adult indigent defense system. From the local to federal level, governments should establish dedicated juvenile defense leadership positions and promote policies to ensure juvenile defenders have seats on boards, task forces, and commissions.

In the absence of autonomous juvenile defense systems, ensuring that defense offices include dedicated juvenile units with their own juvenile defense leadership are the next best delivery method. Juvenile units should include: a juvenile defense chief who is supported by a core group of...
experienced juvenile defense attorneys equipped to provide representation from pre-detention through post-disposition, a dedicated training attorney, an appellate attorney, support staff, social workers, and investigators. These units should be equal in pay and promotion with adult defense units—individual attorney advancement should not be predicated on moving “up” to adult defense practice. Likewise, juvenile defense supervision and performance evaluations should be based upon juvenile defense standards.

Whether a jurisdiction adopts an autonomous juvenile defense system or a dedicated juvenile unit, the workload of a juvenile defender must be reasonable. Unreasonable workloads hurt defenders’ ability to advocate for their clients. Because no two juvenile delinquency cases are alike, caseload limits by themselves are an imperfect tool to ensure effective advocacy. Instead, an assessment of workload, rather than a concrete number of cases, is a better measure. In setting limits on workload, it is important to view each case holistically and take into consideration the resources required—such as investigators, social workers, and experts—and the circumstances of the individual client. The need to reduce excessive workloads and regularly monitor the workloads of public defenders has been recognized by organizations including The Constitution Project,90 the American Bar Association,91 the National Association for Public Defense,92 the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers,93 the National Legal Aid and Defender Association,94 and the United States Department of Justice Civil Rights Division.95

Federal, state, local, and tribal governments need to invest in juvenile defense systems on par with investments for agencies that prosecute juveniles, such as prosecutors, police, and crime labs.

At a minimum, federal, state, local, and tribal governments need to invest in juvenile defense systems on par with investments for agencies that prosecute juveniles, such as prosecutors, police, and crime labs. Consistent with DOJ’s guidance from the Statement of Interest filed in N.P. v. Georgia, competent and effective juvenile defense requires more than just a body in the courtroom.96 Government leaders should ensure juvenile defense systems have sufficient resources to access investigators, social workers, computers, and other support, as well as ample time to meet with clients, conduct investigations, develop motions, prepare for trials and dispositions, and monitor and advocate for clients post-disposition.

90 See Nat’l Right To Counsel Committee, The Constitution Project, Justice Denied: America’s Continuing Neglect of Our Constitutional Right to Counsel 12 (2009) (“Recommendation 6—The Board or Commission should establish and enforce workload limits for defense attorneys, which take into account their other responsibilities in addition to client representation, in order to ensure that quality defense services are provided and ethical obligations are not violated.”).
95 Statement of Interest in N.P., supra note 45, at 14 (“A juvenile division should have the resources to monitor workloads so that attorneys are available to advocate for clients at intake and during detention and probable cause hearings. Outside of court, they need adequate time to meet with clients, investigate the prosecution’s factual allegations, engage in a robust motions practice, devote time to preparing for trial and the disposition process, and to monitor and advocate for the needs of post-disposition clients who are still within the court’s jurisdiction.”).
Non-Profit Office:

The Louisiana Center for Children’s Rights (LCCR) is a nonprofit, specialized juvenile defense law office that provides direct representation for youth in New Orleans delinquency courts and provides juvenile defense policy advocacy and training statewide. Its independence, flexibility, and focus have helped to develop a replicable, best-practice, evidence-based model of holistic advocacy that makes a long-term difference in the lives of the children they serve. LCCR is reinventing defense advocacy for young people in the Louisiana juvenile justice system.

County Agency:

The Office of the Public Advocate (OPA) in Maricopa County, Arizona, is an independent office that is responsible for the representation of indigent youth in the county’s delinquency courts, and is separate from the Office of the Public Defender, which only provides adult representation. While the attorneys at OPA also take dependency and mental health cases, their independence from the larger public defender system allows them to have a sense of permanency in juvenile court, which engenders specialization in juvenile defense practice, enables them to become experts in local juvenile services and systems that affect their clients outside of the courtroom, and focuses their training on targeted juvenile defense skills. As recognized experts in juvenile defense and juvenile justice, office leadership is a regular participant in juvenile justice stakeholder meetings and reform discussions at the county, state, and national level.

Private Contract Office:

The Utah Juvenile Defender Attorneys, LLC, is a private law firm in Salt Lake County, Utah, that is contracted to serve as the primary indigent defense provider for youth in the county’s delinquency courts. As a standalone entity, this office is able to focus its energy on developing a specialized, well-trained corps of juvenile defense attorneys that provides developmentally sound representation in line with national best practices. The office staff includes not only defense attorneys, but also a dedicated forensic social worker and a juvenile appellate attorney. Office leadership also extends its expertise around the state by providing training to juvenile defenders in other jurisdictions and serving on numerous boards dedicated to developing legislation and policy to improve juvenile justice.

99 Interview with Pamela Vickery, Executive Director, Utah Juvenile Defender Attorneys (Feb. 20, 2014) (for further information about Utah Juvenile Defender Attorneys, contact the National Juvenile Defender Center).
ESTABLISHING JUVENILE DEFENDER UNITS WITHIN PUBLIC DEFENSE OFFICES

County Agency:

In several jurisdictions across the country, dedicated juvenile defense units have been created within individual county public defender offices. Notable examples include the San Francisco Public Defender Juvenile Unit and the Miami-Dade Public Defender’s Office. Most recently, as mandated by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) Civil Rights Division’s 2012 Memorandum of Agreement Regarding the Juvenile Court of Memphis and Shelby County, the county established a juvenile unit in the Law Offices of the Shelby County Public Defender.

Statewide Public Defense System:

The Youth Advocacy Division (YAD) of the Massachusetts Committee for Public Counsel Services ensures that every indigent child across Massachusetts has access to zealous legal representation that incorporates a Youth Development Approach. The program is composed of nine staff offices (each has a social worker), a panel of approximately 400 specially trained and certified private counsel, a juvenile appeals unit, a training unit, an education advocacy unit, a specialized juvenile murder panel, a juvenile-lifer parole panel, and a juvenile parole revocation panel.

Non-Profit Office:

The Juvenile Rights Practice of the Legal Aid Society represents most children who appear before the Family Court in New York City on juvenile delinquency petitions. The Practice was established concurrently with New York State’s Family Court in 1962, five years before the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in Gault that children have a constitutional right to counsel at government expense, and was one of the first organizations in the country to represent children in a juvenile court. Since then, the Juvenile Rights Practice has grown into one of the nation’s leading organizations in the field of child advocacy, providing specialized, dedicated, and holistic juvenile defense services.
Most systems use contracts with individuals or independent entities to provide some aspect of juvenile defense representation.106 Even those jurisdictions with statewide defense systems rely on appointed or contract counsel to handle conflict cases and/or to represent the cases that the state public defender offices otherwise do not have the capacity to handle. Model contracts can be developed to establish a clear role for court-appointed juvenile defense counsel, mandate specialized juvenile defense training, establish workloads, provide for oversight and evaluation, and allow for early and post-disposition access to counsel.107

The method of appointing counsel varies widely across the country. In many jurisdictions, judges have wide discretion in assigning counsel for children in delinquency cases.108 This can pose a real or perceived conflict of interest, as an attorney may be placed in a position of having to choose between zealously advocating on behalf of the client’s expressed interests and appearing favorably to the judge who controls future assignments for cases. To prevent such barriers to effective representation of children, it is critical that the appointment of counsel is independent from the judicial and executive branches of government and that oversight and training of counsel are guided by standardized and uniform procedures that apply equally to public defenders and court-appointed private counsel.

It is critical that the appointment of counsel is independent from the judicial and executive branches of government.

Government at all levels must ensure the process and procedure for appointment of counsel is fair and unencumbered by any real or perceived conflicts. State, local, and tribal governments should establish centralized oversight and coordination of private counsel appointment, procedures, and contracts.

---

**INNOVATION**

CREATING MODEL JUVENILE DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Representatives from the juvenile defense bar and law school faculty in Washington State worked with the State Office of Public Defense to develop a model juvenile indigent defense contract that could be tailored to suit the varying needs of the more than 30 Washington county defense services systems.109 The model contract includes provisions establishing juvenile-specific training requirements for attorneys accepting appointments in juvenile court; mandates a caseload cap of 250 cases yearly; provides for adequate supervision; and allows for post-disposition representation.

---

106 See NJDC Assessments, supra note 31.
108 See NJDC Assessments, supra note 31.
109 See Raising the Bar, supra note 107.
The role of the juvenile defender is to bring the expressed interests of youth before the court. Juvenile defenders must have knowledge of delinquency laws and procedures; be versed in adolescent development and the evolving juvenile-specific jurisprudence; be competent to effectively counsel youth on making critical legal decisions; be able to convey complex legal principles to their young clients and families; engage community partners; and have a clear understanding of the obligations of the educational and other systems impacting the lives of youth clients. The United States Department of Justice Statement of Interest in N.P. v. Georgia highlights the need for specialized juvenile defense standards and training as necessary steps toward fulfilling due process: “Indeed, the unique qualities of youth demand special training, experience and skill for their advocates.”

Government at all levels must take the necessary steps to ensure that specialized juvenile defense standards and training are established so that juvenile defense delivery systems can fulfill the demand for such resources.

Juvenile defense, in all its complexity, requires adherence to a specialized set of best-practice standards.

The first step in promoting specialization is to combat the pervasive perception of juvenile court as “kiddie court” or simply a training ground for inexperienced attorneys. Such attitudes and actions are a direct threat to fair treatment and due process for youth.

Federal, state, local, and tribal jurisdictions must recognize and memorialize the obligations of the juvenile defender through specialized standards and guidelines. Juvenile defense, in all its complexity, requires adherence to a specialized set of best-practice standards. Government at all levels should convene specialized committees or commissions to promulgate, adopt, and enforce standards tailored for juvenile defense practice that account for unique laws, procedures, and obstacles that impact the role of the juvenile defense attorney. These standards should be considered when monitoring and evaluating both individual and system performance related to juvenile defense. Development of bar certifications to establish juvenile defense standards and training requirements should also be explored.

Despite the highly specialized skills that are required of juvenile defenders, many states report non-existent or inadequate training for juvenile defenders. Specialized training is crucial to help defenders develop these practice skills and keep pace with an evolving body of scientific research and legal jurisprudence that applies directly to the representation of children. Some states have addressed the need for juvenile defense specialization and training by creating state bar certification programs. State certification programs can set requirements for legal education hours attorneys must attain before representing children in juvenile court.

Juvenile justice system decision makers need access to high-quality, low-cost, ongoing and specialized training to keep up with the rapidly evolving juvenile jurisprudence, developmental research, and best practices emerging in today’s juvenile courts. Juvenile defense training must adhere to juvenile-specific standards that lay out the ethical duties and professional responsibilities of attorneys who defend children. Specialized training is the foundation for comprehensive advocacy by juvenile defenders and ensures that the constitutional rights of youth are protected.

110 Statement of Interest in N.P., supra note 45, at 11.
112 See generally NATIONAL JUVENILE DEFENSE STANDARDS, supra note 69.
113 See NJDC Assessments, supra note 31.
### NATIONAL AND STATE JUVENILE DEFENSE PRACTICE STANDARDS

**The National Juvenile Defense Standards:** The Standards set forth a framework for access to counsel and quality of representation that is anchored in law, science, and professional codes of responsibility.\(^{115}\) Several states are either reexamining their current state-based guidelines or developing new juvenile defense standards following the *National Juvenile Defense Standards*.

### TRAINING TO DEVELOP JUVENILE DEFENSE SPECIALISTS

**Juvenile Training Immersion Program (JTIP):** JTIP is an intensive, 41-lesson training program for effective juvenile defense practice addressing topics ranging from the specialized role of the juvenile defender to representation from pre-trial to post-disposition.\(^{116}\) JTIP is the only training curriculum focused on providing a substantive overview of juvenile and criminal law integrated with developing strong trial advocacy skills exclusively for juvenile defenders.

### TRAINING TO ESTABLISH DEVELOPMENTALLY SOUND JUVENILE COURTS

**Toward Developmentally Appropriate Practice: A Juvenile Court Training Curriculum:** Designed for all juvenile court stakeholders, this five-module training program, produced in collaboration with the MacArthur Foundation’s Models for Change initiative, focuses on adolescent development; screening, assessing, and evaluating youth; special education and disability rights; legal questions about youth’s capacities; and communicating with youth.\(^{117}\) Training sessions based on the Curriculum can focus on one or any combination of modules.

---

115 See id.
State- or regionally-based juvenile defense resource centers can support both public defender offices and private contract attorneys. Such centers draw on a national knowledge base and network of experts to support both practice and policy initiatives, and leverage resources to support juvenile defenders statewide. In rural and remote areas where there may be just one contract attorney, state or regional resource centers can provide ongoing training and mentoring to ensure that attorneys cultivate the specialized expertise required to meet their ethical and professional duties when representing youth, even if it is not their full-time practice.

Government at all levels should support the development of juvenile defense resource centers to facilitate specialized training and technical assistance and to support and monitor consistency across a network of juvenile defenders—including the private bar and contract counsel—and to connect rural communities and urban centers. State- and regionally-based resource centers should track how well or poorly juvenile defense reform is moving within a region, state, or locality, and articulate strategies for what is needed to improve access to justice and fundamental fairness for youth.

**INNOVATION CREATING STATE- AND REGIONALLY-BASED JUVENILE DEFENSE RESOURCE CENTERS**

**The Regional Juvenile Defender Centers** were established by the National Juvenile Defender Center in 1997 to build a network of juvenile defenders across the country grounded in front line practice. For almost two decades these centers have been run by dedicated juvenile defense leaders on a volunteer basis, providing training, technical assistance, and an invaluable network of colleagues and mentors.118

**The Juvenile Defender Association of Pennsylvania (JDAP)** is a statewide association created to provide juvenile defense leadership, expertise, policy development, and training.119 JDAP’s mission is to improve the quality of juvenile representation throughout Pennsylvania. JDAP is a certified Continuing Legal Education provider and sponsors several training programs each year to improve representation of juveniles accused of delinquency, reaching both urban and rural communities.

**Nebraska Youth Advocates (NYA)** was founded in 2015 as a resource center for juvenile defense attorneys across the state, promoting best practices in the juvenile justice system.120 The project provides training and resources in-line with the National Juvenile Defense Standards that are tailored to Nebraska specific practice. NYA participates in statewide and local juvenile justice reform initiatives; provides hands-on training, resource development, and technical assistance; and is helping to build a network of well-trained defense attorneys who ensure a youth’s voice is heard in court.

---


120 For further information about Nebraska Youth Advocates, contact the National Juvenile Defender Center.
The lack of juvenile defense infrastructure and resources in remote, rural, and underserved communities is extreme. The challenges faced by juvenile defense systems nationwide, including lack of attention and underfunding, are exacerbated in these communities and hurt defenders’ ability to meaningfully represent their clients.

Government at all levels must invest in juvenile defense delivery in rural, remote, and underserved regions to safeguard the timely appointment of counsel and the provision of training and support to ensure attorneys develop expertise. All justice systems, even those with the logistical hurdles that rural systems face, have a constitutional obligation to ensure that a child’s right to qualified counsel is protected.

Juvenile court leaders in remote, rural, and underserved regions should consider public-private partnerships as a means to strategize, design, and develop new tools for practitioner training and support. Federal, state, local, and tribal governments should convene task forces or think tanks to promote private innovations and support for communication and transportation issues faced by juvenile defenders, youth, and families in these regions.

Government at all levels should support and fund creative solutions to improve the delivery of juvenile defense services to youth in rural, remote, and underserved areas. Juvenile defense providers should take advantage of existing non-judicial structures in these areas and test new approaches and innovations. Juvenile courts should explore creative options available through technological innovations as well as satellite offices or campuses that can be developed or enhanced to address the specific juvenile defense needs of communities.

The lack of juvenile defense infrastructure and resources in remote, rural, and underserved communities is extreme.

Defense services are not the only services in rural, remote, and underserved areas that face challenges with resources. Across the country, however, communities are developing community-based partnerships to provide greater access to legal and non-legal services that may be leveraged or replicated to provide juvenile defense services.

121 See, e.g., Judith B. Jones, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Dept of Justice, Access to Counsel (2004); NJDC Colorado Assessment, supra note 35; NJDC Maine Assessment, supra note 35; NJDC Maryland Assessment, supra note 35; NJDC Missouri Assessment, supra note 35; NJDC South Carolina Assessment, supra note 35; NJDC Virginia Assessment, supra note 35; NJDC West Virginia Assessment, supra note 35.
### INNOVATION

**INCREASING ACCESS TO JUVENILE DEFENSE SERVICES IN RURAL, REMOTE, AND UNDERSERVED REGIONS**

In Maine, a largely rural state, 100 percent of juvenile defense is provided by appointed counsel. The Juvenile Justice Clinic at the University of Maine School of Law provides practice and policy backup and support to court-appointed counsel working on delinquency cases across the state. The Clinic plays a vital role in supporting effective juvenile defense in jurisdictions beyond the urban centers.

In Michigan, Access Legal Care, PLLC, is a private law office in Detroit, Michigan, that delivers affordable legal services to clients throughout Michigan from a “primary care” office in Detroit. The model is an urban-to-rural partnership whereby a primary care attorney in an urban area coordinates with a local “litigation” attorney in a rural part of the state. Clients communicate with their “primary care” lawyer through technology, as does the local attorney, who is part of a network of rural attorneys linked to the urban office. The local attorney then meets clients in court to handle proceedings. Although not specific to the juvenile defense context, the model is one that could be replicated to support juvenile defenders who practice outside urban centers.

In Wisconsin, the Milwaukee Justice Center’s Mobile Legal Clinic (MLC) provides an innovative example of reaching previously underserved populations. While civil in nature, the MLC is a project of Marquette University Law School and the Milwaukee Bar Association to deliver free legal services to isolated neighborhoods where it is difficult for residents to reach free legal assistance. Similar programs could be developed to reach youth needing access to juvenile defense counsel.

In many rural communities, schools serve as one of the few places where children and families living great distances from each other come together on a regular basis. In an effort to understand the varied rural communities across the nation and the roles of schools in those communities, partnerships can be developed with schools and/or rural education advocacy organizations—such as The Rural School and Community Trust—to address how the juvenile defense community can actively and effectively use schools as resources to increase access to legal counsel and/or legal information.

---

RECOMMENDATION 4.0

ELIMINATE RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISPARITIES

4.1

Eliminate Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Juvenile Court Through Advanced Training and Policy Reform

4.2

Support the Implementation of Best Practices and Resources to Eliminate Racial and Ethnic Disparities
Youth of color face the dual injustices of having their civil rights violated through disparate treatment and their due process rights violated through lack of access to effective lawyers in the justice system. The over-inclusion of youth of color in our states’ juvenile justice systems and their disproportionate treatment once involved is well documented and undeniable.126 Youth of color receive harsher treatment at virtually every stage of the juvenile court process, including disproportionate confinement and removal from their homes and communities, while less restrictive alternatives are offered to white youth under similar circumstances.127 Disparities are so pervasive that addressing disproportionate minority contact in the juvenile justice system has been a core requirement of the JJDPA since 1988.128 Yet, practices and policies leading to the criminalization of adolescent behavior of youth of color remain and the disparities continue.129 Effective advocacy by juvenile defenders is critical to combat implicit and explicit bias in juvenile courts and to address policies leading to disproportionality in the juvenile justice system.

Juvenile defenders must actively work to combat their own internal implicit bias as well as that of other system stakeholders in order to consciously counter bias and end the practice of allowing a youth’s race, ethnicity, or other outward characteristics from becoming a factor in decision-making in juvenile court. Defenders can do this by correcting for bias in strategic case decisions, providing bias-free zealous advocacy in individual representation, raising race in the courtroom through written or oral motions, and by advocating for systemic reform to provide youth of color with equal opportunities for success.

Juvenile courts must aggressively support efforts to end implicit and explicit bias both in and out of the courtroom, and to eliminate the overrepresentation of children of color in the juvenile justice system. Examining bias is more than an individual defender’s responsibility; it requires a culture from within defender offices that supports the need to overcome internal bias and effectively challenge bias in other systems and stakeholders. Defense offices and agencies should develop clear internal policies and practices that acknowledge implicit bias and normalize the conversations about racial disparities.

Public defense systems must also provide juvenile defenders with ongoing training on how to effectively address racial and ethnic disparities in the juvenile justice system. Well-intentioned paternalism is

---


129 The Making of Mass Incarceration, supra note 34, at 223.
a hallmark of the juvenile court system. Even defense attorneys making decisions about cases and advising their clients can be impacted by ideas of what may be best, despite their ethical duty to abide by their clients’ stated interests and goals. Unfortunately, this sense of justice system paternalism is “particularly vulnerable to distortion by implicit racial bias” when what is deemed “best” is driven by race-based assumptions. Education about implicit bias and cultural sensitivity is necessary to teach defenders how to self-correct for biases that may be affecting interactions with and representation of youth of color.

Juvenile defense attorneys must also become skilled at raising racial bias and disparities at every stage of the proceedings against their clients, from the point of contact through release from the system. This may include making motions that discuss race and the bearing that bias has on outcomes for system-involved youth of color. Through training, juvenile defenders need to gain familiarity with data, research studies, and other sources that demonstrate certain practices have a disproportionate impact on youth of color and develop strategies for identifying alternative approaches. Policy reforms must focus on laws, rules, and guidelines that lead to disparate enforcement practices in schools, neighborhoods, and other public areas. Juvenile defenders should also be included and participate in broader coordinated efforts to eliminate racial and ethnic disparities in the juvenile justice system.

INNOVATION INSTITUTE TRAINING TO ELIMINATE RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISPARITIES

A targeted JTIP Lesson, Raising Race, teaches juvenile defenders to combat racial bias in their individual juvenile cases. The Raising Race lesson was developed to provide juvenile defenders with practical information about how to raise and combat racial and ethnic disparities in the treatment of their youth clients throughout a case, from arrest to release from court intervention. The lesson also encourages defenders to engage in policy reform efforts to bring attention to and eliminate disparities.

130 See generally Kristin Henning, Race, Paternalism and the Right to Counsel, 54 AMER. CRIM. L. REV., 12-17 (forthcoming April 2017).
131 Id. at 17-19.
132 Id. at 3.
Federal, state, local, and tribal governments should replicate successful strategies to eliminate racial and ethnic disparities throughout the juvenile justice system. Juvenile courts should establish intentional efforts focused on decreasing disparities by building stakeholder collaboration, identifying and implementing known effective methods, and monitoring implementation. Collecting data on race by outcome at specific decision points—such as school referral, police contact, arrest, diversion, petition, detention, evidentiary rulings, adjudication, disposition, and probation revocation—can help highlight areas where implicit bias may be adversely affecting youth of color in concrete terms and can provide all stakeholders with a baseline for corrective action.

Public defense systems must ensure that juvenile defenders participate in internal and external reforms to address racial bias and disparities in the court. Leaders at all levels of government should coordinate and facilitate collaborations among, within, and across youth-serving systems to develop new approaches to eliminate racial and ethnic disparities, provide stakeholders with intensive technical assistance, and share and promote best practices from successful jurisdictions.

It is critical that all decision makers engage communities of color in addressing racial disparities to guard against the potential for paternalism and implicit bias.

---

**SUPPORT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EXISTING BEST PRACTICES AND RESOURCES TO ELIMINATE RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISPARITIES**

**IMPLEMENT BEST PRACTICES TO ADDRESS RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISPARITIES**

The Center for Children’s Law and Policy’s Racial and Ethnic Disparities (“RED”) Practice Manual provides principles and practices to assist in reducing and eliminating racial and ethnic disparities in the juvenile justice system.¹³⁴

**YOUTH, FAMILY, COMMUNITY, AND DEFENDER PARTNERSHIPS**

Community members and juvenile defenders are engaged in partnerships to strengthen youth voices, engage the community, and improve defense capacity through what the Albert Cobarrubias Justice Project at Silicon Valley De-Bug calls “participatory defense.” This collaborative initiative uses a community organizing model to empower people facing charges, their families, and the community to have a concrete impact on the outcomes of individual cases and to bring needed reform to the justice system. Young people and their communities work with defenders to create a cooperative and supportive approach to a child’s defense, rather than having court be an isolating and dehumanizing experience. Families and communities are able to assist defenders by developing mitigation materials for individual clients and helping to identify community-based supports that will enable youth to return to their neighborhoods. (For further information, please visit https://acjusticeproject.org/).

---

RECOMMENDATION 5.0

ATTRACT AND RETAIN NEW AND DIVERSE TALENT TO THE FIELD OF JUVENILE DEFENSE

5.1 Support the Expansion of Public and Private Law School Clinical and Experiential Learning

5.2 Engage Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic Serving Institutions, and Tribal Colleges and Universities

5.3 Establish Dedicated Juvenile Defense Committees in Bar Associations

5.4 Expand Legal Incubator Programs to Promote Juvenile Defense
Specific attention must be paid to developing a corps of excellence and a pathway for young lawyers to find their way to permanent jobs and opportunities in the field of juvenile defense. The simple fact that many people are not even aware that juvenile defense is a practice different and apart from adult criminal defense is an obstacle to recruitment. Attracting and retaining new and diverse talent to juvenile defense is of paramount importance. Increasing the creation and visibility of juvenile defense clinics, units, leadership positions, and opportunities to engage will also promote juvenile defense as a viable career choice.

Federal, state, local, and tribal governments should invest in the expansion of law school clinical programs focused on juvenile defense. Juvenile courts should work with clinical juvenile defense programs as they raise the level of practice in courtrooms and provide new attorneys with intensive supervision and feedback. Defender organizations should partner with law schools and offer juvenile defense-specific internship opportunities to introduce the practice, pique student interest, and encourage careers in juvenile defense after graduation. Public and private law schools should broaden juvenile defense practice opportunities through expanded classroom learning, internship and externship partnerships or collaborations with juvenile defense entities, and innovative experiential learning programs that fill needed gaps in the delivery of juvenile defense, such as post-disposition representation.

Juvenile court stakeholders should engage historically Black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, and tribal colleges and universities to advance interest in juvenile defense as a career from undergraduate studies through law school. Public defense systems across the country should promote student engagement through formal and informal internships, externships, and mentorship opportunities geared toward students in historically Black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, and tribal colleges and universities to encourage interest in juvenile defense. Private firms, philanthropic entities, and other civic-minded organizations should establish juvenile defense-specific fellowships for law schools and create opportunities to engage law students and recent graduates from historically Black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, and tribal colleges and universities.

RECOMMENDATION 5.1
SUPPORT THE EXPANSION OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE LAW SCHOOL CLINICAL AND EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

RECOMMENDATION 5.2
ENGAGE HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, HISPANIC SERVING INSTITUTIONS, AND TRIBAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

National, state, local, and tribal bar associations should establish dedicated juvenile defense committees to raise the prominence and profile of juvenile defense as a viable career. Juvenile defense committees should create mentorship programs for young lawyers and provide leadership opportunities for juvenile defenders to influence national, state, local, and tribal bar policies. Defense service providers should be intentional about diversifying the field and conduct targeted outreach to minority law student committees in bar associations to offer internships, externships, and volunteer opportunities in juvenile defender offices.

---

**Recommendation 5.4**

**Expand Legal Incubator Programs to Promote Juvenile Defense**

Law firms, non-profits, law schools, and other legal service providers should design self-sustaining Legal Incubator programs to connect practical training for newer lawyers with opportunities to provide affordable or free legal assistance to children in need. Juvenile defense service providers should explore these programs as a means to bring new lawyers into juvenile defense as well as establish and maintain juvenile defense practice in rural and remote areas.

---

**Innovation: The Creation of Legal Incubator Programs**

Lawyers for Affordable Justice (LAJ), launched in January 2016 among three Boston-area law schools, provides low-cost legal services to people who cannot afford conventional legal services, while simultaneously equipping law students with practical skills. This program teaches aspiring lawyers new strategies that utilize technology to deliver legal services at lower costs, which enables lawyers to serve low- and moderate-income clients while learning how to build a successful career in solo or small private practice. Though this program does not currently include juvenile defense representation, it serves as a model for juvenile defense-specific ventures.

---

RECOMMENDATION 6.0

PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF YOUTH WHO FACE ADDITIONAL DISCRIMINATION AND VIOLATION OF THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

6.1
Ensure Meaningful Access to Counsel for American Indian and Alaska Native Youth

6.2
Support System-Wide Training and Develop Policies that Promote Cultural Competence for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer/Questioning, and Gender Non-Conforming (LGBTQ-GNC) Youth

6.3
Ensure Youth in Facilities Have Access to Counsel

6.4
Develop Specialized Defense Expertise for Youth Charged with Sex Offenses

6.5
Remove All Youth from the Adult System and, Until Then, Develop Specialized Public Defense Units for Youth in the Adult System
PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF YOUTH WHO FACE ADDITIONAL DISCRIMINATION AND VIOLATION OF THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Justice-involved youth, by virtue of their contact with the justice system, are in need of representation to ensure they receive fair treatment through due process of law and have opportunities to lead successful lives; however, certain populations of youth require special attention and protections because they face unique risks and barriers in the court system. Such population groups include, but are not limited to: American Indian and Alaska Native youth; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer/questioning, and gender non-conforming (LGBTQ-GNC) youth; youth in secure custody; youth charged with sex offenses; and youth facing prosecution as adults.\(^{137}\)

RECOMMENDATION 6.1

ENSURE MEANINGFUL ACCESS TO COUNSEL FOR AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE YOUTH

American Indian and Alaska Native youth need access to a fair juvenile justice system—encompassing due process and equal protection under the law—that respects the traditions of their tribal community. American Indian and Alaska Native youth are disproportionately exposed to violence at rates higher than any other population in the United States, often leading to toxic stress reactions and severe trauma.\(^{138}\) American Indian and Alaska Native youth “experience posttraumatic stress disorder at the same rate as veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan and triple the rate of the general population.”\(^ {139}\) This level of toxic stress and trauma is further aggravated by the high rates of poverty, homelessness, and loss that American Indian and Alaska Native youth often face.\(^ {140}\) Further, American Indian and Alaska Native women experience the highest rates of sexual assault and domestic violence in the country,\(^ {141}\) often leaving children especially vulnerable to justice system contact.

For American Indian and Alaska Native youth prosecuted in federal, state, and local courts, constitutionally required juvenile defense counsel should be culturally competent and familiar with tribal services that might affect the delinquency case. In tribal courts where youth may not have a right to counsel, children would nonetheless benefit from dedicated advocates who could help the tribal court contextualize the youth’s individual developmental and behavioral situation, and empower the youth to be an active participant in his or her case.

Law school clinical programs, non-profit law centers, and other legal organizations should consider partnership with government at all levels to develop a cadre of lawyers trained to assist American Indian and Alaska Native youth in navigating court. Defender offices that handle large numbers of American Indian and Alaska Native cases should designate “Juvenile Tribal Specialists” who are trained to align principles of tribal justice with

---

\(^{137}\) Although each unique population of youth could benefit from heightened due process protections, this Blueprint is only able to focus on a few. Exclusion of the many other youth populations was not intended to diminish their importance, but was simply beyond the scope of this effort.


\(^{139}\) Id.

\(^{140}\) Id. at 37-39, 98, 217.

\(^{141}\) Id. at 38.
the concepts of due process and equal protection and who work closely with tribal communities on matters related to children. Defender offices should help American Indian and Alaska Native youth understand the complexities of the various systems and guard against dual prosecution.142

Government at all levels should invest in training on the concept of due process and it’s benefit to American Indian and Alaska Native youth in court.

142 See United States v. Lara, 541 U.S. 193 (2004) (finding that prosecution of Native American tribal members by both the tribe and the federal government for the same act does not violate the Double Jeopardy Clause of the U.S. Constitution because each is a separate sovereign).

LGBTQ-GNC youth are disproportionately drawn into the delinquency system.143 Advocacy on behalf of LGBTQ-GNC youth can be challenging because of the heightened need to respect confidentiality and privacy against the backdrop of needing to gather information about the client to advocate for the client’s expressed interest.144

Government at all levels should support system-wide training and develop policies that promote cultural competence about sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression (SOGIE). Public defense organizations must provide juvenile defenders with the tools, knowledge, and skills needed to effectively represent LGBTQ-GNC youth and to understand how issues of SOGIE affect youth within the justice system. Juvenile courts should engage court-involved LGBTQ-GNC youth in reform efforts to address gaps and provide needed support within the system.

As part of a broader research agenda, government at all levels should collect data and conduct impactful research on issues faced by LGBTQ-GNC youth in juvenile courts. Data and research efforts must be conducted sensitively and privately; youth must maintain control over disclosure of identifiable information; and information gathered must only be used to advance the youth’s expressed interests in individual cases or to inform research on an aggregate level. The data and research should also include demographic questions (e.g., race/ethnicity) to ensure that a full picture of LGBTQ-GNC youth is captured.


144 See Equity Project, LGBT Youth in Juvenile Court: Practice Tips for Juvenile Defenders 2-3 (2012), http://www.nlclights.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/LGBTYouthforWeb.pdf; Committee of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Matters, Confidential Rep. to the Administrative Judge of the New York City Family Court 10-11, 31 (Dec. 31, 2011) [hereinafter Confidential Report] (noting that youth are the gatekeepers of information related to their sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender expression, and may not be "out" at all, or "out" to everyone at the same time or to the same degree); Angela Irvine, “We’ve Had Three of Them”: Addressing the Invisibility of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Gender Non-Conforming Youths in the Juvenile Justice System, 19 COLUM. J. GENDER & L. 675, 679-80 (2010) (noting that defenders interacting with LGBTQ-GNC youth should never make assumptions about a client’s sexual orientation or gender identity, and should also protect clients’ confidentiality, as youth often fear rejection, bullying, or harassment by parents, teachers, peers, and/or juvenile delinquency system stakeholders if their sexual orientation and/or gender identity is disclosed).
RECOMMENDATION 6.2

The Equity Project is a unique collaborative initiative of organizations founded to ensure that LGBT youth in juvenile courts are treated with dignity, respect, and fairness. The Equity Project Advisory Committee, which is comprised of individual leaders from across the country with a range of different expertise—from social science researchers to probation officers to defenders—in working with LGBT youth in the delinquency system.


Increasing SOGIE-Inclusive, Non-Discrimination, and/or Juvenile Justice Policies Regarding Treatment of LGBTQ-GNC Youth: To date, approximately 12 states have created policies explicitly addressing LGBTQ-GNC youth in their juvenile justice systems and/or detention centers—a significant increase from just a few years ago.

Collecting Data on LGBTQ-GNC Youth in the Juvenile Justice System: While there is still limited data about LGBTQ-GNC youth in the juvenile justice system, recently updated research across the country and in the State of California found that 20% of youth in juvenile detention identify as LGBTQ-GNC. Moreover, 85% of those youth are youth of color.

145 The Equity Project is a unique collaborative initiative of organizations founded to ensure that LGBT youth in juvenile courts are treated with dignity, respect, and fairness. The Equity Project receives critical guidance from the Equity Project Advisory Committee, which is comprised of individual leaders from across the country with a range of different expertise—from social science researchers to probation officers to defenders—in working with LGBT youth in the delinquency system.
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Youth in confinement are particularly vulnerable to harm. Detrimental room confinement and isolation, restraint practices, sexual and physical abuse, and lack of adequate medical, mental health, and educational services are well-documented in juvenile facilities around the country. Youth in secure custody are further at risk because they are often out of sight of lawyers, families, and the courts.

Federal, state, local, and tribal governments must ensure youth in custody have access to defense attorneys who will monitor conditions of confinement and provide access to courts when those conditions violate children’s rights or inhibit positive youth development. Justice systems must develop specific policies to enhance the monitoring and protection of youth in confinement. In particular, they must ban solitary confinement of youth in facilities.

Juvenile defenders must be trained on standards of care that exist to protect the rights and safety of youth in custody at every juncture.

Federal, state, local, and tribal governments must ensure that youth in custody have access to education services in line with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act, as well as state education laws—all of which require appropriate services in facilities. Education and justice agencies should work together to ensure juvenile defenders and civil education advocates are prepared and available to address inadequate educational services for youth in custody.

**Utilizing the Project on Addressing Prison Rape:** The Project on Addressing Prison Rape, housed at American University’s Washington College of Law, provides information that juvenile defenders can access and use about the history of the history of the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA), all PREA and National Prison Rape Elimination Commission documents, 50-state surveys, checklists, maps, graphic novels, case law digests, news, training, curricula, and links to other important sites and information. The Project also provides training, technical assistance, legal expertise regarding sexual abuse in custodial settings, and guidance on issues advocates face in addressing PREA and responding to sexual abuse in custodial settings.

**Executive Order Ending Solitary Confinement for Juveniles:** In January 2016, President Obama directed the Department of Justice to ban the use of solitary confinement on juveniles in the custody of the federal Bureau of Prisons.

---


151 See, e.g., Mendel, supra note 150.
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Research demonstrates that youth adjudicated of sex offenses are different from adult sex offenders in the reasons they offend, the kinds of offenses they commit, their risk of recidivism, and their amenability to treatment.\(^{158}\) Despite this, juveniles charged with sex offenses are often wrongly labeled as predators and relegated to sex offender registries, sometimes for life. The definition of what constitutes a “sex offense” is expanding to criminalize normative adolescent behavior that is being immortalized through “sexting” and other social media and technological advancements. Juvenile courts should provide training on the developmental underpinnings of sexual conduct in order to better assess whether prosecution is appropriate and, when interventions are necessary, that they are developmentally appropriate. Public defense organizations should provide specialized training for juvenile defenders on the scientific studies regarding juvenile sex offending; an understanding of its causes and interventions will equip juvenile defenders to better represent youth charged with sex offenses and provide the proper developmental context to the court.

Federal, state, local, and tribal governments should abolish juvenile sex offender registries.\(^{159}\) Such laws do not deter sexual offending behavior or promote public safety, and instead harm youth success.\(^{160}\)

Youth under the age of 18 should not be prosecuted in the adult criminal justice system. For more than a decade, the United States Supreme Court has made profound and emphatic statements regarding the developmental differences between youth and adults. Five major decisions handed down by the Court have honed in on developmental aspects of youth as the basis for: (1) eliminating the juvenile death penalty (Roper v. Simmons);\(^{161}\) (2) eliminating life without parole for non-homicide juvenile offenses (Graham v. Florida);\(^{162}\) (3) requiring that law enforcement consider age for purposes of administering Miranda warnings U.D.B. v. North Carolina);\(^{163}\) (4) eliminating mandatory life without parole sentences for youth convicted of homicide committed prior to age 18 (Miller v. Alabama);\(^{164}\) and (5) applying Miller’s decision to eliminate mandatory life without parole sentences retroactively (Montgomery v. Louisiana).\(^{165}\)

Adolescent development concepts—such as the recognition that children are more susceptible to coercion,\(^{166}\) have greater difficulty appreciating the

---

159 See, e.g., In re C.P., 967 N.E.2d 729 (Ohio 2011) (holding that automatic, lifelong registration and notification requirements for youth on sex offender registries violates the prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment and due process); In re J.B. et al., 107 A.3d 1 (Pa. 2014) (holding that the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act’s lifetime requirement violated juvenile offenders’ due process rights).
160 See Elizabeth J. Letourneau et al., Do Sex Offender Registration and Notification Requirements Deter Juvenile Sex Crimes?, 37 CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND BEHAVIOR 553 (2010); Raised on the Registry, supra note 158.
166 Brief for the Am. Psychological Ass’n et al. as Amici Curiae Supporting Petitioners, Miller v. Alabama, 132 S. Ct. 2455 (2012) (Nos. 10-9646 and 10-9647) at 15-16 [hereinafter APA Brief] (“Difficult family and neighborhood conditions are major risk factors for juvenile crime . . . [t]hey, precisely because of their legal minority, juveniles lack the freedom to remove themselves from those negative external influences.”).
consequences of their actions,"^{167} prefer immediate rewards over long-term gains,^{168} and are more vulnerable to peer pressure"^{169}—have significant implications for reforming policies that allow children to be prosecuted in adult criminal court.

Wherever youth are prosecuted as adults, public defense systems should establish specialized units to defend youth and provide adequate training to ensure developmentally appropriate representation and advocacy. These specialized units should also provide continuity of representation when youth are transferred between court systems.

**INNOVATION  PROTECTING CHILDREN CHARGED AS ADULTS**

**Creating Specialized Units to Defend Youth in the Adult System:** The Maryland Office of the Public Defender’s Youthful Defendant Unit consists of a group of attorneys, social workers, and staff who represent children charged as adults in Baltimore City and who are cross-trained in both adult and juvenile practice."^{170} This specialized unit works as a team to provide quality representation throughout all phases of the criminal case (e.g., arraignment, motions to transfer jurisdiction, trial, etc.). If a client is transferred back to juvenile court, the team follows the client and continues to provide seamless advocacy throughout the juvenile delinquency process, including post-disposition.

**Implementing Guidelines for Representing Youth in the Adult System:** The Campaign for the Fair Sentencing of Youth’s Trial Defense Guidelines: Representing a Child Client Facing a Possible Life Sentence set forth a national standard of practice to ensure quality, constitutionally effective representation consistent with the Supreme Court’s ruling in Miller v. Alabama."^{171} The Guidelines draw from the ABA Guidelines for the Appointment and Performance of Defense Counsel in Death Penalty Cases in the capital context and the National Juvenile Defense Standards in the juvenile context.

---

167. Id. at 8 (“Adolescents are less able to control their impulses; they weigh the risks and rewards of possible conduct differently; and they are less able to envision the future and apprehend the consequences of their actions.”).
168. Id. at 11-12 (“[A]dolescents are particularly attuned to immediate rewards . . . [and are] emotionally primed for spur-of-the-moment, reward- and sensation-seeking behavior without offsetting, adult sensitivities to corresponding risks . . . .”).
169. Id. at 16 (“Juveniles are also especially vulnerable to the negative influence of peer pressure. Research has shown that susceptibility to peer pressure to engage in antisocial behavior increases between childhood and early adolescence . . . .”).
RECOMMENDATION 7.0

FUND AND IMPLEMENT MECHANISMS TO COLLECT DATA, CONDUCT ASSESSMENTS AND COURT OBSERVATIONS, AND INITIATE EVALUATION AND RESEARCH

7.1
Develop Juvenile Defense Indicators Targeted to Measure System Performance

7.2
Develop Case Management Systems Specific to Juvenile Defense

7.3
Develop a Comprehensive Juvenile Defense Research Agenda

7.4
Conduct Assessments and Court Observations to Evaluate Access to and Quality of Juvenile Defense Counsel
Government at all levels should provide support and technical assistance to create a uniform set of juvenile defense data indicators, based on shared values, goals, metrics, and terminology. Stakeholders use indicators to describe the state of the field, to measure progress, to help set priorities, and to plan initiatives. Unlike other areas of the justice system, the field of juvenile defense has not finalized and implemented a set of indicators to track progress or performance of children’s access to qualified counsel. In the absence of a nationwide standard set of indicators, the capacity of juvenile defense stakeholders to benchmark progress, identify priorities, and frame public debate is diminished. Juvenile courts must dedicate resources, including technological and human resources, to adopting and implementing a set of standardized juvenile defense indicators.

**RECOMMENDATION 7.1**

**DEVELOP JUVENILE DEFENSE INDICATORS TARGETED TO MEASURE SYSTEM PERFORMANCE**

Government at all levels should provide support and technical assistance to develop, customize, and implement juvenile defense-specific case management systems. Such systems should allow jurisdictions to collect, analyze, and access data on client outcomes, attorney performance, workload and caseload standards, and system performance. Data collection and program evaluation are essential to understanding current juvenile defense service delivery and to make progress toward ensuring every child has access to an effective lawyer.
National leaders should collaborate to develop a comprehensive research agenda on the impact of the juvenile justice system on children. Federal, state, local, and tribal agencies, as well as the private sector, should develop a research agenda to inform effective judicial, legislative, and internal decision making around juvenile defense.

A juvenile defense research agenda should include a range of issues such as: the effect of juvenile defense specialization on procedural justice; the long-term costs associated with an absence of counsel in terms of lost education, employment, and the expense of incarceration; the damage resulting from a lack of post-disposition access to school placement and reentry; and the identification of the most essential elements of a holistic juvenile defense practice.

In New York, The Legal Aid Society’s Juvenile Rights Practice overhauled its case management system to allow for tracking of juvenile defense-specific client data, attorney performance data, and court system performance data to identify needs and make improvements in both individual attorney and system performance.171

The Massachusetts-based Youth Advocacy Division (YAD) developed the Transformational Representation Information System (TRIS), a juvenile-specific case management and data collection system.172 YAD built the system to gather information needed to support quality legal advocacy by lawyers and social workers using a Positive Youth Development approach and to manage individual offices, as well as a statewide division. YAD uses the information in TRIS to improve individual practices, evaluate their overall program, advocate for research-based systemic changes, and seek juvenile defense-specific funding.

Federal, state, local, and tribal governments must support assessments of access to and quality of juvenile defense counsel. Assessments provide a framework to identify gaps in juvenile defense services, amass information, and generate knowledge about the underlying condition of a juvenile defense system. In addition, juvenile courts should establish programs for juvenile defense experts to conduct court observations that inform a snapshot of children’s access to counsel and quality of representation in jurisdictions. Assessments and on-the-ground observations are essential to uncovering how systems function in practice, since practices often don’t reflect written policies, statutes, and rules.

171 Memorandum from the National Juvenile Defender Center et al., to Robert Listenbee, Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (March 13, 2014) (on file with author) (for further information on the case management system developed by The Legal Aid Society, Juvenile Rights Practice, contact the National Juvenile Defender Center).
172 See id. (for further information on the Youth Advocacy Division’s TRIS system, contact the National Juvenile Defender Center).
NJDC partners with state-based organizations and private foundations to conduct and disseminate assessments of juvenile defense systems. Each of the 22 state assessments conducted thus far has significantly raised awareness of system impediments and necessary improvements and has led to lasting juvenile defense reforms.

174 See generally NJDC Assessments, supra note 31.
A CALL TO ACTION
This Blueprint is a call to action. We are overdue on our obligations to uphold and enforce the right to counsel for every child facing prosecution and to adequately fund and support effective systems of juvenile defense. Juvenile defenders are the cornerstone of justice for children whose futures hinge on case outcomes and the constitutional rights guaranteed in juvenile court.

The administration of justice requires the full delivery of the right to counsel and equal protection under the law for our children.

Given the goal of juvenile court to promote positive youth development, stakeholders are often inclined to draw children into the system in the hope of delivering services and interventions. But these interventions have consequences. Juvenile court adjudications result in enduring court records, numerous fees, and developmentally harmful experiences that create lasting barriers to education, housing, employment, and youth success.

The concepts on which our country’s justice systems are built—the presumption of innocence; proof beyond a reasonable doubt; due process; and constitutional protections against self-incrimination and illegal search and seizure—are crucial to preventing unwarranted and harmful court intervention. Our courts must fulfill the promise of justice for children and only intervene in young people’s lives when absolutely necessary. Juvenile defenders safeguard the due process rights guaranteed to children and ensure that the delinquency system works fairly, appropriately, and effectively. The administration of justice requires the full delivery of the right to counsel and equal protection under the law for our children.

175 See Elizabeth S. Scott & Thomas Grisso, The Evolution of Adolescence: A Developmental Perspective on Juvenile Justice Reform, 88 J. CRIM. L. & CRIMINOLOGY 137, 179-80 (1997); Holman & Ziedenberg, supra note 49, at 8-10; Raised on the Registry, supra note 158, at 64-68.

176 In re Gault, 387 U.S. 1 (1967). 50 years after the In re Gault decision affirming a child’s right to counsel, the spirit of this case has not been fully realized. See generally NJDC Assessments, supra note 31; Statement of Interest in N.P., supra note 45; Mlyniec, supra note 47.
The National Juvenile Defender Center (NJDC) is a non-profit, non-partisan organization dedicated to promoting justice for all children by ensuring excellence in juvenile defense. NJDC provides support to public defenders, appointed counsel, private counsel, law school clinical programs, and non-profit law centers to ensure quality representation in urban, suburban, rural, and tribal areas. NJDC also offers a wide range of integrated services to juvenile defenders as well as other decision-makers and advocates, including training, technical assistance, advocacy, networking, collaboration, capacity building, and coordination. To learn more about NJDC, please visit www.njdc.info.

This project was supported in part by Grant #2013-MU-FX-K004 awarded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this guide are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of Justice.
Too often, children across the country are denied access to an attorney trained in juvenile law, if they can access representation at all. Children are our most vulnerable defendants, and they need a skilled attorney to protect them from a system that incarcerates more young people than any other country in the world.

**Lack of Meaningful Access to Counsel**

Fair treatment of children in delinquency courts is virtually impossible without the availability of specialized and highly skilled counsel advocating for the expressed legal interests of the child client. Yet, few children in this country actually receive meaningful access to qualified defense counsel, as constitutionally required in delinquency proceedings.

**Inadequate Juvenile Defense Delivery Systems**

In most federal, state, local, and tribal jurisdictions, existing juvenile defense delivery systems are inadequate or wholly lacking. Children do not have access to counsel early enough in the process, and problems with the timing and appointment of counsel, in addition to burdensome and lengthy indigence determinations, contribute greatly to the high rates of waiver of counsel. Further, many children languish in costly detention placements and institutions due to a lack of post-disposition access to counsel.

**Practices Inconsistent with Adolescent Development**

Many current juvenile court practices and policies criminalizing normative adolescent conduct are inconsistent with positive youth development. Research shows that without any intervention most delinquent behavior desists by early adulthood.
STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

Fifty years ago, the United States Supreme Court said that children have fundamental rights in America’s courtrooms. In the nearly five decades since then, the promise of Gault has not been realized. It is time to fulfill that promise. Justice demands that all children in juvenile court have meaningful access to qualified counsel.

The Gault at 50 Campaign seeks to ensure that every child has an effective attorney in America’s juvenile courts.

Therefore, we believe:

- Every child should be provided a juvenile defense attorney at the earliest possible moment.
- Every child should be automatically eligible for a publicly funded juvenile defense attorney.
- A child’s juvenile defense attorney should represent the child throughout the time the child is under the jurisdiction or supervision of the juvenile justice system, from arrest through post-disposition, which may include incarceration, probation, and/or parole, related appeals, and reentry.
- Every juvenile defense attorney must receive specialized training and support to be an effective advocate for children.
- Publicly funded defense systems must provide the necessary training, leadership, funding, tools, and resources to develop juvenile defenders with specialized knowledge and expertise.

To learn more about the Gault at 50 Campaign and join the growing list of organizations and individuals endorsing this Statement of Principles, visit www.gaultat50.org.
"For too long, the Supreme Court’s promise of fairness for young people accused of delinquency has gone unfulfilled in courts across our country."

"In the decade ahead, the National Juvenile Defender Center will expand our efforts to ensure every child who faces prosecution in America is represented by a well-trained attorney specializing in juvenile defense."
Effective juvenile defenders SAVE money by keeping youth in the community.

**Youth Incarceration** leads to higher risk of poor outcomes, such as:
- Sexual Abuse
- Trauma
- Recidivism
- Disconnect from School and Work

- **Direct Costs of Incarcerating Youth:** $112,555 (Per Year for One Youth)
- **Direct Costs for Intensive, Individualized Services Provided by a Nationally Recognized Nonprofit:** $23,725 (Per Year for One Youth)

Well-Designed Community-Based Programs can lead to better outcomes, such as:
- Healthy Development
- Increased Family Participation
- Reduced Recidivism, Keeping Public Safer
- Education & Employment Opportunities

Effective juvenile defense systems increase public SAFETY.

**One-Year Rearrest Rates for Low-Risk Offenders by Placement Type**
- Community Diversion: 28%
- Probation: 35%
- Low-Risk Residential Confinement: 48%

Low risk youth in community-based programs are much less likely to be rearrested than similar youth in confinement, according to a study in Florida.

Effective juvenile defense systems lead to youth SUCCESS.

- As many as 2 out of 3 youth do not return to school after returning from confinement.
- Community-based programming keeps youth in school, thus leading to lower rates of re-offending & better outcomes into adulthood.
- Attorneys specialized in juvenile defense can advocate for programs that lead to youth success, which saves money and increases public safety.
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The Fragmented State of Juvenile Indigent Defense

Level of state contribution to juvenile defense budget

No state contribution: 4
Less than half provided by state: 14
More than half provided by state: 6
Entirely state funded: 26

(# of states)

Note: DC is federally funded

# of states with a statewide conflict office

6

# of states with a statewide appellate office

*While 29 states have statewide appellate offices, there is a lack of clarity as to the extent in which the offices handle juvenile appeals.

See back for definitions and more information.
Map definitions

Statewide system: juvenile indigent defense is largely controlled, funded, trained, and supervised by a statewide public defender.

Localized system: primary responsibility for providing indigent defense services rests with county governments or with judicial circuits comprised of county groups.

Full oversight: the power to hire (or appoint) and/or fire (either for cause or at will) the chief public defender who delivers defense services—in some branch of the state government.

Partial oversight: bodies that are merely advisory or standard-setting, or any centralized organization that lacks the power to hire, dismiss, or otherwise control the performance of the defenders.

No oversight: states that do not have an oversight body to supervise or advise the delivery of indigent defense.

State by state breakdown


States with full oversight: Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, DC, Hawaii, Kansas, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

States with partial oversight: Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nebraska, North Carolina, Ohio, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, and West Virginia.


States that are entirely state funded: Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, DC (federally funded), Hawaii, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

States that provide more than half of funding: Florida, Kentucky, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Wyoming.

States that provide less than half of funding: California, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Nebraska, Nevada, Ohio, South Dakota, Texas, and Washington.

States that provide no funding (entirely locally funded systems): Arizona, Kansas, Pennsylvania, and Utah.


States with a conflict office: Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Montana, and New Mexico.

The National Juvenile Defender Center (NJDC) is a non-profit, non-partisan organization dedicated to promoting justice for all children by ensuring excellence in juvenile defense. NJDC provides support to public defenders, appointed counsel, law school clinical programs, and non-profit law centers to ensure quality representation in urban, suburban, rural, and tribal areas. NJDC also offers a wide range of integrated services to juvenile defenders, including training, technical assistance, advocacy, networking, collaboration, capacity building, and coordination. To learn more about NJDC, please visit www.njdc.info.

This project was supported by Grant # 2015-MU-BX-K002 awarded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this graphic are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of Justice.
Youth in detention are removed from settings that matter: their homes, schools, and communities. Without those supports, children develop higher rates of depression, anxiety, and other mental health conditions, and they lose access to educational opportunities. Once released, youth who spent time behind bars are more likely to disengage from school and become system-involved in the future.

More than 1 in 5 children awaiting adjudication spend time in pre-trial detention.¹

- **Increased involvement in the justice system**
  - 8.5% more likely to be found guilty²
  - 2x more likely to reoffend than non-detained youth³

- **Lack of access to education**
  - 60% do not return to school or drop out within five months⁴
  - Less special education services
  - Fewer hours of instruction⁵

- **Poor mental health outcomes**
  - 1 in 3 detained youth who are diagnosed with depression developed the condition after placement in detention⁶

Parents are often charged with detention fees, which can total over $600 in some states⁷.

**Average length of stay in pre-trial detention**⁸: 22 DAYS

**Youth of color are detained 1.5 times more than white youth**⁹.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>IMMATURITY</th>
<th>OFFENSE</th>
<th>POLICE QUESTIONING</th>
<th>SERVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMMATURE</td>
<td>Immature thinking</td>
<td>Did not plan: “it happened.” Impulsive</td>
<td>&quot;It was a mistake. It was an accident.”</td>
<td>Must be tailored to each youth's unique needs, but could include services (in a facility or the community) such as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unable to anticipate</td>
<td>Had weapon with no plan to use</td>
<td>Can't look ahead to statement in court</td>
<td>Instruction in anticipating consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unable to see choices</td>
<td>No danger in street activities, getting high</td>
<td>“Only way to go home is say what they want”</td>
<td>Instruction in how to see choices &amp; pros &amp; cons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Minimizes risk</td>
<td>‘It’s just talk.” Sexting/social media=harmless</td>
<td>“Can always take back what I said”</td>
<td>Instruction in decision-making; think before acting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMMATURE</td>
<td>Immature identity</td>
<td>Sensitive to being picked on. Bullied</td>
<td>Self-conscious about being “slow”</td>
<td>Learning how to manage stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Not successful</td>
<td>Does not ask for adult help</td>
<td>Unsure of self; hurt if called a liar</td>
<td>Being successful at something &amp; opportunities to show it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unstable self-definition</td>
<td>Wants to belong even with negative peers</td>
<td>Compliant; does what is asked</td>
<td>Guided process for defining self; becoming a leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Wants acceptance</td>
<td>Needs supervision. Influenced by older codefendants</td>
<td>Naively trusts police; taught to tell truth</td>
<td>Instruction in how to think without being influenced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Can’t function independently</td>
<td>May have been righting a wrong</td>
<td>Can’t believe police would manipulate, lie</td>
<td>Improved social skills to be acceptable to positive peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISABILITIES</td>
<td>Moral development</td>
<td>Did not realize there would be a victim</td>
<td>Snitching=morally wrong</td>
<td>Preparation for work, given talents and disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fairness fanatic</td>
<td>Under stress, can’t use usual moral beliefs</td>
<td>Does not understand rights</td>
<td>Developing job skills; support on the job for good decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Empathy</td>
<td>Can’t walk away, especially when high, even though knows right from wrong</td>
<td>In shock about offense; shame</td>
<td>Learning positive ways to deal with unfairness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fragile moral reasoning</td>
<td>Became agitated under stress</td>
<td>Believes police will help</td>
<td>Practicing good moral reasoning under stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Processing problems (digesting information)</td>
<td>Can’t comprehend others’ intentions</td>
<td>Doesn’t comprehend meaning of Miranda</td>
<td>Victim empathy awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expressive/receptive language</td>
<td>“Things happened too fast”</td>
<td>Can’t follow questions—doesn’t ask</td>
<td>Specialized instruction to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive function deficits</td>
<td>Poor communication. Stories out of order</td>
<td>Difficulty explaining self, confused narrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impaired sequencing</td>
<td>Poor planner; organizing difficulties</td>
<td>Focusses on getting it over with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulty concentrating</td>
<td>Couldn’t envision what would happen next</td>
<td>Thinking compromised by lack of sleep, cold, hunger, other conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAUMA (causes delayed development)</td>
<td>Over-reacts to threat</td>
<td>If victim aggressive, responds as if a repeat of past maltreatment (reflex reaction)</td>
<td>Scared of police, especially 2-on-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High anxiety</td>
<td>Controlling. Reacts to change. Can’t soothe self.</td>
<td>Easily pressured by overwhelming evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depressed</td>
<td>Feels worthless; self-destructive</td>
<td>Tearful, exhausted, little eye contact; slow thinking; gives in easily; overwhelmed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numbs feelings with substances</td>
<td>Lowered inhibitions, poor judgment if high during offense</td>
<td>High, coming down during questioning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- **Behavioral immaturity mirrors brain anatomical immaturity**
- Frontal lobe—responsible for impulse control, judgment, decision-making—develops slowly until early 20s
- Rely on amygdala, primitive emotion center of brain when adults process similar information through frontal cortex
- Prone to risk-taking; it is statistically aberrant to refrain from risk-taking in adolescence
- More susceptible to stress, which further distorts already poor cost/benefit analysis
- Most adolescent delinquent behavior occurs on a social stage where immediate pressures of peers is the real motive
- More vulnerable to peer pressure. Importance of approval makes already risk-prone impulsive teens even more so
- Trauma makes youth hypervigilant in response to threat
- Character is not fully formed, and adolescents' signature qualities—including their susceptibility to peer influence and weaknesses in self-regulation—reflect their incomplete identity
- Normal adolescents cannot be expected to operate w/ maturity, judgment, risk awareness or impulse control of an adult; teen who has suffered brain trauma, dysfunctional family, abuse or violence cannot operate at standard levels for adolescents
- The vast majority of adolescents who engage in delinquent behavior dissociate from crime as they mature
- Even the highest risk youths can be rehabilitated effectively
- Youth crime participation may be necessary to avoid threat
- Adolescents are far less able than adults to assist their counsel or make important legal decisions
- They have suffered brain trauma, dysfunctional family, abuse or violence cannot operate at standard levels for adolescents
- Most adolescent delinquent behavior occurs on a social stage where immediate pressures of peers is the real motive
- More vulnerable to peer pressure. Importance of approval makes already risk-prone impulsive teens even more so
- Trauma makes youth hypervigilant in response to threat
- Character is not fully formed, and adolescents' signature qualities—including their susceptibility to peer influence and weaknesses in self-regulation—reflect their incomplete identity
- Normal adolescents cannot be expected to operate w/ maturity, judgment, risk awareness or impulse control of an adult; teen who has suffered brain trauma, dysfunctional family, abuse or violence cannot operate at standard levels for adolescents

**Key Points:**
- Trauma treatment to:
  - Help in writing complete trauma history
  - See connections between triggers, feelings, actions & learn to respond differently
- Separate past maltreatment from present provocations
- Learning not to blame self; stop self-destructive acts
- Not assume others are hostile; not act like a victim
- Learning to anticipate loss of control & how to manage
- Help with family where there is conflict or substance abuse
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DEVELOPMENT

Immaturity

• Behavioral immaturity mirrors brain anatomical immaturity
• Frontal lobe—responsible for impulse control, judgment, decision-making—develops slowly until early 20s
• Rely on amygdala, primitive emotion center of brain where adults process similar information through frontal cortex
• Prone to risk-taking; it is statistically aberrant to refrain from risk-taking in adolescence
• More susceptible to stress, which further distorts already poor cost-benefit analysis
• Most adolescent delinquent behavior occurs on a social stage where immediate pressure of peers is the real motive
• More vulnerable to peer pressure
• Importance of approval makes already risk-prone impulsive teen even more so
• Trauma makes youth hypervigilant in response to threat
• Character is not fully formed, and adolescents' signature qualities—including their susceptibility to peer influence and weaknesses in self-regulation—reflect their incomplete identity
• Normal adolescents cannot be expected to operate with maturity, judgment, risk aversion, or impulse control of an adult; teen who has suffered brain trauma, dysfunctional family, abuse, or violence cannot operate at standard levels for adolescents
• The vast majority of adolescents who engage in delinquent behavior desist from crime as they mature
• Even the highest risk youths can be rehabilitated effectively
• Youth crime participation may be necessary to avoid threat
• Adolescents are far less able than adults to assist their counsel or make important legal decisions

OFFENSE

Immature Thinking

• Unable to anticipate consequences
• Unable to see choices
• Minimizes risk
• Did not plan; “it happened.” Impulsive
• Had weapon with no plan to use
• Saw no danger in street activities, getting high
• “It’s just talk.” Sexting/social media-harmless
• “It was a mistake. It was an accident.”
• Can’t look ahead to statement in court
• “Only way to go home is say what they want”
• “Can always take back what I said”
• Can’t see meaning of magnitude

Immature Identity

• Not successful
• Unstable self-definition
• Can’t function independently
• Sensitive to being picked on/Bullied
• Doesn’t do well at work
• Wants to belong with negatives
• Needs supervision
• Influenced by older referent
• Self-conscious about being “slow”
• Unsure of self, hurt if called a liar
• Does not trust authority figures
• Taught to tell truth

Moral Development

• Fairness fanatic
• Empathy
• Fragile moral reasoning
• May have been righting a wrong
• Can’t comprehend even simply presented information
• Can’t realize there would be a victim
• Under stress, can’t use usual moral beliefs
• Can’t walk away, especially when high
• Even though knows right from wrong
• Self-deception
• Naively trusts police; taught to tell truth
• Can’t believe police would manipulate, lie
• Snitching—morally wrong
• Does not understand rights
• In shock about offense; shame
• Believes police will help

Disabilities

• Processing problems (dyslexic functioning)
• Expressive/receptive language
• Executive function deficits
• Impaired sequencing
• Difficulty concentrating
• Can’t comprehend others’ intentions
• “Things happened too fast”
• Poor communication. Stories out of order
• Poor planer; organizing difficulties
• Couldn’t envision what would happen next
• Became agitated under stress
• Doesn’t comprehend meaning of Miranda
• Can’t follow questions—doesn’t ask
• Difficulty explaining self; confused narrative
• Focuses on getting it over with
• Thinking compromised by lack of sleep
• Cold, hungry, other conditions

Trauma (causes delayed development)

• Over-reacts to threat
• High anxiety
• Depression
• Numbs feelings with substances
• If victim aggressive, responds as if it were a repeat of past maltreatment (reflex reaction)
• Controlling. Reacts to change. Can’t soothe self
• Feels worthless; self-destructive
• Lowered inhibitions, poor judgment if high during offense
• Scared of police, especially 2-on-1
• Easily pressured by overwhelming evidence
• Fears of pain, exhaustion, little private contact; small talk, gives in easily; overwhelmed
• High, coming down during questioning
• Trauma treatment to:
  • Help in writing complete trauma history
  • See connections between triggers, feelings, and actions and learn to respond differently
  • Separate past maltreatment from present provocations
  • Learning not to blame self; stop self-destructive acts
  • Not assume others are hostile; not act like a victim
  • Learning to anticipate loss of control & how to manage
  • Learn how to concentrate & manage distractibility

SERVICES

• Must be tailored to each youth’s unique needs, but could include services (in a facility or the community) such as:
  • Instruction in anticipating consequences
  • Instruction in how to see choices & pros & cons
  • Instruction in decision-making: think before acting
  • Guided process for defining self, becoming a leader
  • Instruction in how to think without being influenced
  • Improved social skills to be acceptable to positive peers
  • Preparation for work, gain self-esteem
  • Developing job skills; support on the job for good decisions
  • Learning positive ways to deal with unfairness
  • Practicing good moral reasoning under stress
  • Victim empathy awareness

• Be aware of potential: as an adolescent, may be below average in IQ
• Sees offense as unintended, accidental—maintains insistence on innocence
• No future time perspective to understand years of probation or incarceration
• Doesn’t see future risk. “I’m sure I’ll never get arrested/be detained again”
• Just wants to go home; or says, “I’ll just do the time & get it over with”
• Frightened: all the options so scary, shuts down so doesn’t have to think about
• Wants to be liked; wants to give “right” answer even if not true or thought out
• Embarrassed can’t explain why so peer-influenced during offense
• Big identity issue: can’t face being type of person who did offense, especially if media
• Wants more attention from defender; lonely; hard not to be able to talk to anyone
• Preoccupied by what friends/family think; distracted by family/friend problems
• Stuck & only talks about police/detention unfairness; can’t focus on legal issues
• Shocked by what happened & consequences; hard to see victim as “my victim”
• Heart-broken by betrayal by friend; can’t sniff; may never tell everything
• “It shouldn’t be like that;” feels court process unfair so has less faith in defender

ASSISTING IN DEFENSE

• Can’t comprehend even simply presented information
• Can’t consider two things at once, so can’t compare options
• Can’t do strategic decision-making, especially with either/thinking & unfairness focus
• Doesn’t retain previous discussions; poor logical connections between discussions
• Can’t tell what happened in normal sequence; leaves out/adds details each time
• Easily distracted; can’t concentrate as long as it takes to explain legal issues

• Trouble trusting anyone
• Feels helpless; gives up; not fighting for self
• Feels all options are so depressing, can’t think about any of them; strong denial
• Can’t tolerate not being in control; uncertainty causes anxiety impairing rational thought
• Anxiety & depression worsen concentration; sinking into hopelessness interferes
• Embarrassed can’t explain thinking because was so drunk or high
QUESTIONS TO ASK THE EXPERT TO ADDRESS

Traditional mental health evaluations are unlikely to provide an assessment of the complex combination of disabilities, trauma and immature thinking that contributed to a juvenile’s behavior at the time of the offense or during police questioning, or his/her ability to participate in decision-making about his/her case. Traditional diagnosis-driven evaluations also tend not provide adequate guidance for designing services to enhance the future success of and reduce the likelihood of reoffending by this young person.

When a developmental assessment is requested early, findings about disabilities, trauma and immature thinking can be utilized throughout a case (Miranda, trial/plea, disposition).

To obtain a thorough developmental assessment, request that the evaluator address the following questions regarding disabilities, trauma and immaturity:

1. What effects remain from trauma exposure in this youth’s life?
   - Chronology of physical abuse, sexual abuse, exposure to violence, removal from home and other disrupted caregiving, loss of important individuals, bullying, psychological maltreatment, and other life events
   - Slowed development (specifically what areas?)
   - Fearfulness (being on constant alert)
   - Nightmares and/or intrusive bad memories
   - Numbs feelings and memories with substances
   - Trouble concentrating
   - Being controlling, especially when anxious
   - Unusual irritability
   - Depression/suicidal thinking
   - Self-protective when threatened (reactive alarm response)
   - Belligerent outspokenness
   - Difficulty self-calming
   - Oversensitive; unusual perception of others as hostile, mean, and/or unfair
   - When feelings are hurt, flooded with anger from the past out of proportion to the present provocation
   - Mistrusting of others
   - Dissociation (unable to remember emotionally charged situations)

2. Does this young person have learning problems?
   (a) Problems processing information?
      - Digesting what is said or written (including difficulty comprehending and following instructions)
      - Expressive or receptive language difficulties, including narratives
   (b) Executive function deficits
      - Organizing, prioritizing, or sequencing
   (c) Characteristics of fetal substance exposure?
      - Getting easily overstimulated
      - Oblivious to simple rules that other children routinely obey
      - Does not learn from experience, repeating the same mistakes
      - Seems younger than his/her chronological age
   (d) Does a diagnosis of ADD/ADHD adequately account for this young person’s behavior?
      - Documentation of
        -- attention/concentration difficulties/distractibility for child’s age
        -- high activity level for child’s age and/or excessive daydreaming for child’s age
      - What are the details of his/her poor social skills/problems with peers?
      - Has he/she had a diagnosis of ADD and ADHD? If medication did not produce improvement, was an alternative diagnosis given to account for attention difficulties and getting quickly frustrated (for example, the effects of trauma or the symptoms of mild autism can be similar)?
   (e) What accounts for discrepancies between reading/math skills and IQ subtest scores?

3. How specifically does this young person’s behavior reflect his/her immature thinking?
   - Difficulty anticipating consequences/planning
   - Childish decision-making when scared and/or stressed (including seeing only one option)
   - Minimizes danger/not recognizing worst possible outcomes/poor assessment of risks
   - What are this young person’s peer relationships and how does he/she respond to peer pressure?
   - Does this young person have an immature identity?
   - Does this young person have immature moral reasoning? For whom does he/she show empathy?
The 50th Anniversary of *In re Gault*: Looking Back, Looking Forward

Justice Sheryl Gordon McCloud
Washington Supreme Court

2017 ABA Midyear Meeting
Summit on Public Defense
“[C]hildren are different.”

Jacob Lawrence, *Harriet Tubman Series (Panel # 4)* (1940); *Workshop (Builders # 1)* (1972)
Federal constitutional holdings:

Federal constitutional implications:

- “[A] sentencing rule permissible for adults may not be so for children.”  
  *Miller*, 132 S. Ct. at 2470.
- Eight Amendment bars some sentences as disproportionately harsh
- Eight Amendment requires additional protection: judicial discretion – “*Miller*” hearings
State constitutional implications:
Other state law implications:

*State v. O’Dell, 183 Wn.2d 680, 358 P.3d 359 (2015)*
(under Washington’s Sentencing Reform Act, defendant’s youthfulness may be a mitigating factor justifying an exceptional sentence below the standard sentence range; trial court’s failure to consider whether youth diminished defendant’s culpability necessitated remand for resentencing)
“The question presented in this case is ... whether a defendant’s youth can justify an exceptional sentence below the standard range when the defendant was over 18 when he or she committed the offense.” O’Dell, 183 Wn.2d at 689.

Answer:
The legislature did not necessarily consider youth when it established the “standard sentence ranges” under the state Sentencing Reform Act’s grid. *O’Dell*, 183 Wn.2d at 691.
“[W]hen the legislature enacted [the SRA rules], it did not have the benefit of psychological and neurological studies showing that the “parts of the brain involved in behavior control” continue to develop well into a person’s 20s.” O’Dell, 183 Wn.2d at 691-92 (footnotes omitted).
“It is precisely these differences that might justify a trial court’s finding that youth diminished a defendant’s culpability, and there was no way for our legislature to consider these differences when it made the SRA sentencing ranges applicable to all offenders over 18 years of age. Thus, we decline to hold that the legislature necessarily considered the relationship between age and culpability when it made the SRA applicable to all defendants 18 and older.” O’Dell, 183 Wn.2d at 694.
“When our court made that sweeping conclusion [that the ‘age of the defendant does not relate to the crime’ and hence is not a cognizable sentencing consideration], it did not have the benefit of the studies underlying *Miller*, *Roper*, and *Graham* – studies that establish a clear connection between youth and decreased moral culpability for criminal conduct.” *O’Dell*, 183 Wn.2d at 695.
“[F]or these reasons, a trial court must be allowed to consider youth as a mitigating factor when imposing a sentence on an offender like O’Dell, who committed his offense just a few days after he turned 18.” *O’Dell*, 183 Wn.2d at 696.
“[D]espite the scientific and technical nature of the studies underlying the Roper, Graham, and Miller decisions, a defendant need not present expert testimony to establish that youth diminished his capacities for purposes of sentencing. As in a juvenile court decline hearing, ... lay testimony may be sufficient.” O’Dell, 183 Wn.2d at 697.
Racial Disproportionality

“[T]he over-representation of minority youth at every stage of the juvenile justice process persists with very little change. . . . Although there are slight improvements as well, the general conclusion is that not much progress has been made over the last two decades in reducing the over-representation of [minority] youth in the juvenile justice system.”*

*2012 Presentation to the Washington Supreme Court by the Task Force on Race and the Criminal Justice System.
Norman Rockwell, *The Problem We All Live With* (1964)
Dorothea Lange, Two Japanese American children in Hayward, California await relocation (1942)
In spite of the enormous decrease in sentence disparity and increase in proportionality that occurred, the decision guidelines did not eliminate nor even reduce an apparent differential handling of youths based on their race or sex, even when the seriousness of the current offense, priors and age were taken into account. Correlations, controlling for these other relevant variables, occurred repeatedly in both the pre and post time period between the severity of the sanction and the sex or race of the youths.

* * *

When correlations were found between race and sanctions, the minority youths were always the ones receiving the more severe sanctions.

Norman Rockwell, *Shiner* or *Outside the Principal’s Office* (1953)