

## 1: Law and Justice | Foundations in Law | Foundations in Criminal Justice

*This report was transmitted to the Congress in It is based on the organization and methods of 10 juvenile courts in different parts of the country serving cities of over , but less than 1,, population. It was designed primarily to discover successful methods of juvenile court work.*

Going Soft on Juvenile Crime: Although the young still commit outrageous crimes, two multi-billion-dollar foundations have spent years working to make the juvenile justice system more lenient. Now the Obama Justice Department has also joined in the effort. In Torres was murdered at the age of 42 by a group of four teenagers in Oakland, California. They stole a gold chain and an iPod from Torres before fatally shooting him in the back as he tried to run away. Allen ultimately pleaded guilty to a lesser charge of involuntary manslaughter and was sentenced to 12 years, too short for the Torres family. Forget the question of whether 12 years is too light a sentence. These advocates do not want any incarceration for crimes committed by offenders under the age of 18, and their thinking has begun to influence our legal system. Over the last eight years, the courts have made juvenile justice, even for the worst offenders, more and more lenient. Casey Foundation and the John D. These two funders have battled the get-tough-on-crime approach of the s and pushed for alternatives to incarceration for youth offenders. They have also opposed trying minors as adults. These organizations and their allies have had their way in abolishing the death penalty for juveniles thanks to Justice Kennedy , and eliminatingâ€”in most casesâ€”life sentences for youth murderers. They have also forged a tight-knit relationship with the Obama Justice Department and swayed the thinking of a majority of states across the country red and blue on the issue of crime and punishment for minors. The seventh annual conference included numerous workshops with a heavy theme on storytelling and promoting their views in the media, according to a report by Youth Today. Journalists, who supposedly cover juvenile justice in an objective way, actually conducted a workshop for the advocacy group. The Obama administration approved of the key suggestions regarding collaboration among federal departments, Beckman said. Earlier that December, the Justice Department issued a report critical of trying youth offenders as adults. Effect of a Broad Policy in One Court. This supports the general contention that juveniles, even serious offenders who are transferred to adult court, are highly susceptible to negative peer influences and outside pressures. The study should not receive a knee-jerk rejection, but note that its findings largely conform with the philosophy of the MacArthur Foundation and Casey Foundation, with whom the Justice Department has worked closely in recent years. In fact, those foundations co-funded the study itself, as did the National Institute of Justice, the William T. Four organizations received the money: Casey in other areas. For example, last year the DoJ sought to address problems with the conditions of a juvenile detention center in Shelby County, Tennessee. Perez spoke in Memphis about the help the Casey Foundation would provide: Casey Foundation and working with the Memphis City Schools and Police Department to implement a summons in lieu of arrest program for a limited number of offenses. Stimson said advocates seek to frame the debate as if eight- and nine-year-olds are spending the rest of their life in prison. They use child because they want you to think that these are children. You see, the campaign so far is essentially wrapped in these principles: All the countries are the same around the world. All countries are essentially the same. The law established the Office of Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention to support state and local initiatives to improve the juvenile system and prioritize prevention over punishmentâ€”all things that sound ever so good in theory. The law has four core requirements: Just four years after the sweeping federal law passed, the New York state legislature passed the Juvenile Offender Act in response to a crime committed by year-old Willie Bosket. The New York state law required automatic transfer of , , and year-olds to criminal court from juvenile court for 17 different serious felony crimes such as murder or burglary. New York already tried year-olds in criminal court. The following year, Florida lawmakers decided to give state prosecutors discretion on sending youth offenders ages 14 to 17 to adult courts. New York and Florida were trailblazers, as teen crime increased in the s and drugs proliferated.

Such crimes reached a high point in the 1980s, prompting 47 states in the 1980s to pass laws that put more juvenile suspects in adult courts. It found poor facilities with high rates of youth injuries, crowded conditions, little mental health attention, and high staff turnover. It also found that federally accredited facilities were no better, on average, than non-federally accredited facilities. From 1983 through 1989, the U. Supreme Court would issue three landmark decisions making the juvenile system more lenient. The high court ruled 5 to 4 in March 1983 to prohibit capital punishment for youth murderers in *Roper v. Simmons*. They tied her hands with electrical wires and covered her entire face with duct tape before tossing her over a bridge to drown. After Simmons confessed to the murder, he was sentenced to the death penalty. Terrance Graham, 16, along with two accomplices was arrested in for attempted armed robbery of a barbecue restaurant in Jacksonville, Florida. Graham was also charged with assault and battery. He was tried as an adult and pleaded guilty to a felony. A few months later, in December 1983, Graham was arrested again for home invasion. In 1984, Graham was sentenced to life in prison without the possibility of parole. In the majority opinion striking down life without the possibility of parole for minors who did not commit murder, Kennedy distinguished between murder and other crimes. Alabama and *Jackson v. Evan Miller* was 14 when he was charged with robbing and beating a man before setting his trailer on fire and leaving him to die. Miller was tried as an adult and found guilty of capital murder, but he was too young under the law to get the death penalty. So he was sentenced to life without parole. In the other case, Kuntrell Jackson of Arkansas was also 14 at the time he and two other teens were charged with attempting to rob a video store. Jackson was convicted as an adult of capital murder and aggravated robbery and sentenced to life without parole. Established in 1984 by Jim Casey, one of the founders of United Parcel Services UPS, it was named for his mother and originally devoted to children in foster care. In recent years the Casey Foundation has focused heavily on criminal justice in general and juvenile matters in particular. It has also focused on discouraging incarceration for juveniles, arguing the system should focus entirely on reform as if the two are mutually exclusive. The initiative is tied to preconceived notions that the entire criminal justice system is racist: All the programs operate around eight core strategies: In 1997, JDAI found itself embroiled in controversy. The grant was to evaluate the effectiveness of JDAI programs across the country. This situation was sufficiently embarrassing that the Justice Department Office of Inspector General launched an investigation of the matter, releasing a report in September 1997. Models for change The John D. Creating a more fair and effective juvenile justice system that supports learning and growth and promotes accountability can ensure that all kids can grow up to be healthy, productive members of our society. The foundation has also made alternatives to incarceration a priority, especially for juveniles, starting in 1997. The initiative is winding down one phase of funding and beginning another. Unsurprisingly, the MacArthur and Casey foundations both count their work as successful. The study reported on a mother who had asked that her troubled son remain incarcerated, but the system released him and he was soon killed.

## 2: Juvenile Justice – MacArthur Foundation

*This bar-code number lets you verify that you're getting exactly the right version or edition of a book. The digit and digit formats both work.*

Adolescent Diversion Parts Young people ages 16 and 17 are processed as adults within the confines of the criminal justice system. The Court has implemented a separate Diversion Effort to improve court outcomes for youth charged with non-violent offenses, designed to help these young people avoid the legal consequences of conviction and realign them with a law-abiding trajectory and a productive future. Currently operating in nine counties, a variety of youth-specific sentencing options are available including: As of August 4, , over 6, adolescents have been diverted to these innovative court parts. These reforms combine the best features of Family and Criminal Court in order to produce the best possible outcomes while attaining accountability and public safety. STSJP and Risk Assessment Instrument In , New York State enacted legislation as part of its budget for State Fiscal Year that marked the launch of a statewide comprehensive juvenile detention reform agenda through the inclusion of two provisions designed to serve as a foundation for widespread juvenile detention reform over the long term: New York City will gradually acquire youth who have been found delinquent and sent to limited secure and non-secure facilities. This phased plan allows the youth to receive the best possible service provision, while allowing youth to remain near the communities they will ultimately be returning to. This summit highlighted the best practices for improving successful reintegration for delinquent youth back into their community, focusing on transitions into schools, healthcare, and family engagement. A strategic plan was released with comprehensive recommendations to improve reentry policies and practices within NYS. Regional Youth Justice Teams Taking into account the regional similarities and differences between jurisdictions in New York, the Division of Criminal Justice Services released an RFP in to create nine separate regional youth justice teams. These teams act as the conduit between each region and State policy makers providing a regional voice at the State level for channeling technical assistance, juvenile justice expertise, local data and information in regards to best practices back to the local region. These teams will provide a venue for local communities and city, county and state agencies to engage in formal communication and planning around juvenile justice issues. This year, the Juvenile Justice Advisory Group created a targeted request-for-applications specifically for the RYJTs to support the local collaborative efforts, and the implementation of innovative and data drive practices. For information, please visit: Six sites Albany, Erie, Onondaga, Orange, Monroe, and Nassau Counties were selected to begin the journey; through significant technical assistance from national experts, these sites have convened a collaborative group of local stakeholders dedicated to changing the way these jurisdictions handle detention. This process includes a significant data analysis of juvenile justice numbers, as well as budget allocations to see where dollars are being spent. For more information, please visit: Commission on Youth, Justice and Public Safety As a result of a gubernatorial directive, New York State is seriously evaluating the logistical implications of raising the age of juvenile court jurisdiction. Since first meeting in early , the committee will be releasing a report with calculated action steps to make this necessary reform.

## 3: NACDL - Foundation for Criminal Justice

*Search the history of over billion web pages on the Internet.*

Trial as an adult All states have laws that allow, and at times require, young offenders to be prosecuted or sentenced as adults for more serious offenses, Without regard to their age. United States , the United States Supreme Court held that a juvenile must be afforded due process rights, specifically that a waiver of jurisdiction from a juvenile court to a district court must be voluntary and knowing. Supreme Court held, in the case of *In re Gault* , [10] [11] that children accused in a juvenile delinquency proceeding have the rights to due process, counsel, and against self-incrimination, essentially the Miranda rights. Writing for the majority, Associate Justice Abe Fortas wrote, "Under our Constitution, the condition of being a boy does not justify a kangaroo court. Pennsylvania decided that minors do not have the same rights in this regard as adults. Other cases[ edit ] In some jurisdictions, in addition to delinquent cases, juvenile court hears cases involving child custody , child support , and visitation as well as cases where children are alleged to be abused or neglected. Court procedure[ edit ] Procedures in juvenile court, for juveniles charged with delinquent acts acts that would be crimes if committed by adults or status offenses offenses that can only be committed by minors, such as running away from home, curfew violations and truancy are typically less formal than proceedings in adult courts. A serious crime is more likely to result in the filing of a petition than a less severe crime. Petitions are more likely to be filed in cases involving older children. Formal charges are more likely when a minor has been previously involved with juvenile court. The strength of the evidence that the minor committed a crime. Obviously, stronger evidence leads to a greater likelihood of formal charges. Formal charges are more likely to be filed against boys than against girls. Petitions are more likely to be filed when children have a history of problems at home or school. The greater the lack of parental control, the more likely the intake officer is to file a petition. Along with these seven, four "unofficial" factors can sway an official: Formal proceedings are less likely to occur when a child shows remorse for committing a crime. If the young person is polite, dressed well, and neatly groomed, then the intake personnel are more likely to handle the case informally. Whether the minor has family or community support. The more support the young person has, the more likely the intake officer is to deal with the case informally. Whether the minor has an attorney. Disposing of a case informally may be less likely when a child has a lawyer. In Connecticut, a referral can be made to a non-court associated committee referred to as a Juvenile Review Board. These committees can present a resolution that does not result in a juvenile criminal record. However, there are qualifying circumstances for a case to be accepted for review, such as the type of offense often must be minor in nature and prior court involvement many JRBs only accept first-time offenses. Sentencing[ edit ] Juvenile court sentences may range from: Mandatory minimum sentencing[ edit ] Mandatory minimum sentences found their way into the juvenile justice system in the late s out of concern that some juveniles were committing very serious criminal offenses. Mandatory minimum sentences might be imposed in juvenile court for some very serious crimes, such as homicide, and apply to juveniles in the same manner as adults if the juvenile is waived to adult court. Supreme Court has ruled that the use of mandatory life sentences for juvenile offenders is unconstitutional. He stated that the system sends too many children with good chances of rehabilitation to adult court while pushing aside and acquitting children early on the road to crime instead of giving counseling, support, and accountability. In the United States specifically, there are arguments made against having a separate court for youths and juvenile delinquents. From this perspective, the construction of youth and being young is morphing and as such people believe the legal system should reflect these changes. Childhood currently, looks very different and is socially constructed in a much different pattern than in past historical context. Some argue that within our current social climate, a juvenile court system and having a separate deferment for people under the age of majority is no longer necessary as there are such blurred lines between the stages of childhood, youth, and young adulthood. Movements towards less punitive measures or agencies have been a trend in this regard. For

example, in the United Nations general assembly, there was a proposal that "no child or young person should be subjected to harsh or degrading correction or punishment measures". The United Nations believes that youths should have less harsh punishment and be deferred to more community supportive programs like tribunals or courts geared towards young people. In Western Europe, there are many countries also criticized and looked at by the United Nations for the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic minorities in the juvenile court system of the racial and ethnic minority being over-represented. The current regime allows for many systemic perpetuations of class divides, discrimination and gender inequalities. Another reform made by the United Nations is "informalism" in the mid's where a push for diversion and less criminalizing happened. This was when many deferred programs and alternatives to formal criminal and adult jurisdictions changed, making it more child-friendly. In more recent years, the restorative justice model has been promoted as a better way to process and reintegrate youth who are involved in the court system back into the community. This model is multifaceted and requires a change in the cultural understanding of what it means to commit a crime as a person under the age of majority. The United Nations has offered aid to countries looking to move towards a restorative justice model as it is a positive change in from a human rights discourse. Additionally, the traditional values of adversarial justice have been rooted in the juvenile system for a very long time, which makes it difficult to implement change on a global scale. There are also many arguments against the globalization of the reforms of juvenile court systems. Global juvenile justice lacks solutions to the flaws that come out of placing them in such a broad range of social contexts. For example, the case study of Moroccan youth as well as other ethnic minorities or migrant groups living in the Netherlands. There is a disconnect between the idea that crime is a local social problem, but there are movements to solve the problems more generically and on a much broader spectrum. In the Netherlands, the emphasis of juvenile court is rehabilitation despite the reality being a more punitive focused system when placed in practice. Juvenile courts cause further system bias and exclusion for these minority groups, and the disparity is a source of concern. One reason for this problem is the public discourse and police scrutiny—all of which stem from the failed cultural integration. Globalization of youth justice and the court then perpetuates this idea of an "international scapegoat" and causes issues that need more careful consideration for the putting global practices to work in local communities. As some scholars argue, globalization does not simplify the problem but rather complicates it as it challenges "traditional modes of analysis" and creates problems of identity.

## 4: The Juvenile Justice System | [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com)

*ideas and beliefs that serve as the foundations for theories, policies. juvenile justice assumptions consist of what people believe about the causes of juvenile delinquency, what we should do about juvenile delinquency, and how the juvenile justice system should function.*

Intro to Juvenile Justice: It takes a special kind of person to handle at-risk youth that are incarcerated, which brings me to this article. The breakdown of Juvenile Justice facilities and how they operate. Each state differs in their mandatory requirements on handling at-risk youth, but the delicateness and clear separation from adults are practices common across the board. The day has come where juveniles have grown in civil liberties, and are considered a protected class guarded by the law of the land. Over the last 15 years there has been several Supreme Court cases that has aided significant changes that are worth mentioning in this article. These changes reformed Juvenile Justice departments completely in how they operate nationwide, and their function along side the courts. This article is set to provide a foundation of information regarding youth involvement in the criminal justice system. Any individual seeking employment in public service in particularly with youth, will benefit on learning the different components youth may experience. There will be tidbits added throughout the article, as it may be heavy on field related jargon. If you would like more information please click the links as highlighted below!

Simmons Donald P. Roper, Correctional Superintendent was petitioned by the defendant Christopher Simmons. The defendant was 17 years old when he was found guilty for murder, and sentenced to the death penalty in Simmons petitioned his sentence and filed for appeal with the state and federal courts until , but all appeals were denied on both levels. However, that same year a similar case was decided by the U. They ruled in favor of public opinion that executing the mentally ill by death penalty, violated their 8th and 14th amendment rights 8th amend: That case was cited as Atkins v. Simmons reapplied for appeal, citing that new case law. The Supreme Court concluded their findings with a decision that evolved executing minors under the age of 18 prohibited by the 8th and 14th amendment. Florida Terrence Jamar Graham, at 16 years of age was convicted of armed burglary and attempted armed robbery in Florida. Graham was sentenced to 12 months and was released on parole. Another incident occurred six months later and Graham was convicted of armed home robbery by the Florida state courts. Graham was then sentenced to life without parole. Graham went through due process and appealed his case to the Appellate and Supreme Court. The Supreme Court in turn, ruled in his favor with a vote. The majority clause was defined as juvenile offenders cannot be sentenced to life without parole on non-homicidal I. The 8th and 14th amendment became extended to an entire class of juvenile offenders. Alabama In , Evan Miller at the age of 14 years old alongside his friend Colby Smith, beat and killed a man with a baseball bat. They proceeded to burn the trailer down, where the body was, destroying the property completely. They both were arrested. Miller was sent to Circuit Court where he was tried as an adult for murder while committing arson. In , Miller was indicted by a grand jury to a mandatory sentence of life without parole. Miller decided to appeal his verdict to the Appellate and Supreme courts. Other cases with similar back story were being seen and tried by the U. The imposition inquired on juveniles being sentenced to life for homicidal crime. They questioned rather the sentence was a violation of the 8th and 14th amendment. The courts ruled in favor of Miller , with a vote, forbidding mandatory sentences of life without parole for juvenile, in homicidal crimes. The court distinguished children from adults for sentencing purposes, stating it would be unconstitutional punishment for juveniles. Now the foundation of case law is behind us, we can put it all together. The Supreme Court first ruled the death penalty for minors under the age of 18 were unconstitutional. Then proceeded by stating juveniles cannot be sentenced to life without parole on non homicidal crimes. The term was later reconditioned from non homicidal crimes to all crimes committed by youth. In the eyes of the law, juveniles became a protected class that cannot be sentenced to life without parole. Now that youth are being sentenced less, what does this mean for youth involved in the criminal justice system? This method becomes progressional in discipline, contingent on youth

continuous involvement in delinquent behavior. The expansion and use of Juvenile Courts have played an incremental role in handling cases for at risk youth. The court genuinely accepts youth alleged of committing a delinquency act crime up to the age of 18. Once a minor is found guilty by the court through formal proceedings of an adjudicatory hearing, the court has the ability to consider what is in the best interest of the juvenile. Often times this translates to the juvenile court retaining legal custody over the minor for a period of time. The court makes referrals on an individualized basis for where youth serve out their disposition. The Prison Policy Initiative created a pie chart that will be used to highlight the different sectors youth can end up serving their disposition. This chart incorporates the top 4 dispositions that we will be covering in this article for the sake of time. Youth are usually brought in upon arrest, awaiting court hearing, placement, or transfer to another jurisdiction. Youth are assessed upon intake, and classified based on their individualized programming. The housing stays are longer than detention centers, and can range from 3 months to 3 years. Youth are evaluated and individualized plans are implemented for proper interventions. It provides 24 hours of supervision in a home like settings with a trained staff to tackle disorders like substance abuse, eating disorders, self-harm, or behavioral complications. Footnotes Since we have explored the foundation of juvenile justice, it makes you wonder what the future hold with youth incarceration. There are advantages and disadvantages to each sectors listed above. We will explore those options in-depth on future post. The education among the general public is a direct result of where we are now. Public opinion has been pivotal in the realm of criminal justice, demanding more protection on youth and transparency with agencies. The age of which youth are committing delinquent act is getting even younger by the day. A populous in their infancy of cognitive development, who are experiencing traumatic events without the proper coping skills to manage their emotions. Who is to blame for this population growth in the criminal justice system? While there are many factors working against at risk youth, for instance inadequate parenting, dysfunctional household, and push outs from the educational systems in studies similar to the School-To-Prison Pipeline. How do we collectively tackle this epidemic with experts from surrounding interdisciplinary fields? I am ambiguous on this subject as a current practitioner who counsels and supervise incarcerated youth from the inner city. Given all that we know, experienced personally, or read today, do you believe juvenile justice and juvenile courts is a necessity in our society? Should there be harsher penalties for crimes, including murder for juveniles? I would like to know your thoughts. Have you worked with youth that has stayed in a JDC, long term stay, group home, or residential treatment? What was that experience like? Hit me with some comments below or feel free to email me! As stated before, this was an overview for any one who is curious or have interest in working with at risk youth. I believe this information can be useful for job titles including but not limited to: The quality care of youth is a battle fought on many fronts, we all have our part!!

## 5: Juvenile court - Wikipedia

*Foundations in Criminal Justice provides students with a broad overview of the criminal and juvenile justice systems. Students learn about historical developments and current practices in criminal law, corrections, and the courts.*

Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators The Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators CJCA is a national non-profit organization, formed in to improve local juvenile correctional services, programs and practices so the youths within the systems succeed when they return to the community and to provide national leadership and leadership development for the individuals responsible for the systems. FSG FSG is a mission-driven consulting firm for leaders in search of large-scale, lasting social change. Through its combination of customized consulting services, powerful ideas, and learning communities, FSG helps foundations, businesses, nonprofits, and governments around the world unleash their full potential to reimagine social change. Their expertise in strategic planning, evaluation, and implementation helps clients such as the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Lilly, and the Global Fund for Women create social impact in health, economic development, education, and more. Their consulting work, research, and analysis of successful efforts has led them to write about and develop ideas that they believe have the power to change the world. They are well-known for collective impact, and shared value, and they take a systems thinking approach to tackling complex problems. They also support the Collective Impact Forum, the Shared Value Initiative, and the Impact Hiring Initiative—learning communities that provide tools and relationships for change agents. Houston Endowment Houston Endowment is a private foundation that partners with others in the nonprofit, public and private sectors to improve quality of life for the residents of greater Houston. Established by Jesse H. Today the foundation continues efforts to create a vibrant community where all have the opportunity to thrive. The Council of State Governments Justice Center The Council of State Governments Justice Center provides practical, nonpartisan, research-driven strategies and tools to increase public safety and strengthen communities. Their in-depth data analyses, coupled with extensive interviews of people on the front lines of criminal justice, inform recommendations designed for a particular state or county seeking to improve its justice system. Original, groundbreaking research they conduct prompts new national initiatives. The on-the-ground training and assistance they provide helps local and state agencies translate the latest research into policy and practice. Their national and state-level convenings bring together colleagues from across the country to share their successes and challenges with the most pressing and complex issues facing the justice system today. And, briefings they provide to top officials in Congress and the federal government result in legislation that enjoys broad, bipartisan support. Justice Policy Institute Justice Policy Institute is a national nonprofit organization that changes the conversation around justice reform and advances policies that promote well-being and justice for all people and communities. The ultimate goal of DYS is to strengthen and increase the safety of Missouri communities by supporting young people in becoming productive citizens who lead fulfilling lives. The Missouri approach to juvenile justice emphasizes moving beyond symptoms to the root causes of juvenile delinquency so that changes made by young people are long-lasting, preparing them to return and contribute positively to their school, home, and community. National Center for Lesbian Rights The National Center for Lesbian Rights NCLR is a national legal organization committed to advancing the civil and human rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people and their families through litigation, legislation, policy, and public education. NCLR litigates precedent-setting cases at the trial and appellate court levels; advocates for equitable public policies affecting the LGBT community; provides free legal assistance to LGBT people and their legal advocates; and conducts community education on LGBT issues. National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice The National Center for Mental Health and Juvenile Justice NCMHJJ provides a national focal point aimed at improving policy and practice for youth with mental, substance use and trauma-related conditions—referred to as behavioral health conditions—who have come into contact with the juvenile justice system. The Peabody Research Institute at Vanderbilt University The

mission of PRI is to conduct research aimed at improving the effectiveness of programs for children, youth, and families. Using field research, program evaluation, and research synthesis meta-analysis, their faculty and staff help determine which programs are actually making a difference in the lives of the people they serve. PRI research addresses many aspects of child and family programs, such as their implementation, costs, dissemination, and social or political support. But the main focus for all of their work is the effects of programs on children and families. They encourage you to explore their current projects and learn more about PRI.

**Public Welfare Foundation** The Public Welfare Foundation supports efforts to advance justice and opportunity for people in need. The Foundation looks for strategic points where its funds can make a significant difference and improve lives through policy change and system reform. OJJDP supports states and communities in their efforts to develop and implement effective and coordinated prevention and intervention programs and to improve the juvenile justice system so that it protects public safety, holds offenders accountable, and provides treatment and rehabilitative services tailored to the needs of juveniles and their families.

## 6: American juvenile justice system - Wikipedia

*The juvenile justice system was designed to rehabilitate, rather than punish, youth who exhibited certain behaviors deemed "delinquent." Despite this stated goal, over the last several decades, children have been subjected to many of the same harsh, overly punitive policies imposed in the adult criminal justice system.*

Explain the justifications for community-based corrections programs. Identify the four types of prisons. Explain the concept of prison as a total institution. Corrections, Part 2 Explain some of the reasons for violent behavior in prisons. Describe the concepts on which parole is based and the typical conditions that accompany parole. Describe truth-in-sentencing laws and their goals. Special Issues Define delinquency and status offenses. Identify the four major differences between juvenile courts and adult courts. Identify the variables that correlate with juvenile crime rates. Distinguish cybercrime from traditional crime. Explain the activities and purposes of most hackers. The Criminal Justice System Describe governmental structure and its relationship to criminal justice. Describe the components of the criminal justice system and the criminal justice process. Explain the differences between major crime-reporting programs in the United States. Describe crime rates, arrest rates, and clearance rates in the United States. History and Agencies Describe the historical development of police agencies and their jurisdiction. List five main types of law enforcement agencies and the various agencies under the control of the U. Department of Homeland Security. List three primary purposes of police patrol. Describe the role of the police in contemporary society and in community policing. History and Processes Describe the historical development of U. Identify the steps involved in the pretrial criminal process. List the six basic steps of an appeal. Outline the dual court system in the United States. Players and Sentencing Explain the differences among members of the courtroom work group. Explain how a prosecutor screens potential cases. Compare and contrast the four basic philosophical reasons for sentencing criminals. Define the six forms of punishment. Tuition for individual courses varies. For more information, please call or chat live with an Enrollment Representative. Please ask about these special rates: For some courses, special tuition rates are available for current, certified P teachers and administrators. Please speak with an Enrollment Representative today for more details. For some courses, special tuition rates are available for active duty military members and their spouses.

# JUVENILE COURTS AT WORK (FOUNDATIONS OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE)

pdf

## 7: Juvenile Court: An Overview | [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com)

*The Annie E. Casey Foundation has been most persistent funder in this space, hammering away with reform efforts since the early s. MacArthur worked on the issue for 20 years before shifting the focus of its criminal justice work to over-incarceration and jails.*

It gave me a very realistic experience of our justice system and how it works. Student Foundations in Criminal Justice Foundations in Criminal Justice provides students with a broad overview of the criminal and juvenile justice systems. Students learn about historical developments and current practices in criminal law, corrections, and the courts. Throughout the course, they explore the meaning of crime and justice, and the relationship between criminal justice and social justice. Students examine course material through several lenses: Theoretical foundations of the legal system, and purposes and justifications of laws and social contracts. How the law and legal systems can be used both to protect and oppress. The balance of different kinds of power within society is also explored. Law and Law Enforcement: How laws are created, enforced, and interpreted. The relationship between law and public policy at the federal, state and local levels of government are also studied. How individuals and groups, including young people, can take action to reform our legal system. What career paths exist in the legal and criminal justice systems, and how the pursuit of a particular profession can serve as a form of civic action. Essential Questions What is crime? What are the functions of a criminal justice system? How do criminal justice systems balance the safety of the community with the need to protect individual rights? What are the different roles, responsibilities, and limits of professions in the criminal and juvenile justice systems? How do criminal and juvenile justice systems affect young people, and how can they work to improve the administration of justice in their communities? Course Sequence Unit 1: There Ought to Be a Law! Defining Crime and Justice Unit 2: Responses to Crime Unit 3: Jury Trials and the Pursuit of Justice Unit 4: Exploring the Juvenile Justice System Unit 5: Engaging Youth in the Law: Current Issues in Criminal Justice Educators and administrators, register or login to access the full curriculum.

## 8: Juvenile Justice Grants, Grants for At Risk Youth Programs - GrantWatch

*Foundation for Criminal Justice The Foundation for Criminal Justice preserves and promotes the core values of the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers and the American criminal justice system.*

The FCJ embraces the fundamental concept that counsel must be provided to all accused persons at any court appearance at which a guilty plea to any crime may be entered or at which liberty is at risk. This goal remains elusive throughout much of the country. After extensive research and more than interviews with key stakeholders, the Task Force identified several significant, persistent deficiencies in the system. This report explores those concerns and offers seven recommendations to assure a robust federal public defense system. Learn more about how the FCJ supports public defense reform. The problem is compounded by a system that unduly imbues prosecutors with an excessively disproportionate array of tools, including unbridled charging authority, mandatory minimum sentences, and largely unreviewable discretion to control the flow of information to the defense. This is known as the trial penalty. The resulting systematic imbalance impels even innocent people to waive fundamental constitutional rights. Material Indifference and Brady Disclosure In courtrooms across the nation, accused persons are convicted without ever having seen information that was favorable to their defense. What role does judicial review play in the disclosure of favorable information to accused? The results revealed a troubling answer—“the judiciary is impeding fair disclosure in criminal cases and, in doing so, encouraging prosecutors to disclose as little favorable information as possible. There are at least 45, collateral consequences of arrest or conviction. This vast array of legal restrictions, generalized discrimination, and social stigma have become more severe, more public, and more frequently permanent. Collateral Damage and the Task Force on the Restoration of Rights With more than 65 million people in America having some form of a criminal record, the universality and import of the problem this nonpartisan report tackles is tremendous. Included among the witnesses were those who have faced unfair, irrational, and often life-altering barriers arising from a brush with the criminal law. Many of their stories are captured in the report. With more than one in four adults in the United States having some form of a criminal record, and more than 2. This groundbreaking project brought together leading experts from all corners of the criminal justice system over two conferences to identify effective and practical solutions to end racial and ethnic criminal justice disparities. Learn more about the project. The result was Under Siege: Learn more about the project or watch the webinars. Protecting the Fourth Amendment In no area is the role of the criminal defense more vital than in defining individual privacy rights. The FCJ supports efforts to ensure that the Fourth Amendment remains a vibrant protection against encroachments on individual privacy and liberty. This is an especially vital role in the digital age. The FCJ believes that Fourth Amendment protections should neither turn on the medium used to transmit private information, nor on how that information is stored. That report also revealed that federal prosecutors used a mail cover to monitor the communications between a criminal defendant and his lawyers, one of whom was Past President of NACDL Cynthia Orr. It collects news from leading publications across the nation; features a comprehensive listing of legislative developments; and contains sections devoted to relevant case law, scholarship, upcoming events, and data on drone usage. The Domestic Drone Information Center also aggregates existing material from other websites, making it a launching pad to additional information about domestic drones on the web. This project was made possible in part by support from the Foundation for Criminal Justice. Resources for Lawyers The Resource Counsel Project at NACDL, made possible by initial support from the FCJ, provides access to technical assistance for, among others, court-appointed counsel, contract defenders, and solo and small firm defense attorneys. The goal of this project is to give all defense lawyers access to information and direct assistance on as range of critical topics from the basics of criminal procedure, to the cutting edge of substantive criminal law, like motions to challenge eyewitness identification procedures. The Resource Counsel has developed a broad, web-based technical assistance module for defense lawyers, as well as provided innumerable attorneys with

## JUVENILE COURTS AT WORK (FOUNDATIONS OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE)

pdf

direct technical assistance. Additional examples of recently launched web-based training programs and resources are: The Proportionality Litigation Project is a collection of individual downloadable documents that summarize for each U. Having the resource counsel position has also permitted NACDL to obtain funding to train defense lawyers on a number of critical and topical issues. The trainings have been made available online without any charge, and remain available on demand, in an effort to reach the broadest possible audience.

## 9: Juvenile Justice - The Annie E. Casey Foundation

*In , some , children were prosecuted as adults. That same year, the Campaign for Youth Justice was launched with the singular goal of removing youth from the adult criminal justice system. Since that time, 36 states and Washington, D.C., have passed 70 pieces of legislation to move youth out of the adult criminal justice system.*

Pre[ edit ] Juvenile delinquency punishments trace back to the Middle Ages when crimes were severely punished by the Church. Throughout the 17th and 18th centuries, few legal differences existed between children and adults. In court, children as young as seven were treated as adults and could receive the death penalty. Barry Krisberg and James F. Austin note that the first ever institution dedicated to juvenile delinquency was the New York House of Refuge in Prior to this ideological shift, the application of *parens patriae* was restricted to protecting the interests of children, deciding guardianship and commitment of the mentally ill. In the landmark case *Ex parte Crouse*, the court allowed use of *parens patriae* to detain young people for non-criminal acts in the name of rehabilitation. The s through the s saw a rise in attention to and speculation about juvenile delinquency, as well as concern about the court system as a social issue. This era was characterized by distinctly harsh punishments for youths. Criticism in this era focused on racial discrimination, gender disparities, and discrimination towards children with mental health problems or learning disabilities. Today in America no population poses a larger threat to public safety than juvenile offenders". Americans feared a "juvenile super-predator", and this fear was met by the government with harsher policies for juvenile crime. As Loyola law professor Sacha Coupet argues, "[o]ne way in which "get tough" advocates have supported a merger between the adult criminal and juvenile systems is by expanding the scope of transfer provisions or waivers that bring children under the jurisdiction of the adult criminal system". Still others require the courts to treat offending youth like adults, but within the juvenile system. In some states, adjudicated offenders face mandatory sentences. The War on Drugs and "tough-on-crime" policies like Three Strikes resulted in an explosion in the number of incarcerated individuals. Today this is frequently referred to as the School to prison pipeline. Demographics[ edit ] Demographic information for youth involved in the Juvenile Justice system is somewhat difficult to collect, as most data is collected at state, county, and city levels. Although the office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention publishes national numbers that breakdown the racial make-up of youth involved in the juvenile justice system, this data provides an incomplete picture, as it excludes Hispanic youth in its demographic calculations. A demographic breakdown of youth in the United States. A demographic breakdown of youth involved in juvenile court in the United States. According to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, in there were a total of 1., cases handled by the juvenile courts. The most prominent age group represented in the courts is 13 to 15 years, which make up , of the total cases. After this point, the number of cases steadily declined until However, disparities by race remain apparent: African-Americans are close to five times more likely to be confined than white youths, while Latino and Native Americans are two to three times more likely to be confined than white youths. Casey Foundation provides additional information about the demographics of the juvenile justice system. Juveniles in residential placement[ edit ] Residential placement refers to any facility in which an adolescent remains on-site 24 hours a day. These facilities include detention centers, group homes, shelters, correctional facilities, or reform schools. Casey Foundation, the number of youths in juvenile detention centers in the United States has declined in the past two decades. In contrast, there were fewer than 62, adolescents in residential placement in October Private facilities are smaller than public facilities. Half of all juvenile placement facilities in the US are privately operated, and these facilities hold nearly one-third of juvenile offenders. As of , only 1 in 4 juveniles in confinement were incarcerated as a result of a violent crime homicide, robbery, sexual assault, aggravated assault. These include underage possession of alcohol, truancy, drug possession, low-level property offenses, and probation violations. The school to prison pipeline has been described as one mechanism that targets young people in schools and funnels them into the juvenile justice

system. Zero tolerance policies in schools have increased the numbers of young people facing detention. Low-income youth, youth of color and youth with learning and cognitive disabilities are over-represented in the justice system and disproportionately targeted by zero tolerance policies. Currently the juvenile system has failed to ensure that all youth in the system with learning disabilities or mental health issues, and from lower-class individuals and racial minorities are provided with the benefits for a productive life once out of the system. The report recommended juvenile detention facilities should be held to the same academic standards as other public schools. Finley argues for early intervention in juvenile delinquency, and advocates for the development of programs that are more centered on rehabilitation rather than punishment. They also argue that the most effective ways to reform the juvenile justice system would be to reduce the overrepresentation of minorities and eliminate the transfer of juveniles to the criminal justice system. They argue that educational reentry programs should be developed and given high importance alongside policies of dropout prevention. Reentry programs focus on providing care and support to juveniles after being released from detention facilities, and encouraging family support to help adolescents during this adjustment period. One recommendation from the Annie E. Casey Foundation is restricting the offenses that are punishable by incarceration, so that only youth who present a threat to public safety are confined. Other suggestions include investing in alternatives to incarceration, changing economic incentives that favor incarceration, and establishing smaller, more humane and treatment-oriented detention centers for the small number who are confined. The justice system offers specific services to youth facing significant mental health and substance use challenges, but the majority of youth do not qualify for these targeted programs and interventions. Philosophically however, the PYD framework resembles the progressive era ideals that informed the creation of the first juvenile court. As Butts, Mayer and Ruther describe, "The concepts underlying PYD resemble those that led to the founding of the American juvenile justice system more than a century ago. They believed an improved social environment would encourage youth to embrace pro-social norms. Taken together, these theories suggest that "youth are less attracted to criminal behavior when they are involved with others, learning useful skills, being rewarded for using those skills, enjoying strong relationships and forming attachments, and earning the respect of their communities". Youth court[ edit ] Youth courts are programs in which youth sentence their peers for minor delinquent and status offenses and other problem behaviors. The program philosophy is to hold youth responsible for problem behavior, educate youth about the legal and judicial systems, and empower youth to be active in solving problems in their community. Youth courts function to determine fair and restorative sentences or dispositions for the youth respondent. Youth court programs can be administered by juvenile courts, juvenile probation departments, law enforcement, private nonprofit organizations, and schools. Youth court programs operate under four primary models: Under the adult judge model, an adult volunteer serves as the judge while youth volunteers serve as prosecuting and defense attorneys, jurors, clerks, and bailiffs. Under the youth judge model, youth volunteers fill all roles, including judge. Under a peer jury model, youth jurors question the respondents and make sentencing determinations. Under a youth tribunal model, youth serve as prosecuting and defense attorneys, and present their cases to a panel of youth judges, who then make a sentencing determination. To date, there are no comprehensive national guidelines for youth courts, but rather, courts operate under and are tailored to their local jurisdictions. To date, there are more than youth courts in the United States. The East Palo Alto youth court is based on restorative justice principles. Eligible youth must admit the facts of the case, after which youth attorneys explain the facts of the case to a youth jury. It is based on a restorative justice framework. Victims and offenders both take an active role in the process, with the latter being encouraged to take responsibility for their actions. Programs that promote dialogue between victim and offender demonstrate the highest rates of victim satisfaction and offender accountability. New York and North Carolina remain the only states to prosecute all youth as adults when they turn 16 years of age.

Air bags, car seats, and child safety Calcium carbonate application at Puslinch Lake (Cambridge, Ontario for phosphorus control Victoria landmarks Understanding Windows 95 Sligh grandfather clock owners manual Temporary Nanny (Harlequin Superromance) Windsor Red (A Charmian Daniels Mystery) Say hello to Cactus Flats Environmental science engineering notes Solar Polarization 3 Hp designjet 8000 service manual Windows azure tutorial espa±ol Age of psychology. Farrars life and work of saint paul Portraits of vision Julian rotter locus of control theory Fundamentals of Instrumentation and Measurement (Instrumentation and Measurement Series) By persons unknown Night train lead sheet The will to believe and other essays: Authors preface Special Miracles at Journeys End Genetics of childhood-onset psychiatric disorders S. Evelyn Stewart and David L. Pauls William Claxton: Jazz Seen LANGUAGE FEELINGS (A Kangaroo book) Electric properties of matter Cpr callblocker v5000 white list Political science research paper example Political movements and terrorism Mountain memories II Day by day through Lent Asia continent country list Usa today bestselling list Ansel Adams and the photographers of the American West Philosophical disease Indianhead ridge and beyond The shoemakers children travel barefoot Kimble InstructorS Manual (Tm to Accompany Principles of Psychology Lost treasures of Dracula Not quite mine catherine bybee For those who work