

THE ROLE OF THE PROSECUTOR IN JUVENILE JUSTICE:



ADVOCACY IN THE COURTROOM AND LEADERSHIP IN THE COMMUNITY

December 20, 2005

James C. Backstrom
Dakota County Attorney
Hastings, Minnesota

Gary L. Walker
Prosecuting Attorney
Marquette County, Michigan

**THE ROLE OF THE PROSECUTOR IN JUVENILE JUSTICE:
ADVOCACY IN THE COURTROOM AND LEADERSHIP IN THE COMMUNITY**

December 20, 2005¹

By: James C. Backstrom
and
Gary L. Walker*

I. INTRODUCTION

Juvenile justice is the most challenging and complex area of practice for prosecutors in America today. During the 1980's and continuing until 1994, there was an unparalleled increase in the number of criminal offenses committed by juveniles in this country.

Arrests of juvenile offenders for murder skyrocketed between 1985 and 1993, rising approximately 150%.² Juvenile arrests for aggravated assault also rose dramatically by over 120% from 1983 to 1994.³ Total arrests of juveniles for serious violent offenses increased by 67% between 1985 and 1994.⁴ Arrests of juveniles for weapons offenses rose by 93% during this same timeframe.⁵ In many areas of our country, substantial growth occurred in nonviolent juvenile crime over this time period as well.⁶ The growth rates in juvenile crime between 1985 and 1994⁷ far outpaced the rate for adults, which began to decline in most categories beginning in 1992.⁸

Fortunately, juvenile crime rates in America began to decline in 1994. In 2000, there were an estimated 1,200 juvenile arrests for murder.⁹ Between 1996 and 2000, juvenile arrests for murder fell 55%.¹⁰ Murder arrests were 74% lower in 2000 than they were in 1993. Juvenile arrests for violence in 2002 were the lowest since 1987.¹¹ Aggravated assault arrests dropped 14 percent from 1996 to 2000 as well.¹² The number of juvenile arrests in 2000 (2.4 million) was 5% below the 1999 level and 15% below the 1996 level.¹³ Additionally, the juvenile arrest rate for Property Crime Index offenses fell 37% between 1994 and 2000.¹⁴ Between the peak years and 2000, the juvenile arrest rate for robbery declined substantially (57%), falling to its lowest level in two decades.¹⁵

This decline is obviously good news and hopefully predictive for the future. The question remains, however, whether juvenile crime decreases will continue over the next two decades given the large increases we have seen and will continue to see in the number of juveniles in our country between 1990 and 2010. Estimates in a 1998 Bureau of the Census report reflect a growth in juvenile population of approximately 22% during this time period.¹⁶

.....
* James C. Backstrom is County Attorney in Dakota County, Minnesota and a past-Vice President of the National District Attorneys Association (NDAA). Gary L. Walker is Prosecuting Attorney in Marquette County, Michigan, and a past-Vice President of NDAA. Mr. Backstrom and Mr. Walker have served as co-chairs of NDAA's Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee from 1995 to 2002 and 2004 to the present.

Despite dramatic decreases in the overall number of juvenile offenses since 1994, juvenile crime continues to be a significant problem in America. Juvenile crime involves youth from all backgrounds and juvenile violence not only occurs in the urban areas of our country, but also in suburban and rural areas. Also, we are continuing to see isolated instances of extreme violence committed by juvenile offenders in both urban, suburban and rural areas. Perhaps the most significant example of the encroachment of juvenile violence into rural and suburban America has been the rash of tragic school shootings that have occurred since 1996 in Moses Lake, Washington; Bethel, Alaska; Pearl, Mississippi; West Paducah, Kentucky; Jonesboro, Arkansas; Springfield, Oregon; Littleton, Colorado, among other cities.¹⁷ The two most recent school shootings in this country both occurred in Minnesota, in 2003 at Cold Spring and in 2005 at Red Lake. School shootings in America from 1996 to 2005 left fifty-nine students and teachers dead and 144 others seriously wounded.¹⁸ The defendants in these cases were between the ages of eleven and eighteen.¹⁹ These types of multiple killings by children were unheard of even two decades ago and while they are not reflective of typical juvenile crime in America today, they do represent a very alarming trend which cannot be ignored.

Given significant growth in the number of juveniles in America as referenced above, continuing instances of extreme acts of juvenile violence, rapid growth in methamphetamine use, and continuing use of other controlled substances and alcohol by minors, we need to start or continue large-scale, community-wide efforts to address the problem of juvenile crime in America. We can ill afford to sit back and wait.

The challenge for prosecutors dealing with juvenile crime is not merely a reflection of increasing caseloads. No longer does the prosecutor serve merely as the gatekeeper to the juvenile court system by determining which juveniles should be charged with crimes, who should be diverted from prosecution and whether or not efforts should be made to seek waiver or transfer to adult criminal court. While these basic, core functions remain for all prosecutors, to cope with the complexity of juvenile crime today, juvenile prosecutors must do far more. Greater expertise is needed to address violent crimes committed by juveniles and new laws dealing with victim rights, transfer to adult court, and expanded juvenile court jurisdiction. Today's juvenile prosecutor must not only serve as an advocate for justice, for the victim, and for community values, he/she must also serve as a negotiator and dispositional advisor in juvenile cases. Additionally, today's juvenile prosecutor must go beyond the courthouse and become a community leader and teacher, working with civic and social groups, churches and schools, to prevent juvenile crime before it occurs. This Article addresses both the core functions and the expanding challenges facing today's juvenile prosecutor.

II. ORGANIZING THE PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE TO RESPOND MOST EFFECTIVELY TO JUVENILE CRIME

A. Assigning an Experienced and Trained Juvenile Prosecutor is Critical.

Working with juvenile cases may be the most important work any prosecutor will do during his/her career. It is vital, therefore, that juvenile prosecutors receive appropriate training and be selected on the basis of their skill and competence.²⁰ The chief prosecutor should look to issues such as "knowledge of juvenile law, interest in children and youth, education, and

experience” in determining which assistants should be assigned to handle juvenile court matters.²¹ Prior criminal trial experience and adequate training to develop trial skills are also very important.²²

The practice of assigning juvenile court cases to entry-level prosecutors, which historically has been the pattern in many prosecutors’ offices, must change. In today’s world, juvenile cases are clearly as important, and certainly more complex, than those involving adult offenders. Tomorrow’s adult criminals are being seen in juvenile court today. Juvenile cases often pose technical difficulties not always seen in adult cases. Additionally, the presentation of evidence and dispositional alternatives require expertise that the new, under trained or less experienced prosecutor cannot provide. Juveniles who commit criminal offenses require special attention. The chances of successful rehabilitation with juvenile offenders may be greater than with most adult offenders. Therefore, it is vital to have a single, trained, experienced deputy who can evaluate the case, the juvenile’s criminal and social history and the dispositional alternatives in the effort to obtain justice.

B. Vertical Prosecution of Juvenile Cases Should Occur Whenever Possible.

Vertical prosecution (assigning the same prosecutor from initial charging through disposition) ensures continuity in the handling of juvenile cases. The lack of continuity resulting from using different prosecutors in the same case may reduce the opportunity for obtaining meaningful consequences and successful rehabilitation.²³ Vertical prosecution provides a message that the prosecution will stand firm,²⁴ both to the juvenile’s attorney and to the court. It is beneficial to have one person applying consistent criteria in an effort to hold juveniles accountable for their behavior. Continuity may be accomplished by assigning all probation violations and future cases to one prosecutor,²⁵ preferably the same individual who handled the initial prosecution, if possible. In larger jurisdictions, vertical prosecution may not be an alternative in those cases waived or transferred to adult court because those cases are usually prosecuted by the adult prosecution unit. However, the adult unit prosecutor should discuss all of the details surrounding the juvenile’s background with any juvenile prosecutor who has previously dealt with the youth to ensure the most effective prosecution and the most appropriate sentence.

C. Juvenile Cases Should Be Processed As Quickly As Possible.

Time is a major consideration in handling juvenile cases. Children often fail to remember what actions they took yesterday, let alone several months earlier.²⁶ The longer it takes to complete a juvenile case, the more likely the child will lose the long-term message.²⁷ While speedy processing of all juvenile cases is a goal, timely response is most important when dealing with serious, violent or habitual offenders.²⁸ These offenders serve as an example to other juveniles. Therefore, the juvenile justice system needs to demonstrate that the community has expectations of behavior, will not tolerate violations of those expectations and will swiftly sanction any violations.²⁹ When the crime is far removed from the ultimate disposition of the case, such a demonstration cannot be made.³⁰

III. THE PROSECUTOR SERVES AS THE GATEKEEPER TO THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM.

A. Charging Function

A prosecutor should serve as a gatekeeper to the juvenile justice system by determining who should be charged with crimes, who should be diverted from prosecution, and whether or not efforts will be made to seek waiver or transfer to adult criminal court. The discretionary decision to charge or not charge is the heart of the prosecutorial function.³¹ The exercise of appropriate prosecutorial discretion is as essential in juvenile court as it is in adult court. Such discretionary decisions require legal expertise, consistency of purpose and accountability.³² The decision as to which charges, if any, are appropriate or whether the juvenile should be diverted into a program designed to ensure accountability without charging should be based upon all of the available facts and evidence in a case.³³ While the prosecutor's primary duty is to seek justice and to protect the public safety, it is also appropriate to consider the special interests and needs of the juvenile to the extent that this can be done without compromising the safety and welfare of the community.³⁴

A juvenile prosecutor should have the right to screen cases to determine whether facts of each case are legally sufficient for prosecution.³⁵ Legal sufficiency exists only in those cases in which a prosecutor reasonably believes the charges can be proven by admissible evidence at trial.³⁶ In other words, the prosecutor must determine that there is sufficient probable cause to believe that a delinquent act was committed and that the juvenile accused committed it.³⁷ If not, no charges should be pursued.³⁸

In some jurisdictions in this country, the prosecutor's office does not have the responsibility by law or practice to initiate juvenile court prosecutions. The NDAA believes that such a system is inappropriate.³⁹ The NDAA sets forth the following reasons for this conclusion:

- Prosecutors have a responsibility to represent the state in court on juvenile cases and, therefore, should have the right to determine what cases are filed in that court.
- Prosecutors are unable to utilize an effective prosecution policy or effectively implement prosecution standards without control over the charging decision.
- Prosecutors are trained on the legal aspects of the charging process.
- Prosecutors give public safety a high priority in their decision-making process.
- Prosecutors take into consideration the interests of the victim and have a process for giving and receiving information from victims.
- Prosecutors have access to both the criminal and social background of the juvenile.

- Prosecutors are more easily accountable to the public than are other individuals in the juvenile justice system.⁴⁰

Charging is an executive function which the judicial branch should not perform because of the need to maintain appropriate separation of powers. Also, charging is not an appropriate police or corrections department responsibility because of the need to ensure proper legal review of the sufficiency of the evidence to proceed.⁴¹ Prosecutors are governed by ethical standards that are not applicable to police or corrections officials. The decision to charge someone with a crime is appropriately a decision that should be made by an independent prosecutor who serves in the executive branch of government.

B. Development of Charging and Disposition Guidelines

Many prosecutors have adopted written charging and disposition guidelines. In Minnesota, prosecutors are required to do so by law.⁴² Adopting such guidelines does not limit the discretion of a prosecutor's office in charging and disposing of cases, but does assure the public that prosecutors are exercising this discretion by looking at fair, non-discriminatory and appropriate factors. Charging and disposition guidelines for juvenile cases should, therefore, be developed by the prosecutor's office.

C. Diversion

The decision to divert a case from prosecution is also a charging decision. It is a determination that sufficient evidence exists to file a charge in court but that the goals of prosecution can be reasonably reached through diversion.⁴³ Prosecutors should consider establishing diversion programs for appropriate first-time or low-level juvenile offenders who pose no apparent danger to the public safety. Diversion programs should contain criteria to insure that the diverted juvenile offender is held accountable for his/her actions and that restitution is made to the victim of the crime where appropriate. Diversion programs can also play an important role in education and prevention efforts which are critical to efforts to reduce rising levels of juvenile crime in this country.⁴⁴ In the event an agency other than the prosecutor's office coordinates a juvenile diversion program, the prosecutor should be involved in establishing the eligibility criteria and other guidelines for the program.⁴⁵ Any diversion program should contain provisions to insure that diverted juveniles who do not successfully complete the program are referred back to the prosecutor's office for prosecution.⁴⁶

The NDAA's National Prosecution Standards for Juvenile Justice address the factors that should be taken into consideration by a prosecutor in determining whether to charge juveniles formally or whether to divert them from prosecution. These factors include:

- (1) The seriousness of the alleged offense;
- (2) The role of the juvenile in that offense;
- (3) The nature and number of previous cases presented by the police or others against the juvenile and the disposition of those cases;
- (4) The juvenile's age and maturity;

- (5) The availability of appropriate treatment or services;
- (6) Whether the juvenile admits guilt or involvement in the offense charged;
- (7) The dangerousness or threat posed by the juvenile to the persons or property of others;
- (8) The provision of financial restitution to victims; and
- (9) Recommendations of the referring agency, victim and advocates for the juvenile.⁴⁷

As with charging and disposition guidelines, the use of diversion-program guidelines promotes public confidence that eligibility standards for the program are fair, nondiscriminatory and appropriate. These guidelines will also assist juvenile offenders, their attorneys, and parents in clearly understanding who is eligible for the program and what the program requirements will be.

D. Prosecution of Juveniles in Adult Criminal Court

Juveniles who commit crimes are usually subject to the jurisdiction of juvenile court.⁴⁸ In certain situations, depending upon the seriousness of the crime, the threat to public safety, the age of the juvenile, the juvenile's criminal history and other relevant factors, the juvenile offender may be tried in adult criminal court.⁴⁹ The process by which this is accomplished is commonly referred to as transfer, waiver, or certification, depending upon the jurisdiction.⁵⁰ Whether or not a juvenile offender should be prosecuted in adult court is one of the most critical decisions within the juvenile justice system.⁵¹

A number of jurisdictions throughout America have adopted or are considering changes in laws pertaining to the process of certifying serious, violent, and habitual offenders to adult court. Minnesota and Michigan have both adopted such changes.⁵²

Three main categories exist under the laws in various states regarding how the decision of whether a juvenile should be prosecuted as an adult are made:

- (1) The legislature mandates the transfer of a juvenile case to adult court;
- (2) The prosecutor is vested with the discretion to determine whether to transfer a juvenile case to adult court; and
- (3) The juvenile court judge is vested with the discretion to determine whether a juvenile case should be transferred to adult court.⁵³

Most jurisdictions follow a process similar to category (3) in which the juvenile court judge makes the final decision on whether a case should be transferred to adult court. However, in most of these jurisdictions, it is the prosecutor who has the discretion to determine whether the process should be initiated. In exercising that discretion, the primary factors affecting this decision should be the seriousness of the crime and the threat to the public safety, not what is in the best interests of the child, which has long been the standard applicable in most juvenile court proceedings.

Many would argue that those juveniles who commit serious or violent crimes and who are over a certain age should automatically be prosecuted as adults. A number of states are considering the enactment of legislation to this effect. Minnesota has adopted this automatic, adult prosecution standard for youth who are at least sixteen years old and charged with first degree murder, and in Michigan the waiver decision for juveniles over the age of 14 rests with the prosecutor in certain enumerated offenses.⁵⁴ The NDAA has adopted a policy recommending that, for serious, violent and habitual offenders, where factually appropriate, prosecutors should be given the discretion to file such cases in adult court without judicial intervention.⁵⁵

The NDAA also believes that once a juvenile case has been transferred to adult court for prosecution, prosecutions for all further crimes committed by the youth also should occur in adult court regardless of the seriousness of the offense,⁵⁶ if there has been a finding of probable cause⁵⁷ in adult court for the original offense. In those situations where a prior case in which a juvenile is being tried as an adult has not been completed, additional charges filed against this juvenile in unrelated cases should also be dealt with in adult court.⁵⁸

A number of states have adopted new juvenile code provisions providing for prosecution of juveniles who commit serious crimes, not necessarily sufficient to result in adult prosecution for the offense, in a manner that results in sanctions greater than a simple juvenile court disposition.⁵⁹ These types of juvenile code provisions are commonly referred to as “blended sentencing” laws.⁶⁰ Minnesota, for example, has adopted a “blended sentencing” model called Extended Jurisdiction Juvenile (EJJ) Prosecutions.⁶¹ EJJ prosecutions are commonly thought of as a “one last chance” for the juvenile offender to correct his/her behavior before facing an adult prison sanction. Cases prosecuted under Minnesota’s EJJ law result in an adult prison sentence for the crime which is stayed pending successful completion of a juvenile disposition in the case. The juvenile court’s jurisdiction is also extended from age 19 to 21. If the juvenile EJJ offender fails to comply with the conditions of the juvenile court disposition or commits a new crime before age 21, the stay of the adult prison sanction can be lifted and the prison term imposed.⁶²

The NDAA has adopted a position in favor of “blended sentencing” structures for serious, violent or habitual offenders who are not prosecuted as adults.⁶³ However, it is important that prosecutors insure that the results are logical, fair and consistent when using “blending sentencing” models.

IV. THE PROSECUTOR IS AN ADVOCATE FOR JUSTICE, THE VICTIM AND COMMUNITY VALUES

The prosecutor needs to be an advocate for justice, the victim and community values. It is easy in a juvenile justice system, which has long looked to the best interests of the child as its primary purpose, for prosecutors to lose their focus on the need to serve as advocates for justice. While prosecutors should consider the special interests and needs of a juvenile when handling a case, they should never lose sight of their primary duty to seek justice and protect the public safety and welfare of the community.⁶⁴

Juvenile prosecutors should ensure that the crime victims are kept properly notified of important decisions in the case, including charging and disposition matters, in the same manner as in adult prosecutions. Victims should be notified of and offered the opportunity to attend all hearings in a juvenile case and should be contacted, if possible, prior to accepting a plea agreement. The prosecutor should also ensure that the victim has the opportunity to address the court prior to disposition. Furthermore, the prosecutor must make efforts to ensure that restitution is paid so that the victim can, to the greatest extent possible, be made whole and not suffer financial losses as a result of the criminal activity.⁶⁵

Juvenile prosecutors also must keep in mind that they serve the interests of all the citizens in the community. The prosecutor's actions should be consistent with community values. To ensure awareness of these values, juvenile prosecutors should attend and participate in community meetings and other activities concerning juvenile crime or crime prevention within their jurisdictions. By doing so, they will hear firsthand the feelings of the public concerning juvenile crime and its consequences.

While many appropriate programs involving concepts of "restorative justice"⁶⁶ have been developed and implemented across the country, it is important to insure that these types of dispositions do not adversely impact the crime victim. In this regard, the NDAA's Resource Manual and Policy Positions on Juvenile Crime Issues points out: "...victims should not be required to participate in such [restorative justice] programs which require mediation between the offender and victim. Many crime victims do not desire any further contact with the offender who has victimized them and their rights in this regard need to be respected."⁶⁷

In reference to the pursuit of justice, the prosecutor must keep in mind the concepts of fairness and accountability. The punishment for an offense, whether it is through court disposition or part of a diversion program, should be applied fairly to all defendants under similar circumstances and should hold juvenile offenders accountable for their actions. The prosecutor may elect to exercise discretion to dismiss a case that may be technically sufficient, but that lacks prosecutorial merit from a policy or economic standpoint. The prosecutor may dismiss a case at any time in the proceedings if it is determined to be in the best interests of justice. However, care should be made to conform to appropriate guidelines in making these decisions. As mentioned above, prosecutors should adopt written charging and disposition guidelines which are available to the public to ensure both internal consistency and public accountability.

V. THE JUVENILE PROSECUTOR MUST SERVE AS A TRIAL AND DISPOSITIONAL ADVOCATE AS WELL AS AN EFFECTIVE NEGOTIATOR

Making a charging decision does not end the prosecutor's role and responsibilities. The prosecutor should take an active role in all phases of a juvenile case, including both adjudication and disposition.⁶⁸ The prosecutor should ensure that decisions involving juvenile cases are made in a timely fashion to protect juveniles' rights to a speedy disposition of their cases. Cases requiring the detention of a juvenile offender should receive priority treatment. As previously mentioned, the timely resolution of juvenile cases is even more important than in the adult criminal system. Juveniles need to understand clearly the harmful nature of their

actions and receive a timely disposition that holds them appropriately accountable. A disposition occurring many months after the juvenile's act will not have the same force and impact as one occurring in a more timely manner. Prompt determinations also promote public confidence in the system and fairness to the victim and to the community.

The juvenile prosecutor should assume the traditional adversary role in the adjudicatory hearing, recognizing, however, the particular vulnerability of child witnesses.⁶⁹ All juvenile witnesses, including suspects should they testify, must be treated fairly and with sensitivity in direct examination, cross-examination, and throughout the process.

The prosecutor should also be involved in all plea negotiations with a juvenile or the juvenile's attorney. In negotiating pleas, a prosecutor should follow appropriate guidelines for the disposition of cases to ensure fairness and public confidence in the decision. As mentioned above, efforts should be made to contact the victim prior to entering any plea agreement to obtain the victim's comments or concerns.

The prosecutor should be consulted in all decisions affecting the disposition of a case. No case should be dismissed without providing the prosecutor with notice and an opportunity to be heard.⁷⁰ Juvenile prosecutors should take an active role in the dispositional hearing in a juvenile case, including making recommendations to the court as to what should be the appropriate disposition.⁷¹ The prosecutor should review all reports prepared by the corrections department and others before making this recommendation. The prosecutor must "...ensure that the court is aware of the impact of the juvenile's conduct on the victim and community and should further report to the court concerning restitution and community service."⁷² The prosecutor should also take into consideration what the penalty for the crime would be if it had been committed by an adult.

The prosecutor should also provide input concerning the most appropriate dispositional program alternatives for a given case. Prosecutors should periodically evaluate the effectiveness of dispositional programs used for juvenile offenders within their jurisdictions from the standpoint of the public's and the youth's interests.⁷³ A dispositional decision which places a juvenile in a program that is not accomplishing the goals for which it was created is a waste of taxpayer resources and is not in the best interests of the juvenile offender or the public. The prosecutor should also seek new and more appropriate resources, and may create these resources through diversion programs coordinated by the prosecutor's office.⁷⁴

Age alone should not be a mitigating factor in the prosecutor's recommended disposition or the court's sentencing order for cases involving serious, violent or habitual juvenile offenders.⁷⁵ The prosecutor's dispositional recommendation, in the final analysis, should focus upon the prosecutor's primary role of protecting the public safety and welfare, holding the juvenile appropriately accountable for the crime committed, and meeting the needs and interests of the juvenile offender.⁷⁶

Regardless of whether the juvenile or adult justice system is used to adjudicate serious, violent or habitual juvenile offenders, meaningful sanctions should apply. Unfortunately, many states do not have sufficient resources to ensure that serious, violent or habitual offenders

are placed in a correctional setting. Such resources are needed. Probation alone is not an appropriate sanction for serious, violent or habitual juvenile offenders. The NDAA has concluded that the “primary factors affecting a juvenile’s sentence should be the seriousness of the crime, the protection of the community from harm, and accountability to the victim and the public for the juvenile’s behavior.”⁷⁷ Factors such as the seriousness of the juvenile’s prior criminal history should also be considered.

The concept of balanced and restorative justice, sometimes referred to as BARJ, has been incorporated into the juvenile codes of several states and has been expanding into practice in many other jurisdictions.⁷⁸ Restorative justice has different definitions in various jurisdictions, but the primary concept is the development of a new framework to crime that focuses on the injury resulting from the crime and the importance of repairing the harm to victims, communities and relationships. Restorative justice looks to the need to “restore” a community, the victim and the offender through the disposition of the criminal case. The NDAA has recognized the importance of incorporating restorative justice goals by adopting sentencing policies which include the need for a juvenile’s sentence to “...emphasize provisions for community safety, offender accountability, and competency development so that offenders can re-enter the community capable of pursuing non-criminal paths.”⁷⁹ It is important, however, not to lose sight of the need to retain “balance” in the restorative justice framework. Protecting public safety and insuring appropriate punishment for criminal behavior committed by juvenile offenders is critical, and juvenile prosecutors must assure that these important considerations are not overlooked in “restorative” dispositions in juvenile cases.

The NDAA Resource Manual and Policy Positions on Juvenile Crime Issues also underscores the importance of insuring an adequate response to less serious crimes committed by juvenile offenders by stating: As to less serious offenders, while there is a need to rehabilitate the juveniles, an important aspect of rehabilitation includes punishment.⁸⁰ There needs to be adequate resources for the court to impose punishment through the use of appropriate and effective sanctions.⁸¹

The prosecutor’s role does not end with a disposition hearing. The prosecutor should continue to represent the state’s interests in all appeals, as well as in hearings concerning revocation of probation, modification of disposition, or other collateral proceedings attacking orders of the court.⁸² The prosecutor should also take steps to let the juvenile court know if its orders are not properly being followed.⁸³ This follow-up by the prosecutor to ensure that dispositions are properly being carried out also helps maintain public confidence in our system of juvenile justice. Failure to provide consequences for noncompliance of parole or probation conditions endangers the public, creates a negative image of the system, and increases the likelihood that juvenile offenders will become more violent or habitual in their behavior. In this regard, the NDAA has adopted a policy that “[t]here should be assured consequences, including the use of detention space, for those juveniles who violate conditions of probation.”⁸⁴

VI. THE PROSECUTOR’S ROLE IN CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT CASES

Juvenile justice and delinquency should occupy a prominent role in a prosecutor’s office. Equally important is the prosecutor’s role in cases involving the abuse and neglect of children.

The protection of those in our communities who are the most vulnerable and unable to protect themselves are of obvious concern. Further, the clear correlation between the abuse and neglect of children and their likelihood to engage in future criminal behavior⁸⁵ suggests the safety of our community, our primary goal, will be well-served by an aggressive approach to these problems.

In Michigan and Minnesota, the Prosecuting Attorney and County Attorney, respectively, have clearly defined roles in child protection proceedings.⁸⁶ Appearing in court to present evidence and advocate for appropriate disposition in cases involving child abuse or neglect is a requirement.⁸⁷

There are, however, good reasons that the prosecutor should assume a larger role than simply courtroom representation. Often the social service agencies charged with the investigation of child abuse are not adequately trained in either investigation or the standards of evidence necessary to successfully present cases in court. An experienced prosecutor can provide the training and guidance in these areas. The drafting of the petition with allegations of abuse or neglect should be done by the prosecutor because he or she is familiar with burden of proof, evidentiary standards and legal sufficiency.

The prosecutor should also assume an active role beyond the factual adjudication or finding by the court that abuse or neglect has occurred. A review of dispositional recommendations by the social service agency and court worker should be done as a routine function. If necessary, an independent recommendation from the prosecutor should be presented to the court. The policy of state agencies is often drawn by economic considerations, which may not coincide with the best interest of the child in an individual case. Remember, as the prosecutor you are the voice of your community.

Obviously, an aggressive role in child abuse and neglect cases requires a prosecutor or assistant prosecutor who is dedicated to his or her role in juvenile court. It takes time and experience to become familiar with all of the dispositional programs and alternatives and to tailor them to each individual case.

Prosecutors are in a unique position to discover instances of abuse or neglect as the focal point of adult and juvenile criminal cases. An in-depth examination of a child delinquency or incorrigibility may find that the behavior is occasioned by an abusive home. Domestic violence between adult partners may also involve the couple's children. Cases of criminal sexual abuse of a child should be examined to determine if an abuse/neglect petition is appropriate in addition to criminal charges.

Even if your state does not give you jurisdiction in cases of abuse and neglect of children, you should approach cases involving a child with an eye toward making a referral to the appropriate agency. Also, if your jurisdiction does not permit your involvement, you should consider lobbying for changes necessary to become involved, both for the protection of our children and ultimately of society as a whole.

VII. THE PROSECUTOR SHOULD BE INVOLVED IN COMMUNITY OUTREACH EFFORTS TO ADDRESS JUVENILE CRIME

Perhaps the most important role for a juvenile prosecutor today is one that does not occur in the courthouse. If we are to solve the juvenile-crime crisis facing our society, education, prevention, and early intervention are the keys to success. NDAA's Resource Manual and Policy Positions on Juvenile Crime Issues points out that: "Education and prevention go hand in hand with effective law enforcement and prosecution efforts, especially in the area of juvenile crime."⁸⁸ Prosecutors should become directly involved in these activities. However, police and prosecutors cannot solve the juvenile crime-problem alone. It will take the united efforts of everyone to solve these problems, including parents, youth, teachers, school administrators, faith communities, civic and business leaders, law enforcement officials and community-based organizations.⁸⁹

Prosecutors can serve a valuable role in educating the public concerning juvenile justice issues by taking the opportunity to address these important matters in public speeches and presentations. Prosecutors also can serve a valuable role by participating in juvenile crime prevention programs within their communities. The NDAA has recognized the importance of this concept in its Resource Manual and Policy Positions on Juvenile Crime Issues by stating: "Efforts aimed at education, prevention and early intervention are a critical part of any community's war on crime. Young people at early ages must be taught the dangers of using illegal drugs and abusing alcohol. Youth must also learn to confront their problems in nonviolent ways."⁹⁰

As public leaders, prosecutors are in an ideal position to help coordinate prevention efforts, by facilitating the creation of programs designed to help reduce juvenile crime and to promote health and safety. Innovative programs involving diversion for appropriate first-time or low-level juvenile offenders have been established by prosecutors throughout our nation,⁹¹ as have a number of prosecutor-led truancy intervention programs.⁹² Prosecutor-led education programs have also been developed, such as an innovative project entitled "Courtrooms to Classrooms", first implemented by the Denver District Attorney's Office, which involves a prosecutor who goes into schools to help elementary or middle school students understand how our criminal justice system works and to provide them with a positive role model.⁹³

The NDAA believes in the importance of funding proven crime prevention initiatives, recognizing that programs proven to keep kids from becoming criminals in the first place are some of the most powerful weapons in law enforcement's arsenal against crime.⁹⁴ Fight Crime: Invest In Kids, a group led by over 300 police chiefs, prosecutors and crime survivors from throughout America, has been active in promoting the importance of funding proven crime prevention initiatives, including programs aimed at providing early childhood care, preventing child abuse and neglect, and ensuring that quality child care and after school activities are available for America's youth.⁹⁵ The importance of these programs and their role in reducing criminal behavior is supported by scientific research. In Ypsilanti, Michigan, the High School Educational Research Foundation randomly admitted half of the at-risk three and four-year-old applicants to its quality preschool center and provided their parents with in-home coaching and parenting skills for an hour and half each week.⁹⁶ Twenty-two years after this

program ended, the children receiving these services were found to be **just one-fifth as likely** as kids denied the services to be chronic lawbreakers.⁹⁷ In another study in Syracuse, New York, at-risk kids who were provided early childhood services and a high quality preschool program were found to be **only one-tenth as likely** as kids denied these services to be delinquent by age 16.⁹⁸ Other research has shown that even programs that serve only a limited number of children have significantly reduced juvenile victimization during after school hours.⁹⁹ One study has shown that with intensive recruiting, after school programs have cut crime by as much as seventy-five percent in some high crime neighborhoods.¹⁰⁰ Another study concluded that participants in after school programs are more likely to do well in school, to treat adults with respect, and to resolve conflicts without violence.¹⁰¹

Youth who are neglected or abused in their early years run a significantly greater risk of acting out violently when they become teenagers.¹⁰² With almost three million American children reported as being abused or neglected in 1995,¹⁰³ we need to make sure that child protection agencies have sufficient resources to identify and treat abused and neglected children. Studies in this area have once again shown the importance of reducing violence and criminal behavior. The Prenatal and Early Infancy Project¹⁰⁴ assigned half a group of at-risk mothers to receive visits by specially trained nurses and provide coaching and parenting skills and other advice and support. Such a program was shown not only to **reduce child abuse by 80 percent** in the first two years, but also showed that after 15 years following the ending of these services, these mothers had only one-third as many arrests, and their children were **only half as likely** to be delinquent.¹⁰⁵ A similar “Healthy Start” Program¹⁰⁶ in Hawaii, which offered at-risk mothers preventive health care and home visits by para-professionals who coached them in parenting skills and child development and offered family counseling, showed that over a four-year period those who had not received such services were more than 2-1/2 times as likely to have a confirmed instance of child abuse within their families.¹⁰⁷

Truancy is one of the most important predictors of juvenile delinquency and is one of the common factors that runs through the background of almost all juveniles who find their way into court. Funding must be made available for effective truancy intervention programs and the prosecutors of our nation need to work hand in hand with our school districts and social workers to ensure that children are in school and receiving the education that they need to become productive and law abiding citizens in this country.

The importance of funding alcohol and drug abuse programs aimed at youth cannot be ignored. Use of alcohol and drugs is often a precursor to crime and delinquency. We must continue to make it a priority to ensure that our youth remain alcohol and drug free.

We must also do all we can to identify troubled and disruptive children at an early age and provide these children and their parents with counseling and training that can help avoid future criminal behavior. When elementary school children display disruptive behavior, this is a warning signal. Such children and their parents must be provided with appropriate counseling, social skills training, and other help to ensure their future success. Once again, this is an area where studies have already shown the importance of early intervention. A Montreal study¹⁰⁸ showed that providing disruptive first and second grade boys with services like these **cut in half** the odds that they would be placed in special classes, rated highly disruptive by a teacher

or by peers, or be required to repeat a grade in school. These are all signs reflecting the risk of future criminal behavior. Mentoring programs allowing youth access to positive adult role models are also extremely important, so that youth do not look to gang leaders for the support they need.

We must also continue to do everything we can as a society to promote positive assets in youth throughout America. There are far more good kids in this country who are positive role models in their communities than there are delinquents who are committing criminal offenses. We must mobilize these youth to promote their positive assets and enable them to become positive role models for other youth throughout the community. These youth can also serve as resources to help us identify problems and problem kids in our schools and in our communities.

It is important, however, to keep in mind that prevention must not come at the expense of failing to invest in prisons and juvenile detention facilities needed to house serious, violent and habitual offenders or at the expense of police, prosecutors, courts and corrections departments in America not receiving the funding they need to carry out their primary responsibilities of investigating, convicting, adequately punishing and monitoring juvenile criminal offenders. There is no substitute for getting dangerous criminals off the street and behind bars. But the message of Fight Crime: Invest In Kids is a compelling one which we can ill afford to ignore. We must continue our efforts to reduce crime by investing in proven prevention and intervention initiatives, like educational childcare, mentoring programs and after-school programs. Many law enforcement leaders in America believe such prevention investments are important. Balance between law enforcement and prevention efforts must exist for our criminal justice system to survive and adequately cope with the rising numbers of juvenile offenders who will be flooding its gates in the 21st century. Prosecutors and other law enforcement officials need to step beyond their traditional roles and become involved with these types of crime prevention programs. Efforts like these can pay many dividends in the long run by helping to reduce crime.

VII. CONCLUSION

As the NDAA recently noted in its Resource Manual and Policy Positions on Juvenile Crime Issues, “prosecutors are in the unique position of acting as society’s voice in the juvenile justice system.”¹⁰⁹ They are entrusted with insuring that those who violate our laws are brought to justice and held accountable. To do so, adequate laws must exist to ensure that violent and repeat juvenile offenders are appropriately dealt with by the juvenile justice system. Such laws may provide for adult prosecution for serious, violent and habitual offenders or for some form of blended sentencing law that provides adequate accountability and protection of the public. Prosecutors must also make sure never to underestimate the importance of dealing with low-level criminal behavior appropriately and aggressively in an effort to prevent the occurrence of more serious behavior. Very few youth are apprehended for acts of violence who have not had some prior contacts with police, schools or social workers over non-violent activities like alcohol abuse or truancy. Anti-social behavior must be addressed and appropriately dealt with from its onset.

To deal most efficiently with juvenile crime, prosecutors must also become involved in prevention and early intervention efforts in their communities. “A balanced approach to juvenile justice is clearly warranted -- one which emphasizes the enforcement, prosecution and detention of juvenile offenders, to protect the public safety and ensure accountability,” and the importance of pursuing prevention and intervention initiatives aimed at crime prevention.¹¹⁰ Prevention and prosecution are not incompatible. To the contrary, they must both be pursued with equal vigor to help reduce juvenile crime in America.¹¹¹ Prosecutors must not only continue to be effective advocates in the courtroom, but must look beyond their traditional roles and become community leaders by establishing programs and participating in initiatives aimed at reducing juvenile crime before it begins.

O:\ADMIN\JJAC\RoleProsecutorAdvocacyCtrmLeadershipCommunity12-20-05(IncludesChanges).doc

¹ This Article was initially completed on December 1, 1999. It was updated in 2005 to incorporate changes to the *National District Attorneys Association’s Resource Manual and Policy Positions on Juvenile Crime Issues* adopted on July 14, 2002 (see note 23 below for full citation), and to incorporate current juvenile crime statistics in the Introduction section.

² Bureau of the Census, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, *Statistical Abstract of the United States 1997*, at 209 (1997) [hereinafter *Statistical Abstract*].

³ Howard N. Snyder, *Juvenile Arrests 1996, Juvenile Justice Bulletin 5* (Nov. 1997).

⁴ *Statistical Abstract*, *supra* note 2, at 209.

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Dept. of Justice, *Uniform Crime Reports for the United States 1994*, at 221 (1995) [hereinafter *Crime Reports 1994*].

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Dept. of Justice, *Uniform Crime Reports for the United States 1993*, at 225 (1994) [hereinafter *Crime Reports 1993*]; *Crime Reports 1994, supra* note 6, at 225; Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Dept. of Justice, *Uniform Crime Reports for the United States 1995*, at 216 (1996) [hereinafter *Crime Reports 1995*]; Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Dept. of Justice, *Uniform Crime Reports for the United States 1996*, at 222 (1997) [hereinafter *Crime Reports 1996*]; Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Dept. of Justice, *Uniform Crime Reports for the United States 1997*, at 243 (1998) [hereinafter *Crime Reports 1997*].

⁹ U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Nov. 2002, *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*.

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² *Id.*

¹³ *Id.*

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ Bureau of the Census, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, *Population Projections of the United States by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1995 to 2050*, at 72, tbl. 2 (1996); Bureau of the Census, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, U.S. *Population Estimates by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1990-1997*, at 28, tbl. 1 (1998).

¹⁷ See “A Time Line of Recent Worldwide School Shootings” at <http://www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0777958.html>. This timeline contains a more complete listing of school shootings across America between February 2, 1996 and March 21, 2005; and See Richard Lacayo, “Toward the Root of the Evil”, *TIME*, Apr. 6, 1998, at 38.

¹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ *National District Attorneys Association, National Prosecution Standards* § 92.1d, at 251 (2d ed. 1991) [hereinafter *National Prosecution Standards*].

²¹ *Id.*

²² *Id.*

²³ *National District Attorneys Association, Resource Manual and Policy Positions on Juvenile Crime Issues* (July 14, 2002) [hereinafter *Juvenile Crime Issues*], at 5.

²⁴ *Id.*

²⁵ *Id.*

²⁶ *Id.*

²⁷ *Id.*

²⁸ *Id.* The National District Attorneys Association (NDAA) has defined serious, violent and habitual offenders as follows:

- a serious offender is one who is caught for the first time having committed multiple felony offenses, a major economic crime, repeated misdemeanor crimes of violence, or other offenses defined by a local jurisdiction as serious;
- a violent offender is one who was involved in the commission of a felony crime of violence;
- an habitual felony offender is one who was found guilty of at least two prior felonies.

None of these categories is mutually exclusive. (*See Juvenile Crime Issues*, at 1-2).

²⁹ *Id.* at 5.

³⁰ *Id.*

³¹ *Id.* at 6 (citing *Brown v. Dayton Hudson Corp.*, 314 N.W. 2d 210, 214 (Minn. 1981)).

³² *Id.* at 6.

³³ *Id.* at 7.

³⁴ National Prosecution Standards, *supra* note 20, § 92.1b, at 250.

³⁵ *Id.* § 92.2a, at 251.

³⁶ *Id.* § 92.2b, at 251.

³⁷ *Id.*

³⁸ *Id.*

³⁹ National Prosecution Standards, *supra* note 20, § 92.2, at 251-254; *Juvenile Crime Issues*, *supra* note 23, at 7.

⁴⁰ *Juvenile Crime Issues*, *supra* note 23, at 6.

⁴¹ *Id.* at 7.

⁴² Minnesota Statutes 2004, § 388.051, Subd. 3. A copy of the Charging and Disposition Guidelines of the Dakota County Attorney's Office for either adult or juvenile offenses can be found at www.co.dakota.mn.us/attorney.

⁴³ *Juvenile Crime Issues*, *supra* note 23, at 7.

⁴⁴ *Id.*

⁴⁵ *Id.*

⁴⁶ *Id.*

⁴⁷ National Prosecution Standards, *supra* note 20, § 92.2g, at 253.

⁴⁸ *Juvenile Crime Issues*, *supra* note 23, at 9.

⁴⁹ *Id.*

⁵⁰ *Id.*

⁵¹ *Id.*

⁵² Minnesota Statutes 2004, § 260B.125 and Michigan Compiled Laws Annotated 712A.4 (West 1999).

⁵³ *Juvenile Crime Issues*, *supra* note 23, at 9.

⁵⁴ Minnesota Statutes 2004, § 260B.007, Subd. 6(b); and Michigan Compiled Laws Annotated 600.606(1).

⁵⁵ *Juvenile Crime Issues*, *supra* note 23, at 8.

⁵⁶ *Id.* at 10.

⁵⁷ *Id.* at 10: "The notion of 'probable cause' is added to the policy concerning this issue to address those situations in which a juvenile who is prosecuted as an adult is acquitted for the most serious crime but convicted of a lesser offense. In such a case, the acquittal on the more serious charge should not be grounds to keep future offenses involving the youth out of adult court, because a finding of probable cause concerning the commission of the more serious offense previously was made by a court or grand jury. Obviously, if evidence is brought forth resulting in the dismissal of such charge before trial, or if evidence brought forth at trial leads a judge to conclude that probable cause no longer exists as to the more serious offense in question, this same logic would not hold. Thus, no automatic presumption of adult prosecution in future cases should apply under those circumstances."

⁵⁸ *Id.* at 10.

-
- ⁵⁹ *Id.*
- ⁶⁰ An excellent discussion of blended sentencing, with reference to different laws within various states, is included in Patricia Torbet et al, U.S. Dept. of Justice, State Responses to Serious and Violent Juvenile Crime 11-16 (1996).
- ⁶¹ Minnesota Statutes 2004, § 260B.130.
- ⁶² *Id.*
- ⁶³ Juvenile Crime Issues, *supra* note 23, at 8.
- ⁶⁴ National Prosecution Standards, *supra* note 20, § 92.1b, at 250.
- ⁶⁵ Juvenile Crime Issues, *supra* note 23, at 21-22.
- ⁶⁶ See Section V of this article for a more thorough discussion of “restorative justice”.
- ⁶⁷ Juvenile Crime Issues, *supra* note 23, at 22.
- ⁶⁸ National Prosecution Standards, *supra* note 20, § 92.5-92.6, at 256-57.
- ⁶⁹ *Id.* § 92.5b, at 256.
- ⁷⁰ *Id.* § 92.5d, at 256.
- ⁷¹ *Id.* § 92.6a, at 256.
- ⁷² Juvenile Crime Issues, *supra* note 23, at 14.
- ⁷³ National Prosecution Standards, *supra* note 20, §92.6d, at 257.
- ⁷⁴ *Id.*, Commentary, at 264.
- ⁷⁵ Juvenile Crime Issues, *supra* note 23, at 14.
- ⁷⁶ Juvenile Crime Issues, *supra* note 23, at 13-14; see also National Prosecution Standards, *supra* note 20, § 92.6c, at 257.
- ⁷⁷ Juvenile Crime Issues, *supra* note 23, at 13.
- ⁷⁸ See Pennsylvania’s Juvenile Code, 42 Pa. C.S. §6301 (eff. 3/18/96).
- ⁷⁹ Juvenile Crime Issues, *supra* note 23, at 13.
- ⁸⁰ *Id.* at 14.
- ⁸¹ *Id.*
- ⁸² National Prosecution Standards, *supra* note 20, §92.7a, at 257.
- ⁸³ *Id.* § 92.7b, at 257.
- ⁸⁴ Juvenile Crime Issues, *supra* note 23, at 13.
- ⁸⁵ “Studies show that being abused or neglected multiples the risk that a child will grow up to be violent.” See “From America’s Front Line Against Crime: A School and Youth Violence Prevention Plan”, *Fight Crime: Invest In Kids* (www.fightcrime.org).
- ⁸⁶ Legal Consultant to Department. On request of Michigan department of social services or of an agent under contract with the department, the prosecuting attorney must serve as a legal consultant to the department of social services or agent under contract with the department at all stages of a child protective proceeding. Michigan Court Rules 5.914(c)(1). Minnesota’s Child Protection Provisions of the Juvenile Court Act provide that: “[e]xcept in adoption proceedings, the county attorney shall present evidence upon request of the court. In representing the agency, the county attorney shall also have the responsibility for advancing the public interest in the welfare of the child.” Minnesota Statutes 2004, §260C.163, subd. 4. See also Rule 39.03 of the Minnesota Rules of Juvenile Procedure.
- ⁸⁷ *Id.*
- ⁸⁸ Juvenile Crime Issues, *supra* note 23 at 22.
- ⁸⁹ *Id.* at 23.
- ⁹⁰ *Id.*
- ⁹¹ Many prosecutors’ offices have established pre-charge or pre-trial diversion programs. For example, the Dakota County Attorney’s Office in Hastings, Minnesota (Telephone: 651-438-4438; e-mail: attorney@co.dakota.mn.us) for alcohol/marijuana, theft and tobacco offenses, and also coordinates a Peer Court program for various crimes committed by youth.
- ⁹² Many prosecutors’ offices have established truancy intervention programs. Examples include truancy programs in the Ramsey County Attorney’s Office in St. Paul, Minnesota (Telephone: 651-266-3079; e-mail: attorney@co.ramsey-mn.us) and the Prosecuting Attorney’s Office in Marquette, Michigan (Telephone: 906-225-8310).

-
- ⁹³ This program was initiated in the Office of the District Attorney, 2nd Judicial District, Denver, Colorado (Telephone: 720-913-9000; e-mail: info@denverda.org) and was replicated in the Office of District Attorney, 10th Judicial District, Pueblo, Colorado (Telephone: 719-583-6030) and the Dakota County Attorney's Office in Hastings, Minnesota (Telephone: 651-438-4438; e-mail: attorney@co.dakota.mn.us).
- ⁹⁴ Juvenile Crime Issues, *supra* note 23, at 22-23.
- ⁹⁵ See "From America's Front Line Against Crime: A School and Youth Violence Prevention Plan", *Fight Crime: Invest In Kids* (www.fightcrime.org).
- ⁹⁶ *Id.*
- ⁹⁷ Schweinhart, L.J., H.V. Barnes and D.P. Weikart, "Significant Benefits: The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study Through Age 27" (Ypsilanti, MI: High-Scope Press, 1993).
- ⁹⁸ Lally, J.R., P.L. Mangione and A.S. Honig, "The Syracuse University Family Development Research Program: Long Range Impact of an Early Intervention with Low-Income Children and Their Families" in D.R. Powell, ed., *Parent Education as Early Childhood Intervention: Emerging Directions in Theory, Research and Practice* (Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing, 1988).
- ⁹⁹ See "From America's Front Line Against Crime: A School and Youth Violence Prevention Plan", *Fight Crime: Invest In Kids* (www.fightcrime.org).
- ¹⁰⁰ Jones, M.A. and D.R. Offord, "Reduction of Antisocial Behavior in Poor Children by Nonschool Skill Development," *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines* 30 (1989), 737-750.
- ¹⁰¹ Miller, B.M., *Out-of-School Time: Effects on Learning in the Primary Grades* (Wellesley, MA: School-Age Child Care Project [now called the National Institute on Out-of-School Time], Center for Research on Women, Wellesley College, 1995); and Posner, J.K. and D.L. Vandell, "Low-Income Children's After-School Care: Are there Beneficial Effects of After-School Programs," *Child Development* 65 (Society for Research in Child Development, 1994) 440-456.
- ¹⁰² See "From America's Front Line Against Crime: A School and Youth Violence Prevention Plan", *Fight Crime: Invest In Kids* (www.fightcrime.org).
- ¹⁰³ *Id.*
- ¹⁰⁴ Olds, D.L., et al., "Long-term Effects of Home Visitation on Maternal Life Course and Child Abuse and Neglect: Fifteen-year Follow-up of a Randomized Trial," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 278, No. 8, August 27, 1997, pp. 637-652, and Olds, et al., "Long-term Effects of Nurse Home Visitation on Children's Criminal and Antisocial Behavior: 15-Year Follow-up of a Randomized Controlled Trial," *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 280, No. 14, October 14, 1998, pp. 1238-1244.
- ¹⁰⁵ See "From America's Front Line Against Crime: A School and Youth Violence Prevention Plan", *Fight Crime: Invest In Kids* (www.fightcrime.org).
- ¹⁰⁶ *National Institute of Justice*, "Helping to Prevent Child Abuse -- Future Criminal Consequences: Hawaii Healthy Start" (October 1995).
- ¹⁰⁷ See "From America's Front Line Against Crime: A School and Youth Violence Prevention Plan", *Fight Crime: Invest In Kids* (www.fightcrime.org).
- ¹⁰⁸ Tremblay, R.E., McCoard, J., LeBlanc, M., Boileau, H., Charlebois, P., Gagnon, C., and Larivee, S., "Can Disruptive Boys Be Helped to Become Competent?" (1992).
- ¹⁰⁹ Juvenile Crime Issues, *supra* note 23, at 27.
- ¹¹⁰ James C. Backstrom and Gary L. Walker, "A Balanced Approach to Juvenile Justice: The Work of the Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee", *The Prosecutor*, July/Aug. 1998, at 36.
- ¹¹¹ *Id.* at 38.