Commentary to the Model Juvenile Justice Act for States (v0.3)

Author: Hanna Kotyk, PhD (Cand.), Juvenile Justice Policy Analyst

Date: 11/12/2025

This Commentary accompanies the Model Juvenile Justice Act for States (v0.3 – Draft for Expert Review) and explains the logic, structure, and interpretive guidance for each major module of the Act.

Table of Contents

1. General Observations on the Structure and Purpose of the Model Act

The Model Juvenile Justice Act for States ("Model Act") is designed as both a codified juvenile justice framework and a modular reform tool for U.S. states. It can be adopted as a stand-alone juvenile justice code or implemented incrementally through amendments to existing statutes.

The core purpose of the Model Act is to unify key structural elements of juvenile justice systems—age of jurisdiction, diversion and school-based responses, transfer to adult court, restorative justice, procedural safeguards and data standards—while preserving state flexibility. Each Module is relatively autonomous, yet all are connected through shared principles, definitions and evidence-based oversight mechanisms.

This Commentary is intended to: (1) clarify the normative logic of key Sections and paragraphs; (2) provide interpretive guidance for state-level adaptation; and (3) situate the Model Act within broader constitutional, international and evidence-based policy contexts.

2. Commentary on Section 1 – General Provisions (Module 1 – Core Framework)

2.1 §1-102 – Purpose and Scope

Section 1-102 provides the strategic framework for the entire Act. It explicitly links the protection of children's rights with public safety objectives, highlights the need to reduce the school-to-prison pipeline, and grounds the Act in evidence-based policy. Importantly, the Act is not limited to the courtroom. It is intended to guide decisions by schools, police, prosecutors, probation, child welfare agencies and other actors across the juvenile justice continuum.

2.2 §1-103 – Guiding Principles

The Guiding Principles are not merely aspirational language. They provide interpretive direction for all subsequent provisions and may be cited by courts when reasoning through difficult cases or statutory gaps. The principles include: best interests of the child; rehabilitation over punishment; proportionality; minimal criminalization of school behavior; nondiscrimination; and evidence-based policy.

In particular, the principle of minimal criminalization of school behavior elevates the "school-to-prison pipeline" problem to a normative level, while the evidence-based principle is operationalized later through mandatory data collection and annual reporting in Section 7.

2.3 §1-104 – Definitions
Section 1-104 establishes core definitions that structure the entire Act. The definition of "child" or "juvenile" is tied to the youth's age at the time of the alleged offense, not at the time of court proceedings. This allows juvenile courts to complete cases even after the youth turns 18, without automatic transfer to adult jurisdiction.

The definition of "diversion" emphasizes a formal, non-judicial process that redirects cases away from court, while preserving accountability through structured programs. "Waiver" and "Reverse waiver" are introduced as terms of art for transfer to and from adult criminal court, preparing the ground for the detailed rules in Section 4.

3. Commentary on Section 2 – Age and Jurisdiction (Module 2 – Age & Jurisdiction)

3.1 §2-201 – Minimum Age for Juvenile Court Jurisdiction
Section 2-201 sets the minimum age for juvenile court jurisdiction at fourteen (14) years. Children below this age are explicitly excluded from delinquency proceedings and instead should be routed to child protection and mental health systems. This reflects contemporary knowledge in developmental psychology and neuroscience and seeks to avoid early criminal stigmatization of very young children.

3.2 §2-202–2-203 – Upper Age and Exclusive Jurisdiction
Section 2-202 allows juvenile courts to retain jurisdiction over offenses committed before the eighteenth birthday, including through extended jurisdiction up to age twenty-one (21) solely for completion of rehabilitative interventions. This does not create new liability for conduct after age 18; it simply provides time to finish juvenile programs.

Section 2-203 on exclusive juvenile jurisdiction is crucial for limiting automatic or categorical transfer to adult court. All cases involving conduct before age 18 must begin in juvenile court, with any transfer governed strictly by Section 4.

4. Commentary on Section 3 – Diversion and the School-to-Prison Pipeline (Module 3)

4.1 §3-101 – Presumption of Diversion
Section 3-101 introduces a general presumption in favor of diversion for misdemeanors. The burden shifts to the prosecutor or designated authority to justify, in writing, any decision to refuse diversion. This transforms diversion from a discretionary favor into a structured policy tool. Written justifications also create a record for internal audit and judicial review.

4.2 §3-102 – Limits on Criminalization of School-Based Behavior
Section 3-102 establishes objective thresholds for when school-based behavior may be criminalized, such as serious bodily injury or the use of a weapon. In the absence of such factors, incidents should be handled through school discipline or diversion and restorative processes. Memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between schools and law enforcement may not expand these thresholds by contract. The practical aim is to reduce the flow of students from schools into juvenile courts.

4.3 §3-103 – Standards for Diversion Programs
Section 3-103 requires states to develop accreditation standards for diversion programs, including evidence-based methods, cultural responsiveness, meaningful family and community engagement, and outcome monitoring. This moves diversion from ad hoc practice to an institutionalized component of juvenile policy.

5. Commentary on Section 4 – Transfer to Adult Court (Waiver & Reverse Waiver) (Module 4)

5.1 §§4-101–4-104 – Principles, Prohibition of Direct File, Eligible Offenses
Sections 4-101 through 4-104 frame waiver as an exceptional measure. Section 4-102 prohibits prosecutorial direct file, meaning prosecutors cannot bypass juvenile court and file charges directly in adult court. Any transfer must follow a juvenile court hearing.

Section 4-103 narrowly defines the serious violent and sexual offenses that may be eligible for waiver and sets a minimum age of sixteen (16) years. Section 4-104 adds a categorical prohibition on transfer for youth under 16 and creates a presumption against transfer for 16–17-year-olds. The combined effect is to substantially narrow and structure the use of adult court for youth.

5.2 §§4-111–4-114 – Initiating and Conducting Waiver Hearings
Sections 4-111 to 4-114 codify robust procedural safeguards around waiver. The prosecutor must file a written motion that specifies the legal basis, factual grounds and relevant factors. The juvenile has the right to be present, to be represented by counsel, to present evidence and to cross-examine witnesses.

The court must consider a set of modified Kent factors, including age and maturity, nature of the offense, prior record, mental health and disability, availability of juvenile programs, victim input and time remaining to complete juvenile interventions. The prosecution bears the burden of proof under a preponderance standard, and the court must issue a separate written order analyzing each factor and explaining why juvenile interventions are deemed insufficient, if transfer is granted.

5.3 §§4-201–4-207 – Reverse Waiver
Sections 4-201 to 4-207 introduce reverse waiver as a symmetrical mechanism that allows cases transferred to adult court to return to juvenile jurisdiction. The burden is placed on the prosecution to prove that juvenile interventions cannot adequately protect public safety or are manifestly inadequate in the particular case.

The court must give particular weight to changes in the youth's behavior, participation in programs, new mental health information and victim views. Doubts are resolved in favor of returning the case to juvenile court. Data on waiver and reverse waiver practice must be collected and reported, supporting transparency and oversight.

6. Commentary on Section 5 – Restorative Justice and Family Group Conferences (Module 5)

6.1 §5-101 – Priority of Restorative Justice
Section 5-101 explicitly states that restorative justice should be treated as a preferred option wherever it can be used without undue risk to victims or public safety. Courts, prosecutors and diversion services are required to consider restorative options and to document their decisions. This provision elevates restorative justice from an experimental program to a mainstream justice tool.

6.2 §§5-102–5-103 – Family Group Conferences and Plans
Sections 5-102 and 5-103 define Family Group Conferences (FGC) as structured processes that bring together the youth, family, victims, facilitators and relevant service providers. Victim participation is voluntary. The outcome is a written plan that may include measures to repair harm, educational requirements, therapeutic interventions and family obligations.

Once approved by the court or designated authority and successfully completed, the plan can lead to case closure without adjudication. This gives FGCs concrete legal consequences and supports their integration into case management.

7. Commentary on Section 6 – Procedural Safeguards and Conditions (Module 6)

7.1 §6-101 – Right to Counsel
Section 6-101 reinforces the right to counsel at all stages of juvenile proceedings. Any waiver of counsel must occur only after consultation with counsel and, typically, in the presence of parents or guardians. This is designed to prevent pressured or uninformed waivers by youths who may not understand the consequences.

7.2 §6-102 – Prohibition of Interrogation Without Counsel and Legal Representative
Section 6-102 establishes a strong rule on admissibility of statements: confessions or other statements obtained through interrogation of a juvenile without counsel and a legal representative are generally inadmissible, except in narrowly defined emergencies involving an immediate threat to life. This reflects the heightened vulnerability of juveniles to coercion and false confessions.

7.3 §6-103 – Detention as a Measure of Last Resort
Section 6-103 states that pretrial detention should be a measure of last resort. Courts must consider less restrictive alternatives such as supervised release, electronic monitoring, and compliance with FGC plans. The party seeking detention bears the burden of showing that these alternatives are inadequate to protect public safety.

8. Commentary on Section 7 – Data, KPIs and Evidence-Based Policy (Module 7)

8.1 §§7-101–7-102 – Data Collection and Annual Reporting
Section 7-101 requires systematic collection of data on key indicators: diversion and FGC use, completion rates, recidivism, waiver and reverse waiver, and demographic patterns. Section 7-102 mandates an annual public report with statistical analysis, trend identification, disparity assessment and policy recommendations.

Together, these provisions transform the Model Act into a learning system: policies are not static but are expected to evolve in light of data. They also create avenues for public accountability and legislative oversight.

9. Commentary on Section 8 – Implementation and Transitional Provisions (Module 8)

9.1 §8-101–8-103 – Phased Implementation and Conflict of Laws
Section 8 allows states to phase in reforms over a period of up to three years, while requiring earlier implementation of core protections such as the minimum age, prohibition of prosecutorial direct file, and presumption of diversion. Conflict-of-laws provisions ensure that, where the Model Act is adopted, its standards prevail over inconsistent prior statutes unless explicitly stated otherwise.

The modular and phased design addresses practical concerns about capacity and political feasibility. States can begin with age and school-to-prison reforms, then proceed to transfer rules and restorative justice, while building data systems to support long-term monitoring.

10. Conclusion

The Model Juvenile Justice Act provides a structured yet flexible framework for modernizing juvenile justice in U.S. states. It balances child-rights protections, public safety and constitutional standards with evidence-based practice and robust data oversight. This Commentary is intended as a practical guide for lawmakers, judges, prosecutors, advocates and researchers adapting the Model Act to specific state contexts and evaluating its impact over time.