

ANALYTICAL REPORT ON THE MODEL JUVENILE JUSTICE ACT FOR STATES

Rationale, Theory of Change, Implementation Framework, and Evaluation Plan

Draft 4.0 (Version 0.4)

Analytical Report and Research Application Framework

Prepared by

Hanna Kotyk

Juvenile Justice Policy Analyst

Juvenile Justice Innovation Initiative LLC

August 2, 2026

juvenilejusticeinnovation.org

Publication Status and Use Notice

Status. This report analyzes the legal-policy architecture, theory of change, resource dependencies, implementation considerations, and evaluation design of Model Act Draft 4.0. Its primary audiences are scholars, legal professionals, universities, law clinics, researchers, educators, and organizations studying juvenile justice. It does not present projections as established results and does not imply endorsement by any institution or public authority.

Attribution and permitted use. Copyright © 2026 Hanna Kotyk and Juvenile Justice Innovation Initiative LLC. Permission is granted to quote, reproduce, distribute, teach, discuss, and adapt this document for noncommercial academic, educational, legal-research, professional-training, governmental, and public-policy purposes, provided that Hanna Kotyk and Juvenile Justice Innovation Initiative LLC are credited and material changes are identified. Commercial republication requires written permission.

Jurisdictional application. The framework may be used for comparative research, university instruction, law-clinic projects, practitioner education, issue analysis, and jurisdiction-specific reform design. Any application to a particular state should be accompanied by research into that state’s constitution, codes, court structure, appropriations rules, collective-bargaining obligations, and youth-service capacity.

Development Record

Version / Output	Date	Development milestone
v0.1-v0.2	2025 (internal working stages)	Concept development, modular architecture, and partial legislative drafting.
v0.3	August 1, 2025	First full public-facing edition of the modular framework.
Companion Analytical Report	November 10, 2025	Initial problem analysis, module crosswalk, and preliminary measurement framework.
Companion Commentary	November 12, 2025	Initial section-by-section explanation and implementation guidance.
v0.4 / Draft 4.0	August 2, 2026	Complete twelve-module research edition: corrected legislative drafting, expanded safeguards, baseline-driven evaluation, implementation analysis, and jurisdictional application guidance.

Development note. The chronology documents the project’s continuous research and drafting history from 2025 through the present complete edition.

Contents

Executive Summary

1. Development Record and Purpose of the Revision

- 1.1 Documented Timeline
- 1.2 Reasons for Draft 4.0

2. Problem Definition

- 2.1 Fragmented Legal Architecture
- 2.2 School-to-Court Referral
- 2.3 Inconsistent Diversion
- 2.4 Transfer to Adult Court
- 2.5 Procedural and Developmental Capacity
- 2.6 Detention, Placement, and Reentry
- 2.7 Juvenile Records and Collateral Consequences
- 2.8 Data and Accountability

3. Methodology and Scope Boundaries

- 3.1 Methodological Approach
- 3.2 Source Hierarchy
- 3.3 Scope Boundaries

4. Theory of Change

5. Revised Modular Architecture

6. Problem-Solution-Implementation Crosswalk

7. Legal and Policy Design Choices

- 7.1 Minimum Age
- 7.2 Diversion Standard
- 7.3 School Safety Threshold
- 7.4 Transfer Burden and Eligibility
- 7.5 Counsel Before Interrogation
- 7.6 Isolation Cap
- 7.7 Automatic Records Relief

8. Baseline-Driven Evaluation Framework

- 8.1 Why v0.3 Percentage Targets Were Removed
- 8.2 Recommended Metric Families
- 8.3 Evaluation Designs

9. Fiscal and Administrative Impact Framework

- 9.1 Likely Upfront Investments
- 9.2 Potential Avoided or Shifted Costs

10. Research and Professional Community Map

11. Research, Education, and Application Roadmap

Phase 1 - Publication, Teaching, and Research Mapping (0-6 Months)

Phase 2 - Comparative and Jurisdiction-Specific Analysis (6-12 Months)

Phase 3 - Academic and Professional Application (12-24 Months)

Phase 4 - Institutional Research and Evaluation (24-48 Months)

12. Risk Register and Mitigation**13. Academic, Professional, and Institutional Applications**

13.1 Core Academic and Professional Uses

13.2 Suggested Companion Research Outputs

13.3 Dissemination and Institutional Use

14. Publication and Version-Control Protocol**15. Current Status, Uses, and Scope**

15.1 Current Status and Uses

15.2 Scope and Representational Boundaries

15.3 Optional Areas for Supplemental Research

16. Conclusion

Selected Legal Authorities, Research Sources, and Official Reference Materials

Executive Summary

Draft 4.0 of the Model Juvenile Justice Act for States is a complete modular framework for legal research, professional education, comparative analysis, and jurisdiction-specific study. It supplies coherent policy architecture, model statutory language, implementation dependencies, and an evaluation framework that scholars, practitioners, universities, law clinics, and organizations may use independently or module by module. It is not presented as legal advice or as a universal code requiring no jurisdictional analysis.

The project addresses a structural problem: juvenile justice rules and service capacity vary across states and often across counties within a state. Differences may concern age boundaries, school referrals, diversion, transfer to adult court, access to counsel, competency, detention, records, and data. Variation is not inherently improper in a federal system, but poorly coordinated rules can create unequal outcomes, implementation gaps, and difficulty evaluating reforms.

Draft 4.0 responds through twelve linked modules. The revision adds material that was absent or underdeveloped in v0.3, corrects technical ambiguities, and replaces unsupported numeric projections with a baseline-driven measurement process. It also establishes a structured basis for teaching, comparative legal research, professional analysis, state statutory mapping, and evidence-informed discussion.

The principal conclusion of this report is that the Model Act is a mature, publication-ready legal-research and policy framework. Its strongest uses are university instruction, law-clinic projects, scholarly and practitioner analysis, comparative statutory research, professional training, and module-specific jurisdictional study. State crosswalks, fiscal studies, systems analysis, and empirical evaluation are complementary research products rather than prerequisites to the present edition's academic and professional use.

1. Development Record and Purpose of the Revision

1.1 Documented Timeline

The project's record shows progressive development rather than a single static publication:

Stage	Date	Output and significance
v0.1-v0.2	2025, internal working stages	Concept development, modular architecture, and partial legislative drafting.
Model Act v0.3	August 1, 2025	First full public-facing edition of the modular framework.
Analytical Report v0.3	November 10, 2025	Initial problem statement, module analysis, crosswalk, and indicative metrics.
Commentary v0.3	November 12, 2025	Initial explanation of the eight-module draft.
Draft 4.0 / v0.4	August 2, 2026	Complete twelve-module research edition: corrected legislative drafting, expanded safeguards, baseline-driven evaluation, implementation analysis, and jurisdictional application guidance.

Publication dates, preserved copies, and revision summaries document continuity of research and drafting. They should be maintained as part of the project's version-control and research-integrity record.

1.2 Reasons for Draft 4.0

Review of v0.3 identified five categories of weakness:

- 1. Scope mismatch.** The document was described as a comprehensive code but omitted major subjects ordinarily needed for a full code.
- 2. Legislative drafting issues.** Numbering errors, an ambiguous transfer-eligibility sentence, a broad repeal clause, and underdefined school-referral exceptions reduced technical credibility.

3. **Underdeveloped safeguards.** Competency, discovery, pleas, disposition, probation, custody conditions, reentry, records, oversight, financing, and remedies were missing or too brief.
4. **Evidence overstatement risk.** Percentage targets appeared more precise than the available methodology justified.
5. **Publication and scope ambiguity.** The restrictive notice conflicted with the dissemination purpose of a model framework, and the relationship between the model text, research materials, and jurisdiction-specific application required clearer explanation.

Draft 4.0 addresses all five categories.

2. Problem Definition

2.1 Fragmented Legal Architecture

State juvenile systems differ in age jurisdiction, offense pathways, transfer mechanisms, status-offense treatment, diversion, records, and continuing jurisdiction. Official OJJDP materials document this variation. The Model Act does not seek federal uniformity by command. Instead, it offers a shared analytical structure that states may adapt while retaining constitutional and institutional autonomy.

Fragmentation becomes a policy problem when related rules do not work together. A state may expand diversion without changing prosecutorial screening, or limit detention without creating transportation and community services. A state may authorize sealing but fail to notify repositories and commercial data providers. The Model Act therefore focuses on system dependencies.

2.2 School-to-Court Referral

School-based law-enforcement involvement can transform discipline into justice-system entry. The policy challenge is to distinguish ordinary school behavior and disability-related conduct from a narrow category of immediate serious safety events.

V0.3 used an injury-weapon-serious-violence formulation that was too simple. Draft 4.0 identifies specific categories such as intentional serious injury, imminent serious threats, firearm or dangerous weapon use, sexual assault, arson with grave risk, and commercial drug distribution. It also requires documentation of educational and restorative alternatives.

2.3 Inconsistent Diversion

Diversion may depend on county practice, prosecutor preference, program availability, ability to pay, or victim participation. A presumption with written reasons and review promotes consistency. At the same time, diversion quality matters. Excessive conditions, long duration, mandatory admissions, or fees can widen system control rather than reduce it.

Official evidence reviews indicate that diversion is generally promising but heterogeneous. The report therefore treats outcomes as questions to be measured, not guaranteed effects.

2.4 Transfer to Adult Court

States use different transfer pathways, including judicial waiver, prosecutorial filing, and statutory exclusion. Transfer has high consequences and may reduce access to developmentally appropriate intervention. Draft 4.0 uses exclusive original juvenile jurisdiction and a narrow judicial process.

The analytical problem is not merely whether transfer exists. It is whether eligibility is precise, the child has counsel and experts, the state proves insufficiency of juvenile options, the decision is written and appealable, and reverse waiver is available when circumstances change.

2.5 Procedural and Developmental Capacity

Children may not understand warnings, pleas, collateral consequences, or court roles in the same way as adults. Developmental immaturity may affect competency even without a conventional mental-health diagnosis. Draft 4.0 adds early counsel, recorded interrogation, juvenile-specific competency, discovery, expert access, and plea safeguards.

2.6 Detention, Placement, and Reentry

A detention statute that says only “last resort” leaves critical questions unresolved: burden of proof, hearing timing, review frequency, adult separation, isolation, force, education, health care, family contact, grievances, and independent inspection. Draft 4.0 supplies operational standards.

Reentry is treated as part of placement from the beginning. Without records, medication, school enrollment, identification, housing, and appointments, release may be nominal rather than successful.

2.7 Juvenile Records and Collateral Consequences

A juvenile record may affect education, employment, housing, licensing, and background checks. Sealing and expungement are not identical, and petition-based relief often favors people with legal knowledge and resources. Draft 4.0 creates automatic processes, downstream notices, legal effect, and remedies for unlawful disclosure.

2.8 Data and Accountability

Data may use inconsistent definitions or fail to connect events across police, schools, prosecutors, courts, probation, facilities, and records repositories. Numeric targets are unreliable without baseline quality. Draft 4.0 begins with a public data dictionary and a twelve-month baseline process and requires limitations to be disclosed.

3. Methodology and Scope Boundaries

3.1 Methodological Approach

The revised project uses:

- doctrinal analysis of constitutional juvenile-procedure and youth-sentencing decisions;
- review of federal statutory requirements affecting state juvenile systems;
- official OJJDP materials describing state structures and evidence reviews;
- comparative legislative design focused on modularity, implementation, and reviewability;
- internal consistency testing across definitions, jurisdiction, procedure, disposition, records, and data; and
- version control documenting changes from v0.3.

3.2 Source Hierarchy

The project distinguishes:

1. binding constitutional and statutory law;
2. official federal agency guidance and data;
3. persuasive comparative and international materials;
4. empirical studies and evidence reviews; and
5. model-policy recommendations that intentionally exceed existing legal minima.

This hierarchy reduces the risk of presenting a preferred policy as if it were already required law.

3.3 Scope Boundaries

Draft 4.0 is designed as a modular legal-research, educational, and policy framework. It does not claim to provide:

- a comprehensive fifty-state statutory survey for every module;
- a legal opinion on any particular state constitution or code;
- a jurisdiction-specific fiscal note, workforce plan, or appropriations estimate;
- technical integration specifications for court, school, records, detention, or data systems; or
- empirical findings from pilot implementation.

Those subjects require separate jurisdiction-specific, institutional, fiscal, technical, or empirical projects. They do not limit use of the present suite for scholarship, teaching, comparative analysis, professional education, issue identification, or preliminary legal-policy design.

4. Theory of Change

The Model Act's theory of change is that clear legal thresholds, early counsel, high-quality alternatives, reviewable decisions, operational safeguards, and transparent data can reduce unnecessary formal processing while preserving individualized responses to serious safety risks.

Inputs	Activities	Near-term outputs	Intermediate outcomes	Long-term public value
Model statutory language; legal research; constitutional and empirical sources; academic and practitioner knowledge; institutional data; teaching and research capacity	Analyze and compare modules; teach and discuss legal design; prepare state crosswalks and issue briefs; develop professional training; test evaluation concepts against available data	Published framework; teaching materials; crosswalks; legal memoranda; practitioner guides; data dictionaries; research papers; institutional discussions	More precise legal analysis; clearer identification of system dependencies; better-informed professional education; stronger comparative research; improved capacity to evaluate reform options	Durable research infrastructure; higher-quality legal and policy debate; more coherent institutional standards; evidence-informed juvenile-justice development

The arrows in this model are hypotheses, not proof. Outcomes depend on implementation quality, service availability, fidelity, local context, and measurement design.

5. Revised Modular Architecture

Module	Principal subject	Main improvement over v0.3
1	General provisions and definitions	Reframes document as core framework; adds detailed interpretive rules and definitions.
2	Age, jurisdiction, status offenses	Adds transitional option, status-offense protections, and venue principles.
3	Intake, diversion, schools	Removes victim veto; adds filing screen, review, program quality, and precise school exceptions.
4	Transfer and reverse waiver	Corrects eligibility; narrows offenses; raises burden; adds experts, immediate appeal, and sentencing safeguards.
5	Restorative justice and FGC	Adds voluntariness, confidentiality, facilitator standards, and agreement review.
6	Counsel, interrogation, competency, adjudication	Adds major procedural architecture absent from v0.3.
7	Disposition, probation, reentry	Adds least-restrictive disposition, technical-violation limits, review, and release planning.

Module	Principal subject	Main improvement over v0.3
8	Detention and custody	Adds release burden, frequent review, adult separation, education, health, isolation, force, and grievances.
9	Records and collateral consequences	Resolves prior gap by adding automatic sealing, expungement, notices, legal effect, and remedies.
10	Data and independent oversight	Replaces unsupported targets; adds definitions, privacy, oversight office, and research ethics.
11	Implementation, financing, rulemaking	Adds capacity planning, appropriations, training, explicit conforming amendments, and phased dates.
12	Construction and remedies	Adds enforceability, fees prohibition, ameliorative retroactivity, severability, and periodic review.

6. Problem-Solution-Implementation Crosswalk

Problem	Draft 4.0 response	Critical dependency	Primary implementation risk
Very young children enter delinquency systems	Preferred minimum age fourteen; noncriminal support pathway	Child welfare, behavioral health, education, family services	Transferring coercion to another system without resources or due process
Uneven diversion	Presumption, written denial, judicial review, quality standards	Accessible programs, defense counsel, transportation	Net widening or unequal program access
Overcriminalization of school conduct	Enumerated safety exceptions; documentation; limits on MOUs and SRO roles	School supports, disability compliance, crisis response	Broad offense definitions or emergency exception overuse
Transfer without individualized protection	Exclusive original jurisdiction; narrow eligibility; clear-and-convincing standard; appeal; reverse waiver	Expert funding, juvenile program capacity, appellate timing	Transfer hearings becoming mini-trials or relying on unsupported risk predictions
Coercive restorative processes	Voluntary participation, counsel, confidentiality, trained facilitators	Qualified facilitators and victim services	Pressure to admit or participate; unsafe power dynamics
Children misunderstand proceedings	Early counsel, recorded questioning, competency, understandable notice	Public-defense capacity, interpreters, evaluators	Formal compliance without meaningful comprehension
Overuse of detention and restrictive custody	Presumption of release; repeated review; isolation and force limits	Community alternatives, staffing, courts, clinical services	Detention justified by service scarcity; underreporting critical incidents
Records create long-term barriers	Automatic sealing and expungement; repository notices; remedies	Court and repository technology; commercial-data compliance	Records persist in decentralized or private databases
Reform claims cannot be verified	Public data dictionary; baselines; annual reporting; independent oversight	Data integration, privacy controls, analytic capacity	Inconsistent definitions, missing data, overclaiming causation
Statute adopted without operational support	Implementation plan, fiscal analysis, training, appropriations, rulemaking	Legislative and executive coordination	Unfunded mandates and delayed effective dates

7. Legal and Policy Design Choices

7.1 Minimum Age

Age fourteen is the preferred standard in Draft 4.0. The report does not claim it reflects current law in most states. Official OJJDP sources show substantial state variation and frequent absence of a minimum age. The value of the proposal lies in creating a clear developmental boundary and requiring services outside delinquency court.

The transitional option is a feasibility tool, not an endorsement of twelve as the final standard. A target-state analysis should compare current age law, case volume, service capacity, and constitutional provisions.

7.2 Diversion Standard

The presumption reduces discretion but does not eliminate individualized safety review. Clear and convincing evidence is selected to make the presumption meaningful. A state may debate that burden, but a lower standard would need other safeguards to prevent routine denial.

7.3 School Safety Threshold

The enumerated model is preferable to a broad “serious offense” category because it is more reviewable. Nevertheless, exact offense mapping is essential. State-specific work must examine definitions, attempt and accomplice provisions, school code, disability law, and crisis protocols.

7.4 Transfer Burden and Eligibility

The model narrows eligibility and requires personal culpability. The clear-and-convincing standard reflects the seriousness and claimed exceptional nature of transfer. It is a proposed state-law protection, not a statement that federal due process uniformly requires that burden.

7.5 Counsel Before Interrogation

Draft 4.0 proposes private consultation with counsel before custodial interrogation and full recording. This protection intentionally exceeds the constitutional floor described in existing waiver doctrine. It creates a clear administrable rule and reduces disputes over developmental comprehension.

7.6 Isolation Cap

The four-hour cumulative room-confinement cap is a policy proposal requiring operational review by facility, clinical, disability, and safety experts. It should be tested against staffing, facility design, crisis alternatives, reporting systems, and more protective state law.

7.7 Automatic Records Relief

Automatic relief is chosen because petition-based systems depend on awareness and resources. Implementation requires accurate case-status triggers, statewide repositories, notice workflows, and enforcement against redisclosure.

8. Baseline-Driven Evaluation Framework

8.1 Why v0.3 Percentage Targets Were Removed

The v0.3 report included illustrative targets such as percentage reductions in school referrals and transfer. Although labeled indicative, the exact ranges lacked a demonstrated state baseline, implementation model, comparison method, or source establishing that those percentages were achievable across jurisdictions.

Draft 4.0 replaces those figures with a four-step process:

1. define each metric and responsible data owner;

2. test completeness, consistency, and linkage for twelve months;
3. establish state and county baselines with disparity analysis; and
4. adopt conservative, moderate, and aspirational targets through a public process.

8.2 Recommended Metric Families

Domain	Example measure	Required caution
Access to counsel	Median hours from custody to first confidential counsel contact	Do not count nominal appointment without contact as access
Diversion	Eligible cases offered diversion; acceptance; completion; reasons for denial	Separate eligibility, offer, acceptance, and completion; monitor ability-to-pay barriers
School referrals	Arrests and petitions by school, conduct category, disability, and race/ethnicity	Adjust for enrollment and avoid treating allegation as proven conduct
Detention	Admissions, days, review intervals, reasons, releases to alternatives	Distinguish pre-adjudication, post-disposition, status, and probation cases
Transfer	Motions, grants, reversals, age, offense, county, race/ethnicity, expert use	Do not infer public-safety effect from transfer count alone
Restorative processes	Offer, voluntary participation, completion, victim-reported experience	Protect confidentiality and avoid pressuring victims to report satisfaction
Competency	Referral, finding, restoration setting, duration, dismissal	Avoid interpreting disability prevalence as dangerousness
Custody conditions	Force, injury, room confinement duration, grievances, education hours	Audit underreporting and definitions across facilities
Reentry	School enrollment, insurance, medication continuity, housing, ID at release	Measure timely delivery, not merely plan creation
Records	Automatic sealing and expungement completion; repository correction time	Test private background-check persistence
Recurrence	New adjudication at defined intervals	Separate arrest, petition, adjudication, and serious violent conduct
Equity	Decision rates and outcomes across demographic and geographic groups	Report denominators, small-cell suppression, and plausible confounders

8.3 Evaluation Designs

A state should select a method appropriate to the intervention and available data:

- interrupted time series for systemwide implementation;
- matched county comparison when rollout is phased;
- randomized or quasi-random evaluation for a specific program when ethical and feasible;
- process evaluation for fidelity, access, and unintended consequences;
- qualitative interviews with youth, families, victims, practitioners, and providers; and
- cost analysis that identifies cost shifting, not only aggregate savings.

No single design will answer every question. The annual report should distinguish descriptive trends from causal evaluation.

9. Fiscal and Administrative Impact Framework

Draft 4.0 does not provide a universal fiscal estimate. State costs depend on existing law, volume, salary structure, facility use, information systems, and service capacity.

9.1 Likely Upfront Investments

- public defense and expert funding;
- diversion and community-provider capacity;
- competency evaluators and restoration services;
- court, school, and repository information-system changes;
- facility training and crisis alternatives;
- independent oversight staffing;
- education, health, and reentry coordination; and
- records-notice and commercial-data enforcement.

9.2 Potential Avoided or Shifted Costs

- fewer petitions and hearings for diverted matters;
- fewer detention days and adult-court proceedings;
- shorter supervision when early termination applies;
- reduced manual sealing petitions; and
- reduced downstream consequences associated with public records.

Potential savings should not be promised in advance. They may occur in different budgets and at different times. A fiscal note should identify which agency pays, which agency saves, timing, and any cost shift to families or community providers.

10. Research and Professional Community Map

Research or professional community	Primary application	Illustrative contribution
Universities and law schools	Teaching, scholarship, interdisciplinary study	Courses, seminars, articles, conferences, and research projects
Law clinics	Applied legal research and education	State crosswalks, memoranda, drafting exercises, and public education
Juvenile defenders	Rights, procedure, disposition, and records analysis	Practice guides, training, case-law analysis, and module-specific critique
Prosecutors and public-safety practitioners	Screening, diversion, transfer, victim safety, and proportionality	Administrability analysis, training scenarios, and offense-mapping research
Judges and court administrators	Hearing design, findings, review, competency, and records	Process analysis, forms, data requirements, and educational programs
Education and disability specialists	School referral, accommodation, crisis response, and continuity	Interdisciplinary research, legal mapping, and training materials
Behavioral-health and developmental specialists	Age, competency, treatment, crisis practice, and reentry	Clinical and developmental analysis and implementation case studies
Victim-service and restorative-justice organizations	Safety, voluntariness, confidentiality, and participation	Research, training, outcome measures, and program analysis
Facility, oversight, and conditions specialists	Isolation, force, education, health, grievances, and inspection	Operational research, standards comparison, and monitoring frameworks
Records, privacy, and data specialists	Automatic relief, repository practice, private databases, and evaluation	Systems research, data dictionaries, privacy analysis, and compliance studies
Youth and family researchers or organizations	Accessibility, burden, lived experience, and institutional impact	Qualitative research, educational materials, and implementation case studies

11. Research, Education, and Application Roadmap

Phase 1 - Publication, Teaching, and Research Mapping (0-6 Months)

- preserve prior editions and publish Draft 4.0 with a dated revision history and module summary;
- prepare teaching notes, presentation materials, and short research guides for universities, law clinics, and professional programs;
- identify one or two states for illustrative statutory crosswalks;
- catalogue constitutional, statutory, administrative, fiscal, and data sources relevant to each selected jurisdiction; and
- publish module-specific issue briefs or working papers.

Phase 2 - Comparative and Jurisdiction-Specific Analysis (6-12 Months)

- complete one or more state crosswalks showing current law, model provisions, conflicts, options, and research questions;
- map offense definitions, court jurisdiction, records procedures, education rules, and institutional responsibilities;
- develop fiscal and capacity questions without presenting unsupported universal cost estimates;
- compare available public data with the Model Act's proposed data dictionary; and
- use the materials in seminars, workshops, clinic projects, and practitioner education.

Phase 3 - Academic and Professional Application (12-24 Months)

- publish comparative articles, conference papers, teaching modules, and practitioner guides;
- expand the state index and module-by-module legal research;
- develop case studies on diversion, transfer, records relief, detention conditions, and data governance; and
- document institutional or educational use of the framework.

Phase 4 - Institutional Research and Evaluation (24-48 Months)

- support university, law-clinic, nonprofit, or professional-association research using defined modules;
- update authorities and state-law mappings as law and practice change;
- evaluate any real-world application only when reliable baseline and outcome data are available; and
- preserve published research outputs and source materials in an accessible archive.

12. Risk Register and Mitigation

Risk	Likelihood / consequence	Mitigation
Framework is mischaracterized as enacted law or universally applicable	Medium / high credibility harm	Use the publication notice; distinguish model language from binding law; identify jurisdiction-specific assumptions and sources
Partial adoption creates gaps	High / medium	Use dependency checklist and state crosswalk; sequence services and rights together
Service scarcity drives detention or denial of diversion	High / high	Capacity inventory, appropriations, transportation, remote access, and rule against increasing restriction because services are absent

Risk	Likelihood / consequence	Mitigation
Broad state offense definitions expand transfer or school referral	Medium / high	Enumerate statutory citations and review attempt/accomplice definitions
Data are incomplete or incomparable	High / high	Public dictionary, data-quality audit, staged baseline, and independent validation
Program expansion causes net widening	Medium / medium	Eligibility and duration limits; compare with decline/no-action cases; monitor conditions and fees
Victims feel pressured into restorative processes	Medium / high	Independent victim support, voluntary participation, multiple participation modes, withdrawal, confidentiality
Records remain in commercial databases	High / high	Automated notices, correction deadlines, audits, remedies, and vendor compliance process
Facility restrictions are adopted without alternatives	Medium / high	Crisis-response staffing, clinical services, de-escalation training, incident review, phased readiness assessment
Fiscal savings are overstated	Medium / medium	Agency-by-agency fiscal note, timing analysis, sensitivity ranges, and disclosure of cost shifts
Academic or professional use remains too abstract	Medium / medium	Develop module guides, teaching materials, state crosswalks, annotated examples, and practitioner-oriented issue briefs

13. Academic, Professional, and Institutional Applications

13.1 Core Academic and Professional Uses

The Model Act suite may be used for:

- university courses and seminars in juvenile justice, legislation, criminal procedure, children’s rights, public policy, and comparative law;
- law-clinic projects involving statutory crosswalks, legal memoranda, drafting exercises, public education, and interdisciplinary research;
- scholarly articles, conference presentations, webinars, and research collaborations;
- practitioner training and issue analysis for defenders, prosecutors, judges, educators, behavioral-health professionals, records specialists, and oversight personnel;
- module-specific work by professional associations, nonprofit organizations, universities, and research institutions; and
- jurisdiction-specific studies of legal compatibility, capacity, fiscal questions, data architecture, and implementation risk.

13.2 Suggested Companion Research Outputs

Useful companion outputs include state statutory crosswalks, case-law charts, annotated bibliographies, module briefs, fiscal-question templates, data dictionaries, implementation case studies, teaching materials, and comparative reference tables.

These outputs may be developed independently. Their absence does not make Draft 4.0 incomplete; each addresses a different research or application question.

13.3 Dissemination and Institutional Use

The Initiative’s website, SSRN, ORCID, Google Scholar, LinkedIn, webinars, direct professional correspondence, university contacts, and law-clinic networks may be used to disseminate the suite and identify academic or professional applications.

Outreach should present the documents as substantive research materials and invite readers to examine modules relevant to their teaching, scholarship, practice, or institutional work. The purpose is informed use and professional discussion, not endorsement of every provision.

14. Publication and Version-Control Protocol

The Initiative should maintain:

- immutable copies of each released version;
- a public date and version number on every document;
- a revision summary identifying added, deleted, and materially changed provisions;
- a source list and “last reviewed” date;
- a development log identifying publication dates, substantive author revisions, and related research outputs;
- stable citations and archive links for each public edition; and
- archive links on the Initiative website.

This protocol supports research integrity and documents continuing development without making claims beyond the evidence.

15. Current Status, Uses, and Scope

15.1 Current Status and Uses

Draft 4.0 is the current complete published research edition of the Model Act suite. It is ready for:

- university teaching, seminars, and law-clinic projects;
- scholarly publication, comparative legal research, and interdisciplinary analysis;
- professional education, webinars, workshops, and module-specific discussion;
- state statutory crosswalks and jurisdiction-specific legal research;
- use as a reference for institutional standards, policy memoranda, amendments, and reform proposals; and
- documentation of sustained research and drafting activity from August 2025 through August 2026.

15.2 Scope and Representational Boundaries

Draft 4.0 should be described as a complete modular model framework and research suite. It is not:

- enacted law or legal advice;
- a comprehensive fifty-state statutory survey;
- a jurisdiction-specific constitutional opinion, fiscal note, or technical implementation manual;
- a report of completed pilot implementation or demonstrated outcome effects;
- proof that every module is equally appropriate for every jurisdiction; or
- a claim that any specific percentage reduction or fiscal saving has already been established.

15.3 Optional Areas for Supplemental Research

Supplemental research may include:

- a fifty-state statutory survey or selected-state comparative series;
- jurisdiction-specific constitutional and case-law memoranda;
- fiscal, workforce, service-capacity, and collective-bargaining case studies;
- records, background-check, and data-systems research;
- teaching modules, clinic assignments, and practitioner guides; and
- empirical evaluation if any jurisdiction or institution applies defined provisions in practice.

16. Conclusion

Draft 4.0 is a complete and credible substantive advance from v0.3. It corrects drafting defects, expands the framework to subjects necessary for serious juvenile-justice analysis, strengthens legal and implementation safeguards, and replaces speculative targets with a defensible baseline-driven evaluation design.

The central value of the revised suite is its capacity to function as a durable reference for scholarship, teaching, practitioner education, comparative legal research, institutional standards, state crosswalks, policy memoranda, amendments, and targeted reform modules. It is not dependent on verbatim legislative adoption. Its strongest applications include diversion standards, school-referral limits, transfer safeguards, procedural protections, automatic records relief, detention conditions, data governance, and implementation analysis. The preserved version history documents sustained research and drafting from August 2025 through August 2026.

Selected Legal Authorities, Research Sources, and Official Reference Materials

The following legal authorities and research sources informed the architecture of this Research Edition. U.S. legal authorities are presented in a Bluebook-oriented form, while official research materials identify the responsible author or institution, publication date, and NCJ number where available. Their inclusion does not imply that every protection in the Model Act is constitutionally required; several provisions intentionally propose protections above the constitutional floor.

Judicial Decisions

- *Kent v. United States*, 383 U.S. 541 (1966) (requiring procedural regularity in juvenile waiver proceedings, including access to counsel and a statement of reasons).
- *In re Gault*, 387 U.S. 1 (1967) (recognizing notice, counsel, confrontation, and the privilege against self-incrimination in juvenile delinquency proceedings).
- *In re Winship*, 397 U.S. 358 (1970) (requiring proof beyond a reasonable doubt for delinquency adjudications based on criminal conduct).
- *Fare v. Michael C.*, 442 U.S. 707 (1979) (applying a totality-of-the-circumstances test to a juvenile waiver of Miranda rights).
- *Roper v. Simmons*, 543 U.S. 551 (2005) (holding the death penalty unconstitutional for offenses committed by persons under eighteen).
- *Graham v. Florida*, 560 U.S. 48 (2010) (prohibiting life without parole for juvenile nonhomicide offenses).
- *J.D.B. v. North Carolina*, 564 U.S. 261 (2011) (holding that a child's age is relevant to the Miranda custody analysis when known or objectively apparent).
- *Miller v. Alabama*, 567 U.S. 460 (2012) (prohibiting mandatory life-without-parole sentences for juveniles).
- *Montgomery v. Louisiana*, 577 U.S. 190 (2016) (holding Miller retroactive and emphasizing youth's diminished culpability and capacity for change).

Federal Statutory Authority

- 34 U.S.C. § 11133 (state-plan requirements under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act).

Research and Official Reference Materials

- Development Services Group, Inc., *Age Boundaries of the Juvenile Justice System*, Model Programs Guide Literature Review (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, updated Mar. 2024), <https://ojjdp.ojp.gov/model-programs-guide/literature-reviews/age-boundaries-of-the-juvenile-justice-system> (last visited Aug. 2, 2026).
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, *Juvenile Justice System Structure & Process*, Statistical Briefing Book (June 1, 2023), https://ojjdp.ojp.gov/statistical-briefing-book/structure_process (last visited Aug. 2, 2026).
- Development Services Group, Inc., *Diversion from Formal Juvenile Court Processing*, OJJDP Model Programs Guide Literature Review, NCJ No. 249701 (Feb. 2017), https://ojjdp.ojp.gov/sites/ojjdp/files/media/document/diversion_programs.pdf.
- Development Services Group, Inc., *Restorative Justice*, OJJDP Model Programs Guide Literature Review, NCJ No. 249722 (Nov. 2010), https://ojjdp.ojp.gov/sites/ojjdp/files/media/document/restorative_justice.pdf.
- Charles Puzzanchera, Sarah Hockenberry & Melissa Sickmund, *Youth and the Juvenile Justice System: 2022 National Report*, NCJ No. 305721 (National Center for Juvenile Justice, Dec. 2022), <https://ojjdp.ojp.gov/publications/2022-national-report.pdf>.