

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 6, 2020

Addison Davis Biography	2
John Newman Biography.....	3
Mo Canady Biography	4
Mo Canady Testimony.....	5-10
Mo Canady Supporting Documents: Standards and Best Practices for School Resource Officer Programs	11-25
Bill E. Waybourn Biography	26
Thomas Lemmer Biography	27
Thomas Lemmer Testimony	28-32

Addison Davis

Superintendent of Schools, Hillsborough County Public Schools



Addison Davis is the Superintendent of Schools for Hillsborough County Public Schools where he took office in March 2020. HCPS is the seventh largest school district in the nation with more than 25,000 employees that serve nearly 220,000 students.

Mr. Davis believes in putting students' best interests at the heart of all decision-making, goal-based management, and building a school system that embraces the entire community.

Mr. Davis' experience in transforming schools has resulted in increased student achievement in large urban and mid-size suburban Florida school districts. Before arriving in Hillsborough County, he served as the Superintendent of Schools for Clay County. Under his leadership, the Clay County School District had dramatic improvements across all performance metrics. Additionally, Clay County's graduation rate rose 6.4 percentage points, improving from twentieth in the state to eighth.

Prior to his responsibilities as Superintendent of Schools in Clay County, Mr. Davis was the Chief of Schools for Duval County Public Schools, the nation's twentieth largest school district serving more 120,000 students. He worked for Duval County Public Schools for eighteen years, starting as a teacher, moving to an Assistant Principal, Principal, Executive Director of Turnaround, Middle School Cluster Chief, and Region Superintendent.

In December 2019, Mr. Davis was named the Sunshine State Public Relations Association's 2019 Superintendent Communicator of the Year. Within his first year in Clay County, he was named a 2017-2018 Superintendent to watch by the National School Public Relations Association. This award recognizes superintendents for their dynamic, fast-paced leadership and strong communication skills.

Addison Davis was born and raised in northeast Florida and has a master's degree in Educational Leadership from Jacksonville University. He and wife Natalie have two daughters, Madisyn and Kaitlyn.

John Newman

Chief of Security and Emergency Management, Hillsborough County Public Schools



Chief John Newman oversees the Security and Emergency Management Division for Hillsborough County Public Schools (HCPS), the seventh largest school district in the nation with more than 25,000 employees that serve nearly 220,000 students.

Before his appointment to HCPS in 2014, Chief Newman was a 29-year veteran of the Tampa Police Department, retiring as the Assistant Chief. He holds both a BA in Criminal Justice from the University of South Florida as well as a MA in American Studies from the University of South Florida. He is a graduate of the prestigious Southern Police Institute at the University of Louisville. Chief Newman has experience in a variety of law enforcement areas such as patrol, tactical response team, narcotics, school resource program, criminal intelligence and internal affairs. In his position as Assistant Chief for the Tampa Police Department, Chief Newman oversaw training, recruitment, policy development, all specialty teams, large event planning, and major crime operations.

In his current position, Chief Newman is responsible for deploying and managing the security assets on all 277 sites operated by HCPS. He oversees 368 men and women armed security officers, as well as more than 100 law enforcement personnel assigned to our middle and high school campuses. HCPS appointed Chief Newman as one of Florida's 67 Safe School Specialists that report to the Florida Department of Education's Office of Safe Schools. With the passage of the Safe Schools legislation in Florida, Chief Newman has overseen the most aggressive expansion of HCPS Security and Emergency Management in the organization's history.

As a tenured police executive, Chief Newman has professional relationships with local, state and federal government agencies. He is a member of the Tampa FBI Joint Terrorism Task Force, Tampa Bay Area Chiefs of Police Association, and the Florida Department of Law Enforcement State Wide Working Group for Homeland Security.

Chief Newman and his wife have been married for 36 years and have two daughters, all of who are teachers for Hillsborough County Public Schools.

Mo Canady

Executive Director, National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO)



Mo Canady holds a Bachelor's degree in Criminal Justice from Jacksonville State University. He is a former Lieutenant with the City of Hoover Police Department in Hoover, Alabama. The last twelve years of his career were spent as the supervisor of the School Services Division. After a 25 year career, He retired from the Hoover Police Department in 2011.

He was appointed as an instructor for the National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO) in 2001 and a NASRO board member in 2005. He is a past President of the Alabama Association of School Resource Officers.

Mo now serves as the Executive Director for NASRO. He recently testified on the matter of SRO National Standards before The Federal Commission on School Safety. He has also testified on the matter of school safety before the United States House Committee on Education and the Workforce. He is a co-author of the national report; "To Protect and Educate – The School Resource Officer and the Prevention of Violence in Schools".

May 6, 2020

Presidential Commission on Law Enforcement and The Administration of Justice
Phil Keith | Chairman

Testimony of James “Mo” Canady, Executive Director, National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO)

Thank you for inviting me to testify on behalf of the National Association of School Resource Officers. It is my honor to serve as the Executive Director for this outstanding group of law enforcement and education professionals. NASRO is a not-for-profit association founded in 1991 with a solid commitment to our nation’s youth. NASRO is comprised of school-based law enforcement officers, school administrators, and school security and safety professionals working as partners to protect students, faculty and staff, and their school communities. The “school resource officer” (SRO) refers to a commissioned law enforcement officer selected, trained and assigned to protect and serve an educational environment. I cannot emphasize enough how critical it is for officers to be *carefully* selected and *specially* trained to function in the school environment. This is always a factor in the success or failure of the SRO program.

The SRO program is most effective when it is built on the foundation of interagency collaboration. Through a formal memorandum of understanding between a law enforcement agency and a school district, each collaborator has a clear and properly enforced understanding of his or her role in the school environment.

The role of the SRO should utilize the triad concept of school-based policing, in which an SRO functions in a school environment in three capacities: (1) as a Law Enforcement Officer, (2) as a Teacher or Guest Speaker, and (3) as an Informal Counselor or Mentor. These elements should be based on a set of well-established best practices, which NASRO has spent nearly 30 years crafting. The NASRO Board of Directors recently commissioned a group of dedicated association members to create a formal document of standards and best practices for school resource officer programs. On July

13th, 2018, this important document was completed. A copy of these best practices is included with this written testimony.

These best practices are organized into four sections, each of which encompasses an essential component of a successful SRO program.

The first section outlines administrative standards, including an outline of the definition and purpose of an SRO and recommendations for the establishment of a thorough memorandum of understanding between a law enforcement agency and a school. An SRO should be a sworn, certified law enforcement officer assigned to a community-based policing program who is actively working in a collaborative effort with the school district. When this definition is followed, the SRO program serves to significantly benefit its school community. However, without adherence to this definition, the effectiveness of the SRO program will, at best, be substantially hindered, and, at worst, be drastically detrimental to the school, the law enforcement agency, and the community. The number one goal of any successful SRO must be to “bridge the gap” between law enforcement and youth. Positive relationships between students and SROs lay a powerful foundation for the exchange of information and the protective support of students. These relationships, along with those the SRO builds with the school administration and with parents, can prevent, and have averted acts of school violence before a shot is ever fired.

I would like to share with you just one case study I pulled from the national Averted School Violence (ASV) Database, which speaks to the importance of the SRO “bridging the gap” between students and law enforcement.

The ASV Database was created through a cooperative agreement between the COPS Office of the U.S. Department of Justice with the National Police Foundation (NPF) and funded by the Comprehensive School Safety Initiative passed by Congress in the aftermath of the Sandy Hook mass casualty school shooting in December 2012. More information about the ASV Database can be found at: www.avertedschoolviolence.org.

In this case, an 18-year-old student told a peer that he was going to “shoot up” their high school and that he had access to guns that were kept in a safe at his house. The 18-year-old also posted a threat on social media. The peer reported the threat to the school resource officer (SRO) and an investigation was initiated. Law enforcement made contact with the student at his residence. He was interviewed, along with his parents, and a

search was conducted. During the search, police found four rifles and one handgun, which were confiscated, and the student was taken into custody. He faces a felony charge of terroristic threats, causing a serious public inconvenience, and misdemeanor disorderly conduct. Although open-source reports do not indicate a motive for the possible attack, it was planned for the day before the 2nd Anniversary of the Marjory Stoneman Douglas school shooting in Florida.

According to the ASV Database, clearly educating members of the school community (students, parents, teachers, and staff) about the indicators for potential self-harm and targeted violence, and how to report concerning behavior, assisted in averting this potential act of school violence. It is essential that every student have at least one adult in their school community whom they trust enough to share concerning behavior. In this case, the SRO was that trusted adult. A student and a parent reported concerning behavior, and school administrators and law enforcement took the report seriously and acted expeditiously to neutralize the threat. The presence of an SRO within the school community made it possible to immediately assess the viability of the threat and take preventive action.

The second section of NASRO's Best Practices document speaks to the importance of the selection process. The SRO position is a unique assignment in law enforcement, and it requires a unique officer to properly serve in it. Due to the nature of the assignment, the SRO will become one of the most well-known officers in the community. First, it is critical that the officer selected for this position have several years of law enforcement experience in order to ensure effective real-world application of enforcing the law in the community prior to carrying out this responsibility within the school setting.

The selected individual should also have excellent verbal and written communication skills, which enhance an SRO's ability to work with a diverse community of school administrators, teachers, counselors, parents, and students. The selected SRO must also be of good moral character in order to effectively serve as a mentor and positive role model to students. Finally, a law enforcement officer should have a sincere willingness to engage with and develop students to serve as an SRO. Those who have prior experience in youth or community policing programs or who have previously coached, mentored, taught, or volunteered with students or youth generally demonstrate this interest.

The third section outlines the essential details of an SRO's specialized training. Once the officer has been carefully selected, it is then crucial that he or she be specifically trained to work in a school environment, employing the triad approach. Every SRO should complete NASRO's Basic SRO Course, which includes topics such as: Foundations of School Based Policing, Understanding the Teen Brain, School Law, and Emergency Operations Plans. An SRO's training must be ongoing as educational trends and school culture change and should include topics such as: Adolescent Mental Health and Brain Development, Active Shooter Response, Constitutional and State Law, Driver Safety, Human Trafficking, Interview and Interrogation, Resiliency and Wellness, School Safety, Social Media, Threat Assessment, Trauma-Informed Practices, and Youth Decision-Making, Victimization.

The final section highlights the vital importance of interagency collaboration between the school district and the law enforcement agency. Proper collaboration between school officials and SROs will most definitely enhance preservation of the campus from disruptive forces while nurturing and protecting youth who are compelled to attend school. This collaboration should be formalized in a Memorandum of Understanding.

Relationship building is certainly an important factor in the success of an SRO program. The SRO must endeavor to build positive working relationships with the school administration. One way to help build these relationships can be through the SROs role on the school safety team. Properly trained SROs are prepared to be a member of safety teams and can also take a leadership role in helping to develop teams where none exist.

I spent nearly half of my law enforcement career in school based-policing. It was without a doubt the most rewarding period of my career. It was more than just a job. It became my life's work. I developed positive relationships with administrators, faculty members, students and parents. I became an integral part of the Hoover, Alabama, City Schools District Crisis Team. By being a part of a school safety team, the SRO becomes fully engaged in crisis planning to include Prevention, Preparedness, Response and Recovery. SROs can provide value to the written plans for a school district. They can also assist with campus site assessments as well as by conducting safety drills.

I had not given a great deal of thought to “Recovery” during the early phase of my career in school-based law enforcement. It was not until the days following November 19, 2002, that the importance of the role the school resource officer can play in the recovery of a school community following a critical incident became clear. The unthinkable had happened at our largest high school. One student had taken the life of another in the hallway during the change of class periods.

This resulted in a very large crime scene that took some time to secure. The students had to remain in a modified lockdown for several hours. We all knew this put quite a burden on teachers, in particular. However, they did exactly what they were supposed to do, as they had been trained. The principal asked me to join him in a faculty meeting after the students were released. I took the opportunity to praise the staff for their good work. Faculty members were well prepared for an incident such as this because of the school’s commitment to maintaining a solid school safety team.

I believe that this faculty meeting was actually the beginning of the recovery process. Plans were developed for the next day. We thought that our most important job on November 20th would be to keep this from happening again. To keep weapons out of the school. To make sure that no retaliation occurred. While all of those things were important, it paled in comparison to the needs of the student body to be comforted and reassured. The need for trusted and caring adults became the more important issue in this recovery process. The school resource officers were certainly still focused on security; however, we were most definitely more engaged in the emotional and mental recovery process. The reason for this is because we were much more than just a law enforcement presence. We were trusted adults who had developed positive relationships with the students and faculty we served. Because of that, we helped to make a difference in the lives of children during the days prior to, and most definitely following, November 19, 2002.

Trained and committed police officers are well-suited to effectively protect and serve the school community. School resource officers contribute by ensuring a safe and secure campus, educating students about law-related topics, and mentoring students as informal counselors and role models. Over the last 29 years, the National Association of School Resource Officers has become the world leader in school-based policing. We have trained thousands of officers based on the Triad model of school-based policing, and we continue to train officers to address emerging issues and trends. These school resource

officers are having a positive impact on the lives of children every day throughout the United States and the world.

As “The World’s Leader in School Based Policing,” NASRO has regularly spoken to the critical need for best practices for SRO programs. We are proud to have authored Standards and Best Practices for School Resource Officer Programs. This important document was created in the furthering of our mission to keep every school and every student safe. I trust that you will agree with its tenets. Thank you.

Standards and Best Practices for School Resource Officer Programs

Mo Canady

NASRO Executive Director

✉ : mo.canady@nasro.org

☎ : (205) 739-6060

The Standards and Best Practices presented here are separated into two classifications: Mandatory (M) and Recommended (R) to identify the importance of each Standard and Best Practice.

© 2018 BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICERS, INC., (NASRO). ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. THIS DOCUMENT MAY NOT BE REPRODUCED OR DISTRIBUTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS WITHOUT THE EXPRESSED WRITTEN PERMISSION OF NASRO.



Forward

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE STANDARDS

1.1 General

This publication represents a standard for domestic and international agencies and departments. This *Standards and Best Practices for the School Resource Officer Programs* was developed and is maintained by the National Association of School Resource Officers, Inc., (NASRO) a section 501(c)(3) IRC membership association established pursuant to Chapter 617 of the laws of the State of Florida.

1.2 Applicability

This document contains professional standards and recommended best practices for law enforcement agencies both within and outside of the United States, regardless of size or level of government (federal/national, state/provincial or local).

NASRO has adopted this *Standards and Best Practices for the School Resource Officer Programs* and supports the need for the standards to be used as a guide for new and existing SRO units and for the best practices to be reviewed and adopted by all law enforcement, school safety agencies and school boards, as recommended.

NASRO has adopted these standards and best practices as the bases for future law enforcement certification or accreditation and supports the need for the standards to be used as a guide for all SRO law enforcement administrations and operations.

1.3 Intent

These standards and best practices are intended to provide a foundation of safe operating practices in the performance of the unit's mission and were formulated based on what has been identified as the two highest priorities of school-based law enforcement programs:

1. Safety first in all aspects of the operation.
2. Provide excellence in SRO services in support of the agency's mission.

1.4 Scope

The scope of this document is intended to encompass all aspects of SRO law enforcement and has been divided in four (4) major sections: Administration, Selection, Training and Collaboration. The subsections are intended to encompass the primary aspects of SRO law enforcement unit administration and operations.

2.0 THE MAJOR BENEFITS OF ADOPTING THESE STANDARDS

Agencies are strongly encouraged to adopt and implement the standards and best practices outlined in this publication. They have been designed as industry standards intended to foster a universal application of best practices throughout the SRO law enforcement community. Although adoption and implementation of these standards and best practices is strictly voluntary, agencies that choose to adhere to them set themselves apart from others, becoming exemplars of SRO safety and operational excellence.

2.1 Safe, Effective and Cost-Efficient SRO Law Enforcement Operations

Compliance with these standards and best practices provides agencies with a foundation upon which a culture of safe operating practices may be formulated and establishes a mark of excellence to further develop and enhance the SRO unit's professionalism, efficiency, and overall effectiveness.

2.2 Greater Accountability with the Agency

These standards and best practices provide the respective agency chief, sheriff, or department head sound training principles, personnel qualification requirements, clearly defined lines of authority, and examples of accepted industry standards that support informed decision-making and resource allocation.

2.3 Controlled Liability Insurance Costs

Compliance with these standards and best practices may allow for agencies to more easily purchase SRO law enforcement and liability insurance, increase the limit of their insurance coverage, and, in many cases, lower their insurance premiums and/or gain other financial incentives.

2.4 Stronger Support from Government Officials and the Community

By complying with these standards and best practices, agencies establish credibility as professional operations, which provide safe, cost-effective, and essential SRO support to law enforcement operations in a variety of missions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
Section 1	Administration	5-8
	01.01.00 Definition	5
	01.01.02 Purpose	5
	01.01.03 Knowledge and Support	5
	01.01.04 Memorandum of Understanding	6-8
Section 2	Selection	9-10
	02.01.00 Selection Process	9
	02.01.02 Experience	9
	02.01.03 Number of SROs Selected	9
	02.01.04 School Climate	10
	02.01.05 Willingness in Developing Youth	10
	02.01.06 Communication Skills	10
	02.01.07 Probationary Period	10
Section 3	Training	11-13
	03.01.00 Training Standards	11
	03.01.01 Importance	11
	03.02.01 Basic SRO Course	12
	03.02.02 The TRIAD Approach	12
	03.02.03 School Administration Policies & Procedures	12
	03.03.00 Advanced SRO Course	13
	03.04.00 Single Officer Rapid Deployment	13
Section 4	Collaboration	14-15
	04.01.01 Definition	14
	04.01.02 Defining Role of School Admin. and the SRO	14
	04.01.03 The Administration's Role in SRO Selection	15
	04.01.04 The Administration's Role in SRO Evaluation	15
	04.01.05 The Administration's Role during the SRO Probationary Period	15

Limitation of Liability

The National Association of School Resources Officers, Inc., makes no warranty, expressed or implied, for the benefit of any person or entity with regard to any aspect of the standards and best practices contained herein. These standards were adopted for the sole purpose of developing best practices by law enforcement agencies, SRO units or division, school safety organizations, and school boards throughout the U.S., and various foreign countries to obtain and maintain certification, there being no intended third-party beneficiaries hereof, expressed or implied. Nothing herein shall be construed so as to create any right, use, property interest, or entitlement on the part of any applicant agency or third party. These standards shall in no way be construed to be an individual act of any director, employee, agency, member, individual, or a legal entity associated with NASRO or otherwise be construed so as to create any liability in an individual or official capacity on the part of any NASRO, director, employee, agency, member, individual, or legal entity associated with NASRO.

SECTION ONE | ADMINISTRATION

01.01.00	Administrative Standards	Compliance
01.01.01	<p>Definition</p> <p>A school resource officer (SRO) is a full-time law enforcement officer with sworn law enforcement authority, trained in school-based policing and crisis response, assigned by the employing law enforcement agency to work with the school using community-oriented policing concepts.</p>	(M)
01.01.02	<p>Purpose</p> <p>The purpose of a successful SRO program is to “bridge the gap” between law enforcement and youth. This purpose is best accomplished by using the TRIAD model: Law Enforcement (LEO), Teacher (Guest Speaker), and Informal Counselor (Mentor). Each element of the TRIAD will be further explained throughout this document.</p>	(R)
01.01.03	<p>Knowledge and Support from Agency Administration</p> <p>For the SRO program to be successful, the law enforcement agency head and the superintendent of the school district must understand and fully support the SRO program, including an understanding of the standards and best practices put forth in this document.</p>	(M)

Memorandum of Understanding

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or a similar contractual document should be established between the operating law enforcement agency and the school district. This document will assist in developing program goals and evaluating the program to assess the success in meeting identified goals.

Example MOU topics include but are not limited to:

- **Defining the roles and responsibilities of formal school discipline (M)**
 - SROs should not be administering formal school discipline such as detentions, suspensions, or expulsions. These decisions are the sole responsibility of the school personnel.
- **SROs act in accordance with the recommended TRIAD roles (R)**
 - As a law enforcement officer, the SRO shall abide by federal, state, and local laws.
 - As an informal counselor/mentor, the SRO may address school violations in an effort to positively impact student behavior and character and may refer students to school personnel as necessary.
 - As a teacher/classroom presenter, the SRO may address school-related education law to positively impact student behavior and character to mitigate more serious behaviors.
- **Defining roles and expectations pertaining to decision to arrest (M)**
 - According to federal law, the responsibility and decision to arrest lies solely with the SRO, respective to state law, local ordinances, and the SRO's departmental standard operating procedures or standing order.
 - The SRO's continual collaboration with school personnel and his or her understanding of each student's needs may impact the decision to arrest but the responsibility is that of the SRO alone.
- **Chain of Command (M)**
 - The SRO shall abide by the law enforcement agency's policies pertaining to the chain of command.

- **Uniform Use (M)**
 - SROs must be clearly identified as law enforcement. The uniform apparel and law enforcement equipment shall be defined by the agency policy. If a “soft” uniform is agreed upon, the uniform should not detract from clearly identifying the SRO as law enforcement.
- **Weapons Storage (M)**
 - Normal duty gear is to be defined by the SRO’s agency policies.
 - In the event additional weapons or gear is to be utilized, the storage of these items shall be defined by the law enforcement agency
- **Use of Less Lethal Tools (R)**
 - The SRO should abide by agency policies pertaining to the use of less lethal devices.
 - If there is a desired deviation from the policies, the cost, storage, and use must be agreed upon.
- **Sharing of Information (M)**
 - SROs and school personnel shall share information in accordance with their respective state laws.
 - Access and use of school camera footage, body-worn cameras, student database information, and any other information sharing practices should be defined by the MOU.
- **Documentation and Reporting Requirements (M)**
 - The SRO shall be under the immediate supervision and direction of his or her law enforcement agency.
 - The agency policies shall identify the documentation and reporting procedures to be used.
 - Any documentation requested by the school personnel shall be addressed by the MOU or similar contractual document.
- **Expenses (M)**
 - The salary (including overtime), benefits, and equipment costs should be established in the MOU and/or in an agreed upon contract between the law enforcement agency and the school district.

- **Office Space and Office Supplies (R)**
 - A clearly defined location should be established for the SRO to conduct school and law enforcement business.
 - Due to the nature of law enforcement related to juveniles, a dedicated location with a closable door should be available.
 - Access to office supplies such as paper, a printer, computer, etc. should be addressed in the MOU.

- **Hours on Campus (M)**
 - Clearly defined expectations of the hours the SRO shall spend on campus should be agreed upon by the operating law enforcement agency and the school district.
 - Due to the nature of law enforcement, there may be a need for the SRO to be out of the building(s) for a period of time.
 - This should be understood and agreed upon by all parties involved.

- **Day-to-Day Duties (M)**
 - As formerly described, the SRO shall utilize the TRIAD model: Law Enforcement (LEO), Teacher (Guest Speaker) and Informal Counselor (Mentor).
 - Quality law enforcement practices should be assumed and agreed upon.
 - The SRO should not be assigned to specific locations or duties on a daily basis, but rather be available to assist teachers, administrators, and students when requested and as consistent with their roles as a law enforcement officer, informal counselor/mentor, and teacher/classroom presenter.
 - The expectations of the SRO's daily duties must be agreed upon by the law enforcement agency and the school district.

- **Extracurricular Activities (R)**
 - There is a demonstrated benefit to the SRO's involvement in extracurricular activities.
 - Expectations of attendance and compensation should be agreed upon by the law enforcement agency and the school district.

SECTION TWO | SELECTION

02.01.00	The SRO Selection Process	Compliance
02.01.01	The SRO Selection Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There shall be a clearly defined process of selection for the SRO to be employed. • This selection process shall be agreed upon between the agency and the school administration. • The school administration shall be involved in the selection process, including but not limited to, the interviews of SRO candidates. 	(M)
02.01.02	Experience <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is recommended that the officer selected have at least three (3) years of law enforcement experience. • This level of experience will help the officer obtain credibility among the school faculty, students, and parents. • This level of experience will also allow the SRO to have a greater understanding of the local agency's policies and procedures. 	(R)
02.01.03	Number of SROs Selected <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is recommended that each school have at least one (1) SRO on campus. • It is recommended that the determination of the number of SROs needed for each school be based on but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ School enrollment ○ Discipline history ○ Number of campus buildings ○ Campus acreage ○ Calls for service ○ Location in the community ○ Number of non-sworn safety personnel in the building 	(R)

02.01.04	<p style="text-align: center;">School Climate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several factors pertaining to school climate should be considered when considering the best SRO fit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Student enrollment ○ School discipline history ○ Cultural and minority representation ○ Special Education programs ○ English as a Second Language programs 	(R)
02.01.05	<p style="text-align: center;">Willingness in Developing Youth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective SROs have a willingness to engage with youth. • This can be demonstrated in the candidate's previous participation in youth or community policing programs. 	(M)
02.01.06	<p style="text-align: center;">Communication Skills</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must have excellent verbal and written communication skills. 	(M)
02.01.07	<p style="text-align: center;">Probationary Period</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selected SRO should have a probationary period agreed upon by the operating law enforcement agency and the school district to allow all parties to best determine if the selected officer is a proper fit for the school community. 	(R)

SECTION THREE | TRAINING

03.01.00	Training Standards	Compliance
03.01.01	<p style="text-align: center;">Importance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SRO must be specially trained in school-based policing, as the duties and responsibilities of an SRO are inherently different than that of other law enforcement specialties. • At a minimum, the SRO should attend annual training related to school safety topics. These topics may include, but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Crisis Planning ○ Active Threat Response ○ Adolescent Mental Health • Such trainings enhance and maintain the relevancy of the SRO's skill set. • It is recommended that a school administrator also attend with his or her SRO to support ongoing collaboration. • Some opportunities for these training programs include SRO conferences such those offered by the National Association of School Resource Officers and its affiliated state associations. 	(M)

03.02.00	The Basic SRO Training Course	Compliance
03.02.01	<p style="text-align: center;">Basic SRO Course</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SRO should complete a foundational school-based policing course, such as the NASRO Basic SRO Course, prior to being assigned. • If it is not practical for the new SRO to complete a foundational school-based policing course prior to the assignment, the new SRO shall complete a foundational school-based policing course within one (1) year of beginning the assignment. 	(M)

The TRIAD Approach**(M)**

- SROs must be trained to utilize a TRIAD approach to school-based policing.
- This concept includes understanding and applying the principles of each TRIAD component: Law Enforcement (LEO), Teacher (Guest Speaker) and Informal Counselor (Mentor).
- The specifics of each component include but are not limited to:
 - To be an effective law enforcement officer (LEO) in a school environment, the SRO should have a working knowledge of:
 - Constitutional and state law
 - Armed response
 - Crime prevention and mitigation
 - Interview and interrogation
 - Investigations
 - Crime Prevention Through Environmental School Design
 - Patrol operations (high visibility)
 - Advocacy within the juvenile justice system
 - Mandatory reporting
 - To be an effective teacher/guest speaker, the SRO should be capable of delivering law-related education lessons on topics such as:
 - Crime prevention
 - Social media
 - School safety
 - Victimization
 - Laws pertaining to students
 - Safe traffic stops
 - Driver safety
 - Decision making
 - Other topics requested by staff/parents
 - To be an effective informal counselor/mentor, the SRO should be properly trained in:
 - Mentoring
 - Crime prevention
 - Empowering youth
 - Resiliency and overall wellness
 - Adolescent brain development
 - Social and emotional development
 - Recognizing and supporting diversity
 - Improving youth decision-making skills
 - Trauma-informed practices

03.02.03	School Administration Policies & Procedures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional school-related training topics in support of an effective SRO program should be ongoing. • Examples of these include but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Structure of the school's discipline policy. ○ Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and other school-related law issues. ○ Working with special needs students and the special education department within the school. ○ A school-utilized behavioral intervention program. 	(R)
----------	--	-----

03.03.00	The Advanced SRO Training Course	Compliance
03.03.01	Advanced SRO Course <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is recommended that the SRO successfully complete an advanced level school-based policing course approximately one (1) year after successful completion of the basic foundational course. • This course will build on and further expand the SRO's foundational knowledge and skills. 	(R)

03.04.00	Single Officer Rapid Deployment Training	Compliance
03.04.01	Single Officer Rapid Deployment Training <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SRO should successfully complete bi-annual training for single officer rapid deployment. • This training should provide appropriate methods for the SRO to be able to respond to active assailants or threats in the school. 	(R)

SECTION FOUR | COLLABORATION

04.01.00	Collaboration Between Law Enforcement and the School Community	Compliance
04.01.01	<p style="text-align: center;">Definition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A successful SRO program must have a strong collaboration between the law enforcement agency and the school community. • Although various elements of the job are defined by each party, it is important that these elements are clearly defined and communicated. 	(M)
04.01.02	<p>Defining Roles of the School Administrator and the SRO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is recommended that each party establish the role of the school administrator and the SRO in this partnership to ensure that all district policies, department policies, local laws, state laws, and federal laws are followed. • It is recommended that a school administrator who will be partnering with the SRO also complete Basic and other school-based policing courses with the SRO. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This strengthens the collaboration and the understanding of this partnership in support of an effective SRO program. • Effective partnerships can be supported through but are not limited to the following methods: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The MOU and its annual review for program improvements and updates. ○ Shared trainings to best understand school and law practices, policies and programs. ○ Regular meetings to review existing and potential school-related issues. ○ Teachers correctly following the school's chain of command and the SRO correctly following agency's chain of command. ○ Established sharing of information on policies and procedures. ○ Regular review of CPTED at the school. ○ Crisis management planning and practice. ○ Community education in school-related law concerns of parents. 	(R)

04.01.03	<p>The Administration's Role in SRO Selection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The selection process of the SRO must include both the law enforcement agency and the school administration. • Factors of selection should include, but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ School enrollment ○ Discipline history ○ Number of campus buildings ○ Campus acreage ○ Calls for service ○ Location in the community ○ Number of non-sworn safety personnel in the building 	
04.01.04	<p>The Administration's Role in SRO Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The effectiveness of the individual SRO must be based on the established performance goals agreed upon by the law enforcement agency and the school district. • An evaluation tool specific to the position of the SRO must be developed and utilized. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This will include evaluating the relationship between the SRO and the school administration and the effectiveness of the SRO related to the training and expectations. ○ This tool should include language specific to the law enforcement agency's expectations as well as the school district's expectations. 	(M)
04.01.05	<p>The Administration's Role During the SRO Probationary Period</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The school administration shall participate in the probationary review of the selected SRO as agreed upon by the agency and the school district to allow all parties to best determine if the selected officer is a proper fit for the school community. 	(M)

Bill E. Waybourn

Tarrant County Sheriff, TX



Bill began his career in service when he joined the U.S. Air Force in 1978, serving in both the active duty and reserves. On April 30, 1981, after serving active duty, Bill began working for Dalworthington Gardens Police Department. Bill was promoted to Chief of Police on June 1, 1984; making him the youngest police chief in the state of Texas. Later, he united the city through combining the police and fire services making him the Chief of Public Safety. In his 31 years as Chief of Dalworthington Gardens, he has testified on numerous cases as an expert witness, pioneered the Texas model for DWI “No Refusal” program—which has been credited with lowering the fatality and DWI rate and is now being used as the model for several surrounding states; testified before the state legislature on a diverse array of issues relating to the Second Amendment and civilians carrying firearms. He worked with the state legislature on Texas’ original concealed handgun license laws in the 1990’s, as well as the most recent open carry law that passed in 2015. Bill is also extremely honored to have helped the Chris Kyle Bill become a law in Texas—a bill that streamlines the process for military service men and women to become police officers.

He has a Bachelor’s Degree in Criminal Justice and a Master’s Degree in Conflict Resolution. Bill is a graduate of the FBI National Academy, the Texas A&M Police Academy, and is a black belt in Tae Kwon Do. During Bill’s first term as Sheriff, he has created a Human Trafficking Unit, a Department of Intelligence, aggressive inmate service programs, several less than lethal programs, and numerous other training initiatives. Both Intelligence and Human Trafficking have gained state and national prominence by being on the tip of the spear. Bill often is speaking publicly about various topics to: churches, civic organizations, colleges, and police related events.

Bill is married to Laura Waybourn and together have ten children, eight of which have been adopted. Bill and Laura are zealous and passionate advocates for the fatherless.

Thomas J. Lemmer

Fraternal Order of Police Lodge #7 Member, Deputy Chief, Chicago Police Department



Thomas Lemmer is dedicated law enforcement professional and member of Chicago Lodge 7 of the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP), the world's largest organization of sworn law enforcement officers. He first became a member of the FOP in 1985, while he was a U.S. Department of Defense Police Officer at the Great Lakes Naval Training Center. Since joining the Chicago Police Department (CPD) in 1986, and becoming a member of Lodge 7, he has been a beat officer, gang tactical officer, sergeant, the CPD's gang violence project coordinator, as well as a field lieutenant, the department's commanding officer for research and development, a captain directing patrol operations, the commander of the department's Youth Investigations Division, and he is currently the deputy chief who oversees the department's management accountability processes.

Overall, he has nearly four decades of experience in public safety positions, including more than twenty years of experience as a law enforcement supervisor and executive. He has served in ethnically diverse and predominately minority communities, as well as within college, military, and public transportation settings, and he has extensive expertise in addressing the complexities of criminal gang activity and juvenile crime. For his work in the area of juvenile delinquency intervention, he has been a recipient of both the Chicago Crime Commission's *Star of Distinction Award* in 2003 and the Illinois Bar Association's *Law Enforcement Award* in 2018.

As a committed lifetime learner, researcher, and educator he holds a bachelor's degree from Saint Xavier University, and a master's degree from Loyola University Chicago, both in the field of criminal justice. He has conducted research in the area of gang activity, and he has seven years of experience as an undergraduate criminal justice instructor with Loyola University Chicago on the topics of policing and gang activity, for which he received the *Mangus Seng Teaching Excellence Award* in 2011. He is also a graduate of Northwestern University's School of Police Staff and Command, and drawing upon his juvenile crime, law enforcement policy, program development, and management accountability expertise, he continues to be an active police trainer, including as a contributing presenter for the Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board.

In addition to the FOP, he serves on the Illinois Juvenile Justice Leadership Council, and he is also a member of the Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and the Police Executive Research Forum.

A citizen concerned about Chicago's youth, he was elected three times to the Mount Greenwood Local School Council (LSC), a Chicago public elementary school of approximately 500 students from kindergarten through eighth grade. Under Illinois law, each CPS school has an eleven-member LSC that is charged with providing school management oversight and monitoring of educational quality. Lemmer was twice elected as the Mount Greenwood School LSC chairman, serving in this leadership role from 1991 thru 1996, after having previously served as the vice chairman from 1989 thru 1991.

How Law Enforcement Addresses Juveniles Involved in Crime
Juvenile Justice Hearing - Wednesday, May 6th, 2020, 2:00pm to 3:00pm, Eastern Time

Written Testimony of Thomas J. Lemmer

Fraternal Order of Police, Chicago Lodge 7, Member

Opening Statement

I would like to thank the President of the United States, Donald J. Trump, and United States Attorney General William P. Barr for having established the *President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice*. I would also like to thank Commission Chairman, Phil Keith, and each of the commissioners, for their time and commitment to the work of the commission. Finally, I would like to thank the National President of the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP), Patrick Yoes, and Chicago Lodge 7 President Kevin Graham for their commitment to the law enforcement profession. The FOP is the world's largest organization of sworn law enforcement officers, with more 330,000 members, and I am honored to speak today on their behalf regarding the challenges of juvenile crime.

The Mission of Law Enforcement and the Connection to Juvenile Crime

The goal of the modern police agency is crime prevention. While the apprehension of offenders and enforcement activities, such as arrests and citations, are strategies used by the police – the goal is crime prevention, not more arrests – not more prosecutions. Such is particularly true relative to juvenile crime. Police officers are instinctively protective of children, and even with juveniles engaged in delinquency, police officers seek the implementation of the intervention approaches most likely to prevent those youths from continuing to be involved in delinquent behaviors. Secondly, police officers on the beat have always engaged in persuasion and warning as core approaches in encouraging youth to avoid “getting into trouble.” Nothing has changed; these remain key delinquency response approaches. Thirdly, police officers also fully support – and in many communities actively assist with – pure delinquency prevention approaches, including athletic leagues; explorer, “officer friendly,” DARE, and GREAT programs; as well as other community recreation and outreach efforts. Fourth, even when the arrest of a juvenile is seen as necessary, police officers see the value, and regularly make use of diversion as an outcome approach. Under Illinois law, diversion can occur at two levels – by the police juvenile officer, using a process known as a “station adjustment,” and then also through the prosecutor's office. In both instances, the youth is returned home without the filing of a formal court case, and the youth may be referred to support programming or services (see the Illinois Juvenile Court Act, 705 ILCS 405/Art. V Pt. 3). In Chicago during 2019, police station adjusted (diverted) nearly one-third of all juvenile arrests (CPD data).

Foundational Role of Juvenile Court and the Police

In 1899, with the establishment of the nation's first juvenile court, Chicago played host to what many observers have described as the single greatest leap toward the ideal of an effective system of juvenile delinquency intervention. However, by 1965, rising social unrest, as well as specific concerns over crime and violence, including juvenile crime, led President Lyndon B. Johnson to establish the first President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. After months of study, among the extensive findings brought forward by the commission, and its Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency, was the conclusion that the juvenile court system was falling short of its mission. The first commission wrote:

“To say that juvenile courts have failed to achieve their goals is to say no more than what is true of criminal courts in the United States. But failure is most striking when hopes are highest”
(President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice 1967: 80; Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency 1967: 7).

What a powerful statement: *“But failure is most striking when hopes are highest.”* It is difficult to find unanimity in national opinion on any given public policy matter. Nonetheless, since the 1820s, there has been wide support for the premise that relative to crime and our response to it, juveniles are, and need to be handled as, special cases. Even as the public policy debate over how to best address this special

Written Testimony of Thomas J. Lemmer | May 6, 2020

population has fluctuated over the past 200 years, finding an effective response to juvenile delinquency has been a continuing and high hope. While President Johnson's commission acknowledged the struggle of the juvenile court process to meet its mission, the commission neither abandoned the longstanding hope for a special response to the juvenile offender nor advocated for the end of our juvenile courts. The commission's Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency wrote: *"What is required is rather a revised philosophy of the juvenile court based upon the recognition that in the past our reach exceeded our grasp"* (Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency 1967: 9).

In Chicago, and in communities across the United States, there is continuing hope that we can improve the response to juvenile crime. It is the hope of those of us in law enforcement that this *President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice* will be able to strengthen support for our juvenile courts as a foundation for wider and more effective delinquency intervention, and in so doing, make the next great leap toward improving the nation's response to juvenile crime.

The Johnson Commission feared that the abandonment of juvenile court would simply return the nation to using the criminal courts to address juvenile crime – and they firmly rejected that outcome. As I will touch on further in the "All of the Above Response" section of my testimony, we should not allow the question to be one of the juvenile courts "or" diversion and deflection approaches. The complexities of the nation's juvenile crime issue require a multi-layered "and" approach. As such, this Commission should once again encourage those frustrated with the juvenile justice system not to abandon our juvenile courts. Just as returning all juvenile offenders to the jurisdiction of the nation's criminal courts is an idea to be rejected, so too is the idea that the complexities of juvenile crime can be adequately addressed solely through the use of full deflection to non-court, community alternatives. Since the 1960s and 70s, our juvenile courts have made greater strides relative to including community-based, diversion programs for use with lower-level delinquency and youth with limited arrest histories. Police officers support expansion of such efforts, when consistent with the restorative justice model, and when such approaches can reasonably be expected to: (a) effectively address the needs of the involved youth, (b) ensure the safety of victims, and (c) reduce the potential harm to the community from possible continuing delinquency.

Without question, it is hoped that parents, schools, faith-based organizations, and other community programming and service approaches will both: (1) have the tools necessary to assist each young person involved in delinquent activities, and (2) have the level of cooperation among those same young people and their parents or guardians to actually get them in and through the needed services. However, the reality is that a great many youth – particularly those most deeply involved in gang activity and drug dealing – may not yet be in a place where they are ready to willingly engage in services. Absent follow-up monitoring by the police for services connected via a station adjustment, or via the prosecutor's office or juvenile probation department for prosecutor-level diversion, such youth simply dropout, and do not receive the services needed. If we draw from a medical model, it is as if a prescription was written for the involved young person, but that young person never received the medicine or failed to take the full dose as prescribed. How can we expect the services to work if the young person never actually received them?

All delinquency intervention – beyond the young person's self-motivation to actively participate – relies upon the existence of a support structure to guide the youth toward positive change. When home, schools, or community programs are unable to reach a youth resistant to change, it falls to our juvenile courts to provide the structure essential for the needed change to have any chance to occur.

Juvenile Crime – the Adult Factor

A significant portion of the violent crime involving juvenile offenders in Chicago, and countless towns and cities across the country, has gang connections. Particularly with respect to the more established gangs and those actively involved in the drug trade, these organizations can be multi-generational in nature, and they are controlled by adults with extensive criminal histories. Juveniles can be easily influenced, and if caught selling drugs or carrying a gun, given they are juveniles, they are far less likely to receive the same level of consequences in court that an adult would. Such provides an incentive for gangs to seek out

Written Testimony of Thomas J. Lemmer | May 6, 2020

juveniles to perform the basic criminal activities of the gang. In larger, more organized gang structures, the leaders will use layers of intermediaries to further shield them from legal accountability for the criminal acts they encourage or direct juveniles to perform. A harsh secondary reality, from the view of the adults controlling a gang, when "necessary" juveniles are more easily replaced and expendable.

On August 28, 1994, a 14-year-old girl named Shavon Dean was murdered as she played near the front of her home in Chicago. Had she lived, Shavon would now be a 39-year-old woman. Sadly, beyond her family, few probably recognize her name, even though in 2016 the city designated an honorary street name – her name – at 108th Place and Wentworth Avenue, the block where she lived and was murdered. The nickname, "Yummy," by which her 11-year-old killer Robert Sandifer was known, is more widely remembered, and it remains a haunting reminder to many veteran Chicago police officers, the Dean family, and countless older community members of the worst that can come from juvenile crime. In 1994, Time magazine reporter Julie Grace captured the pain.

"Deborah Dean rubs her arms for warmth and shakes her head. The gunshots still echo; the memory of panicked footsteps raises the hair on her arms. 'Deborah, call an ambulance!' her nephew had cried. And then she saw her husband standing over the body of her daughter Shavon, 14. 'My 12-year-old had to call the ambulance. I just collapsed.' The family had been in the middle of an evening barbecue at their home in the Roseland section of Chicago when gunfire from what was believed to be a gang-initiation rite sent the fatal bullet into Shavon. 'There's no words to say how I feel,' says Dean. 'Whatever I say, it's not going to bring my daughter back'" (Time, "There are no children here," Sep. 12, 1994).

Prior to Shavon's murder, "Yummy," at age 11 was already involved in the drug trade of a major Chicago street gang, and he had already been arrested 40 times, including for drug crimes and armed robbery. He had been prosecuted in juvenile court eight times for felony cases, and sentenced twice to probation. On that August evening in 1994, Sandifer had been assigned by older gang members to shoot at a group of boys playing football, who were believed to include rival gang members. "Yummy" shot one boy in the hand, and one bullet went past the group of boys and struck Shavon in the head killing her. And yet, the maiming of one boy and the murder of a 14-year-old girl, in an act of extreme gang violence by an 11-year-old, was not the end of this story. Quickly identified as the murderer, a massive police response led the gang to hide Sandifer. Concerned "Yummy" might talk to police if caught, and then implicate those who sent him, gang leaders ordered two other juveniles – gang members – Derrick (age 14) and Craig Hardaway (age 16) to kill Sandifer. Sandifer was picked up by the Hardaway brothers from a safe house, and he was told that he was going to be moved out of the city. Instead, "Yummy" was taken just nine blocks from where he had been picked up, and under a neighborhood railroad viaduct he was executed. Not for killing Shavon; he was executed because of the danger he represented to those who had sent him. No adult gang members were ever prosecuted in the murders of Dean or Sandifer – the shield held.

The involvement of juveniles in serious, violent and chronic delinquency often has a connection to the criminal conduct of adult offenders. This adult connection to juvenile offending is particularly evident when the influences of criminal gang activity are involved. However, rarely are the adults that are at the root of the "pushes" and "pulls" of juvenile delinquency held accountable. Existing statutes regarding compelling gang membership and intimidation require the proving of a direct victimization of the involved juvenile by the adult, and such cases are difficult to prove absent the full cooperation of the involved juvenile. Secondly, many juveniles in these circumstances do not cooperate based upon a belief in the false promises of solidarity from the gang, and still others do not cooperate based on fears of retaliation. Such was the case with the Hardaway brothers. In a 2014 WGN-TV News interview from an Illinois prison, Craig Hardaway spoke of how Sandifer's murder was *"not in my control,"* and how he feared for his own life had he not carried out the murder. When Derrick Hardaway was asked by reporter Tonya Francisco: *"Why not tell?"* He responded: *"Because I believed in the foolishness that they were tellin' me, far as the gangs and that lifestyle"* (WGN News, Dec 12, 2014).

Written Testimony of Thomas J. Lemmer | May 6, 2020

When we do see 11-year-old, 14-year-old, and 16-year-old children being arrested with non-family-member adults age 18 or 19, or in their 20s, or even older – such requires a response that discourages these and other adults from using juveniles to further their own criminal objectives. Existing statutes regarding acts that contribute to the delinquency or criminal delinquency of minors are structured as an additional offense, requiring prosecutors to prove that the involved adult actively solicited, compelled, or directed a minor to engage in the commission of the offense. These statutes are difficult to prove (particularly without the cooperation of the involved juvenile), and they are infrequently charged. When these statutes are charged, they are likely to be dropped as part of the plea-bargaining process. As a result, these two factors diminish their potential to deter criminally-motivated adults from continuing to make use of juveniles to further their own criminal objectives.

To address this contributing adult factor of juvenile crime, the adoption of sentence enhancement approaches for use at both the federal and state prosecutorial levels is recommended. Such provisions could be enacted similar to those that currently exist for convicted offenders who used a firearm when committing their crimes. The sentence enhancement approach would not require the charging of a separate offense, rather only the inclusion, as part of the factual basis of the offense charged, proof that a co-offender was a juvenile at the time of the crime.

All of the Above Response

Gang leaders, who seek out the children of others to advance their own criminal agendas, do not pose the only dangers contributing to the risk that a juvenile may become involved in delinquent behavior. Sadly, for too many children there are risks in their homes as well. Research has shown that there is a connection between the maltreatment and abuse of children and their subsequent involvement in delinquency. Such was the case with “Yummy” Sandifer. Now publicly available information regarding his childhood experiences show that Robert Sandifer had been an abused child, and the earliest state child protective services agency records dated back to when he was just 22 months old. Regarding the pattern of abuse and neglect experienced by Sandifer, then Cook County Public Guardian Patrick Murphy said in 2001: *“If ever there was a case where a kid’s future was predictable, it was this case”* (Time, *“Murder in Miniature,”* June 24, 2001). Fortunately, research also indicates that while abuse and neglect are associated with future delinquency – future delinquent behavior is not inevitable and intervention is possible (see *“Understanding Child Maltreatment & Delinquency,”* CWLA Press, 2003).

It is recommended that the Commission encourage greater collaboration between child welfare agencies and juvenile court, and within our juvenile courts themselves, between the child protection and the delinquency sides of the courthouse. Releasing delinquent children back into homes where they are being neglected and abused is both wrong and a failed approach in reducing delinquency among these children.

Getting Arrest Record Expungement Right

There are valid concerns that the consequences of a permanent record of youthful behavior can linger into adulthood in harmful ways. Juvenile arrest and court records must be strictly confidential, and the expungement of these records (except in the most extreme cases) can appropriately occur quickly (even immediately upon reaching adulthood, provided that all sentence obligations have been completed and the offending is not ongoing). However, expunging these records while youth are still youth is problematic, as it leaves police and social service workers blinded, as they seek to identify the intervention approaches appropriate for those youth. Consider again the medical model. What may be symptoms indicating a minor ailment (a cold perhaps) and correctly diagnosed at an urgent care center, may also be the early signs of a more serious illness requiring far deeper care. If after each visit (arrest) we are wiping the medical (arrest) history clean – then those seeking to identify the most effective treatment approach will only detect cases with emerging levels of seriousness after serious – even violent offending has already occurred. Such is neither in the “best interests” of the involved youth, nor the community. More succinctly: there are no *“Men in Black”* memory wiping devices, and even when those in the system have forgotten, the involved youth remember. Some juvenile offenders will equate the system’s memory loss

Written Testimony of Thomas J. Lemmer | May 6, 2020

with the notion that their involvement in delinquent acts is not a problem – giving them false confidence that they can continue in their problem behaviors without the risk of serious consequences.

In 2018, the Chicago Police Department's (CPD) Youth Investigations Division released a brochure to the parents of arrested youth, entitled: *"Help Us Keep Kids Always from Crime in Your Area."* In the brochure, parents were reminded that adults and older teens can influence younger children into behaviors *"their parents would not approve."* Parents were also advised that in 2016, a youth age 10 to 17, who had not been arrested, had a risk of being murdered of just 0.4 in 10,000. A similar youth arrested just once had a murder risk of 15.0 in 10,000 (38 times higher), and a youth arrested four times had a risk of 64.0 in 10,000, a full 160 times higher than the youth who had not been arrested. Of course, it is not the arrest that raises the risk. The increased risk comes from the fact that the behaviors causing youth to come to the attention of police also bring those youth into contact with others – some of whom are inclined toward violence. Expunging juvenile arrest records does nothing to lower the victimization risk for the involved youth, it only conceals that risk from police and others seeking to identify the need for intervention approaches. An expungement process that leaves youth vulnerable to victimization is not in their best interests.

Overall Recommendations for Consideration by the Commission

The following recommendations are offered to the Commission:

Recommendation 1: Harness the Potential of the Juvenile Court Structure

Once again acknowledge the importance of the nation's juvenile courts as essential to the effort to address juvenile crime.

Recommendation 2: Multi-Layered Community Response

Encourage the establishment of a full, comprehensive response continuum relative to youth actively engaged in delinquency. Such efforts should include: (1) robust prevention programming that increases the abilities of parents to effectively respond at home; (2) effective child welfare monitoring whenever neglect or abuse is detected; (3) deflection programming options for first-time, non-violent youth, without service mandates by police, prosecutors, or the courts; (4) diversion programming options that include service completion requirements, and appropriate re-engagement collaboration efforts by police, juvenile probation, or prosecutors for those youth with emerging patterns of delinquency; (5) intervention support efforts for youth unable or unwilling to meet service engagement requirements, to include juvenile court itself; and lastly (6) the formal filing of delinquency petitions seeking court intervention with all youth that are involved in serious acts of violence or chronic patterns of delinquency harmful to the community.

Recommendation 3: Balanced Approach to Records Expungement

Encourage the states to delay the automatic expungement of juvenile arrest and court records until the individual has reached adulthood and has successfully completed all disposition requirements.

Recommendation 4: Address the Contributing Adult Factor

Encourage legislation mandating sentence enhancements at both the federal and state levels for adult offenders who knowingly engage in felonious crimes with non-family-member juveniles as accomplices. Such enhancements should be on a graduated scale consisting of: in non-violent felony offenses, an additional year; for violent crimes that did not result in great bodily harm or death to any victim, an additional five years; for violent crimes resulting in great bodily harm to a victim, but not a death, an additional ten years; and for any violent crime resulting in the death of a victim, an additional 20 years.

Closing Statement

I share the enthusiasm for the work of this Commission expressed by National FOP President Patrick Yoes, and I would like to once again thank the members of the Commission, and the members of the Juvenile Justice and the Youth Crimes Working Group, for your efforts and the opportunity to speak to you today. I look forward to answering any questions that you may have.