

Testimony of Eduardo R. Ferrer
Policy Director, Georgetown Juvenile Justice Initiative*
Visiting Professor, Georgetown Juvenile Justice Clinic*
***Titles and organizational affiliation for identification purposes only.**

**Committee on the Judiciary and Public Safety Public Hearing on
on Bill 23-0723, the “Rioting Modernization Amendment Act of 2020”; Bill 23-0771, the
“Internationally Banned Chemical Weapon Prohibition Amendment Act of 2020”; and Bill
23-0882, the “Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act of 2020”**

Thursday, October 15, 2020

Good morning, Chairman Allen and members of the Committee on the Judiciary and Public Safety. My name is Eduardo Ferrer. I am a Ward 5 resident and, for identification purposes, the Policy Director at the Georgetown Juvenile Justice Initiative and a Visiting Professor in the Georgetown Juvenile Justice Clinic. The views expressed are based on my research and experience and not given on behalf of Georgetown University. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

I would like to start by commending Chairperson Allen for his continued leadership on justice reform issues in the District. Given the breadth of the three bills, this testimony will focus specifically on the area of youth justice reform. Unfortunately, while this bill proposes many important reforms that would apply equally to youth and adults alike, the bill does not propose any reforms specific to the manner in which youth are policed in the District. This is not an oversight of the Committee, but the result of the fact that so much of criminal procedure – particularly concerning 4th and 5th amendment jurisprudence, which forms the backbone for many of the constraints on police power – is based upon the constitutional floors set by the Courts, not by optimal, developmentally-responsive social policy. As a result, the courts have often developed one-size-fits-all policies that fail to account for the evidence-based and common-sense material differences between youth and adults. To remedy this failure, the Committee should make two amendments to the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act prior to mark up. First, as others have also proposed, the Committee should amend DC Code to create a more mature *Miranda* policy for the District that guarantees youth the right to consult with counsel prior to waiving their right to remain silent. Second, the Committee should go further than requiring *Miranda*-like warnings prior to a “consent” search of an individual under the age of 18 and make inadmissible the fruits of any such “consent” search involving a youth.

Additionally, making policing fairer and more developmentally-appropriate alone will not remedy the fact that our Black youth are over-policed in the first place. As a result, we recommend that this legislation also eliminate the School Safety Division at the Metropolitan Police Department. Now that DCPS will be resuming control of the management of its school security, the need for this unit is significantly lower and the money currently allocated to this unit can be better invested at the school level to ensure the adoption and implementation of a holistic approach to safety in our schools and communities.

The Need for a More Mature Miranda Policy

The District's approach to youth interrogations is one example where policing is out of step with adolescent development, social science, and fundamental fairness. Although most people probably could not describe any of the facts of *Miranda v. Arizona* from TV shows and movies, many people would recognize the warnings that police are supposed to give someone before they start interrogating them.¹ The point of these now-familiar warnings is to inform someone that they have certain rights before they talk to the police.² However, merely informing someone of their rights does not mean they actually understand those rights, understand the implications of waiving those rights, or feel like they can actually avail themselves of those rights. This is particularly true when it comes to young people being interrogated by police. It is here where DC is failing to provide for the youth of DC, and why it is time to enact a more mature *Miranda* policy in the District.

The *Miranda* framework of reading a suspect his or her *Miranda* rights and asking for a waiver was designed with *adults* in mind. To understand standard *Miranda* warnings someone must have the working memory capable of holding all the warnings in his or her mind at once, processing their meaning, and also formulating a response.³ He or she has to understand what an attorney is, what kinds of questions the police will be expected to ask, and what it means to have their responses "used" against them (which further requires general knowledge of the criminal legal system).⁴ Studies have found that some warnings, such as the right to be appointed an attorney and the right to silence, require a post-high school reading ability in order to read and comprehend.⁵ In order to make a knowing, intelligent, and voluntary waiver, someone has to possess the requisite cognitive ability (if they are under 16 years old), knowledge base, and psycho-social maturity.

In DC, MPD officers are supposed to read to all suspects a standard set of *Miranda* warnings before interrogating them, whether they are an adult or a child. But this ignores advancements in our understanding of adolescent development, which have demonstrated that young people as a class cannot effectively waive their *Miranda* rights just by being informed of them by the police. In the decades since 1965, when *Miranda* was decided, study after study has confirmed what we have long intuitively understood about children: they are different than adults. The research shows that youth undergo dramatic changes during adolescence. Indeed, we now know that adolescence is the second-most important period of brain development, after the first three years of life.⁶ For instance, in adolescence, pathways of the brain that are not used as

¹ See *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436, 444 (1966).

² See *id.* at 445.

³ See Kenneth J. King, *Waiving Childhood Goodbye: How Juvenile Courts Fail to Protect Children from Unknowing, Unintelligent, and Involuntary Waivers of Miranda Rights*, 2006 WIS. L. REV. 431, 432 (2006).

⁴ See *id.* at 432–33.

⁵ Anthony J. Domanico, Michael D. Cicchini & Lawrence T. White, *Overcoming Miranda: A Content Analysis of the Miranda Portion of Police Interrogations*, 49 IDAHO L. REV. 1, 14 (2012).

⁶ See Kerstin Konrad, et al., *Brain Development During Adolescence*, 110(25) DEUTSCHES ARZTEBLATT INT'L 425, 426–27.

often are pruned back while the pathways of the brain that are being used are reinforced, resulting in a period of increased malleability and capacity for change.⁷ Additionally, the limbic system – the part of the brain that controls emotions – develops during the earlier part of adolescence whereas the prefrontal cortex – which is situated at the front of the brain and controls reasoning, decision-making, and impulse control – does not fully develop until the end of adolescence.⁸

As a result of this differential in the timing of development of the different parts of the brain, youth as a class lack the psycho-social maturity that adults possess. Specifically, adolescents are not as capable in making well-reasoned decisions, especially under intense stress or fear such as in an interrogation setting.⁹ Moreover, adolescents tend to focus on short-term rewards rather than long-term risks, which makes them especially vulnerable to waiving their *Miranda* rights without considering the long-term consequences.¹⁰ For example, if an officer tells an adolescent during interrogation that if they waive their rights they can go home, the short-term reward of going home can induce an adolescent to waive their *Miranda* rights no matter what the long-term consequences may be.¹¹ Youth still lack the tools to truly evaluate the impact of that choice on the rest of their life.¹² Thus, the current *Miranda* framework is ineffectual for youth as it is less likely that they can execute a truly knowing, intelligent, and voluntary waiver under the circumstances typical to most custodial interrogation situations.

In addition to adolescents' psycho-social immaturity, there is also the fact that adolescents may lack the cognitive ability to even understand the *Miranda* warnings. In one study, a researcher asked 400 delinquent youth and 200 criminally and non-criminally involved adults a series of questions designed to gauge the participant's understanding of *Miranda* rights. Controlling for age, IQ, and other variables, what he found was that *fifty-five percent* of youths clearly misunderstood one or more of the *Miranda* warnings, compared to just twenty-three percent of adults.¹³ Youths in this study misunderstood that the right to remain silent meant they could choose to not speak with the police officer, which was at odds with their experience that they need to talk to adults if asked.¹⁴ Some youths understood that if they have an attorney the attorney is supposed to be "on their side," but believed that the attorney will help them only if they are innocent.¹⁵ Even though after age 15 adolescents generally have the same cognitive

⁷ *See id.*

⁸ *See* Jennifer Woolard, *Adolescent Development*, 19.

⁹ Thomas Grisso, *Adolescents' Decision Making: A Developmental Perspective on Constitutional Provisions in Delinquency Cases*, 32 NEW ENG. J. ON CRIM. & CIV. CONFINEMENT 3, 9 (2006).

¹⁰ *Id.* at 8–9.

¹¹ Steven A. Drizin & Beth A. Colgan, *Interrogation Tactics Can Product Coerced and False Confessions from Juvenile Suspects*, in INTERROGATIONS, CONFESSIONS, AND ENTRAPMENT 127, 136 (G. Daniel Lassiter ed., 2004).

¹² *J.D.B. v. North Carolina*, 564 U.S. 261, 269 (2011).

¹³ Thomas Grisso, *Adolescents' Decision Making: A Developmental Perspective on Constitutional Provisions in Delinquency Cases*, 32 NEW ENG. J. ON CRIM. & CIV. CONFINEMENT 3, 10 (2006).

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ *Id.* at 11.

abilities as adults,¹⁶ because of their lack of familiarity with the *Miranda* rights and psychosocial maturity they still “often lack the experience, perspective, and judgment to recognize and avoid choices that could be detrimental to them.”¹⁷

Demanding a more mature *Miranda* policy for the District is also critical as a matter of racial justice. Black youths have their views of police officers and law enforcement shaped by historical police violence and contemporary coverage of police brutality against Black people.¹⁸ Their views are also shaped by their own experiences of police harassment with police officers, as well as those of their friends and families.¹⁹ Too often, Black youth feel compelled to be deferential to police officers to avoid risking more severe harassment, injury, or death.²⁰ The backdrop of police violence against Black people, their own experiences of police harassment, and the developmental immaturity of youth previously describe create a powerful force undermining the voluntariness of any *Miranda* waiver Black youths may make. They may waive their *Miranda* rights just so they could get out of the interrogation room. In this respect, for Black youth *Miranda* warnings do not serve as an effective deterrent against the coerciveness of police interrogation.

To illustrate the futility of the current *Miranda* doctrine as it applies to DC youth, consider the following recent case. This young man was taken into the police station and read his *Miranda* rights. When asked if he wanted an attorney, he said that he already had an attorney and that he would like to talk to her. The police told him that this meant they would have to leave, which was true. They then remained in the room, staring at him, until he said he would talk to them. The police continued reading him his rights, and he again said he wanted an attorney. They stopped again and waited again until he had agreed to talk to them. Then, upon being read his *Miranda* rights and invoking his right to silence, he was told by the detective that he marked the wrong box. While on paper, this whole charade may have observed the niceties of the *Miranda* warning and waiver system, in no way could this be a model of justice. This is not just a fault of the police officers that day, but of the system that did not take into consideration the developmental stage of the youth being interrogated and how that affected any waiver he could give.

Miranda represents the bare minimum of what is required under the Constitution to advise a child of their rights; but that does not make it sound policy. It is time that DC goes beyond the bare minimum, uses the advances in adolescent development research over the last 30 years, and creates a legal framework that is developmentally appropriate when it comes to adolescents being interrogated by police officers. The way to do this is change the law so that statements in custodial interrogation made by youth under 18 are inadmissible unless 1) the youth is read their *Miranda* rights by a law enforcement officer in a developmentally appropriate

¹⁶ *Id.* at 11–12.

¹⁷ *Bellotti v. Baird*, 443 U.S. 622, 635 (1979).

¹⁸ Kristin Henning & Rebba Omer, *Vulnerable and Valued: Protecting Youth from the Perils of Custodial Interrogation*, 52 ARIZ. STATE L. J. ____ (forthcoming December 2020).

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ *Id.*

manner; 2) the youth has the opportunity to consult with counsel before making a waiver; 3) and, in the presence of their attorney, the youth makes a knowing, intelligent, and voluntary waiver of their rights.²¹ Studies show that having the opportunity to consult with counsel before making any decision about waiving *Miranda* rights helps adolescents make a more informed choice, even if they are particularly young or have poor cognitive abilities otherwise.²² A more mature *Miranda* doctrine for youths in DC that includes the right to counsel before they make a waiver decision preserves the rights of children, cuts down on coerced confessions, and protects the purpose that animated *Miranda* in the first place.

Recommendation 1: Statements made by youth under 18 during custodial interrogation should be inadmissible unless 1) the youth is read their *Miranda* rights by a law enforcement officer in a developmentally appropriate manner; 2) the youth has the opportunity to consult with counsel before making a waiver; 3) and, in the presence of their attorney, the youth makes a knowing, intelligent, and voluntary waiver of their rights.

The Need for Consent Search Reform for Youth in Particular

The District’s approach to “consent” searches of youth is another example where policing is out of step with adolescent development, social science, and fundamental fairness. While we applaud the important step taken by the proposed legislation to provide *Miranda*-like warnings prior to “consent” searches, these warnings will not be sufficient to protect youth from the effects of police coercion (and may not be sufficient to protect adults either). Requiring law enforcement officials to deliver *Miranda*-like warnings to individuals before they consent to a search represents an improvement from a baseline of no protections for adults. However, expecting these *Miranda*-like warnings to improve a youth’s ability to consent to be searched invokes the same issues as expecting the current *Miranda* doctrine to protect youth from the coercive atmosphere of custodial interrogation.²³ Holding youth and adults to the same standard ignores decades of research confirming what experience and common sense tell us²⁴ – that the differences between children and adults in experience, susceptibility to peer pressure, and perception of authority²⁵ require different treatment under law. It further ignores that children are conditioned to obey adults, particularly adults in positions of authority, and that children of color are often taught by their parents to comply with the demands of police officers to avoid being the next child whose death or disability is caught on camera.²⁶ Thus, as the proposed legislation

²¹ Katrina Jackson & Alexis Mayer, Demanding a More Mature *Miranda* for Kids, D.C. Justice Lab & Georgetown Juvenile Justice Initiative, at bit.ly/mature-miranda.

²² Jodi L. Viljoen & Ronald Roesch, *Competence to Waive Interrogation Rights and Adjudicative Competence in Adolescent Defendants: Cognitive Development, Attorney Contact, and Psychological Symptoms*, 29(6) LAW AND HUMAN BEHAVIOR 723, 737 (2005).

²³ See *J.D.B.*, 564 U.S. at 273.

²⁴ *Id.* at 272.

²⁵ *Id.* at 273.

²⁶ See, e.g. Sam Sanders & Kenya Young, A Black Mother Reflects On Giving Her 3 Sons 'The Talk' ... Again And Again, NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO (June 28, 2020), <https://www.npr.org/2020/06/28/882383372/a-black-mother-reflects-on-giving-her-3-sons-the-talk-again-and-again>.

recognizes, unconstrained “consent” searches may be constitutional, but they are not good policy given their inherent power imbalance and the reasonable fear that many people of color have of the police.²⁷ For youth, this imbalance cannot be corrected with warnings alone. Therefore, we suggest that the final legislation prohibit the fruits of *any* “consent” searches of youth from being introduced as evidence against them in a criminal or delinquency matter.

The legal standard for consent invites the consideration of age in both its objective and subjective analyses. Consent must be “freely given,” meaning that it is not valid if it’s the result of express or implied coercion, or if the person searched did not know they could refuse.²⁸ The government must prove that the person’s consent was valid under the totality of the circumstances, analyzing both objective and subjective factors.²⁹ More than the facts of the incident, the consent analysis requires the court to consider the facts of the person, their knowledge of their rights, and their personal and cultural experiences with law enforcement.

The importance of considering age is rooted in precedent such as *Roper* and its progeny, which held that children are less culpable for their actions and choices due to the decades of research which show that they are less mature and capable of making informed decisions.³⁰ From this research, we know adolescents are more impulsive, sensation-seeking, likely to make decisions based on “immediate” rather than “long-term” consequences, and sensitive to social pressure than adults.³¹ Adolescents are also less aware of their “legal rights” than adults.³² These factors create the perfect storm for consent searches predicated on implicit coercion. Youth are both more likely not to know that there are no legal consequences for refusing to be searched, and more sensitive to extralegal, short-term consequences.³³ They are also more likely to answer the officer impulsively and change their answer in response to cues in the officer’s body language, tone, and demeanor.³⁴

Other factors affecting youth such as race and personal and cultural experience with policing intensify our concerns with the proposed remedy to the fundamental power imbalance in consent searches. A study on the effects of police interactions on adolescents found that youth with more exposure to law enforcement officials report more emotional distress after each

²⁷ See, e.g. *Dozier v. United States*, 220 A.3d 933, 944 (D.C. 2019) (“An African-American man facing armed policemen would reasonably be especially apprehensive... fear of harm and resulting protective conditioning to submit to avoid harm at the hands of police is relevant to whether there was [consent]”)

²⁸ *Schneekloth v. Bustamonte*, 412 U.S. 218, 227, 93 S. Ct. 2041, 2048 (1973).

²⁹ *Id.* at 229.

³⁰ See *Roper v. Simmons*, 543 U.S. 551, 569, 125 S. Ct. 1183, 1195 (2005)

³¹ Laurence Steinberg et al., *Are Adolescents Less Mature than Adults? Minors’ Access to Abortion, the Juvenile Death Penalty, and the Alleged APA ‘Flip-Flop’*, 64 AM. PSYCHOL. 583, 592 (2009).

³² Kristin Henning, *The Reasonable Black Child: Race, Adolescence, and the Fourth Amendment*, 67 Am. U. L. Rev. 1513, 1536-1537 (2018).

³³ See *id.* at 1537.

³⁴ See *id.*

interaction.³⁵ This trauma is aggravated if the encounter took place in public due to feelings of “embarrassment” and “stigmatization,”³⁶ and if the youth is African American or Latino/a.³⁷ Similarly, African American youth who live in neighborhoods with a greater police presence report more trauma and anxiety symptoms.³⁸ The severity of these symptoms is associated with the number and intrusiveness of their interactions with police.³⁹ Young Black males living in highly-policed areas who have watched friends, family members, or even complete strangers get searched by police officers report symptoms consistent with secondary trauma.⁴⁰ Exposure to these incidents on social media had a similar effect.⁴¹ Further studies have found that these feelings of fear, embarrassment, and helplessness affect how young people develop into young adulthood; injuring their self-concept and permanently damaging their trust in law enforcement.⁴²

Informing a young person that they can refuse to be searched with no legal consequences will not address these concerns. The proposed policy asks youth to weigh the type of long-term consequences they have the most difficulty judging, particularly when under stressful conditions, and does not address the short-term concerns that inform their decisions. It also tests a youth’s attention and ability to learn a legal concept in a high-stress situation that adults find difficult to navigate. For African American and Latino/a children, it contradicts the warnings of their parents not to resist the requests of police officers and often their lived experience that saying no to them is dangerous and futile.⁴³

In the District of Columbia, consent searches are the second most common type of search by MPD’s NSID.⁴⁴ Although the number of consent searches was tracked along with the number

³⁵ See Dylan B. Jackson et. al, *Police Stops Among At-Risk Youth: Repercussions for Mental Health*, 65 *Journal of Adolescent Health* 627, 629,

³⁶ *Id.*

³⁷ Dylan B. Jackson et. al, *Low self-control and the adolescent police stop: Intrusiveness, emotional response, and psychological well-being*, 66 *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 2020, at 1, 8.

³⁸ Geller et al., *Aggressive Policing and the Mental Health of Young Urban Men*, 104 *Am. Journal of Pub. Health* 2321, 2324 (2014).

³⁹ *Id.*

⁴⁰ Nikki Jones, “The Regular Routine”: Proactive Policing and Adolescent Development Among Young, Poor Black Men, *in* *Pathways to Adulthood for disconnected young men in low-income communities*. *New Directions in Child and Adolescent Development*, 33, 45 (K. Roy & N. Jones 2014).

⁴¹ B.M. Tynes et al., *Race-Related Traumatic Events Online and Mental Health Among Adolescents of Color*, 65 *Journal of Adolescent Health* 371, 376 (2019).

⁴² Jones, *supra* at 52.

⁴³ See, e.g. Ben Crump (@AttorneyCrump), TWITTER (October 6, 2020), <https://twitter.com/attorneycrump/status/1313681956870205441?s=21>, Virginia Bridges, *City council members ‘disturbed’ by video of NC police officer searching Black teen*,” *THE NEWS & OBSERVER* (July 28, 2020), <https://www.newsobserver.com/news/local/counties/durham-county/article244437062.html>, and *The Guardian, Exclusive: police fail in attempt to tase Ahmaud Arbery during 2017 incident*, YOUTUBE (May 18, 2020), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1v7o_6uI9R0&ab_channel=GuardianNews.

⁴⁴ National Police Foundation, *Metropolitan Police Department Narcotics and Specialized Investigations Division: A Limited Assessment of Data and Compliance from August 1, 2019 - January 31, 2020*, 17 (2020).

of stops after the implementation of the NEAR Act, the reasons for those consent searches have not been as closely analyzed. We do know that between July and December 2019, 90% of the people and 89% of the adolescents searched by police officers in the District were African American.⁴⁵ And our African American clients report the same feelings of fear and powerlessness when interacting with the police as documented on a national scale.⁴⁶ In fact, our clients have reported that they will often lift up their shirts and display their waistbands unprompted when they see an officer to avoid harassment. Police officers have literally conditioned them to “consent” without even being asked. This conditioning is something that an officer in the Seventh District bragged about on a t-shirt just a few years ago.⁴⁷

As the legislation recognizes by proposing Miranda-like warnings prior to “consent” searches, the current legal framework for “consent” is merely a constitutional floor. D.C. can and should implement a policy that further protects adults and youth from police coercion in the “consent” search context. For youth, the protection should make any evidence seized as the result of the consent search of any individual under the age of eighteen inadmissible in criminal or delinquency proceedings. Excluding evidence obtained through searches justified by the consent of a minor in court would also address the reality acknowledged by the Supreme Court and operationalized by jurisdictions such as California and West Virginia⁴⁸ that minors “lack the experience, perspective and judgment,”⁴⁹ to interact with the criminal justice system as adults and therefore require special legal protections.

Recommendation 2: Any evidence seized as a result of a search is inadmissible in any criminal or delinquency proceedings against the individual from whom the evidence was seized if: 1) the subject of the search is an individual under the age of 18; 2) the justification for a search by sworn members of a District of Columbia law enforcement agency is consent; and 3) the search is not executed pursuant to a warrant or another exception to the warrant requirement. The foregoing should apply even when law enforcement officers did not know the age of the individual when they searched.

The Need for Police Free Schools & Realignment of DC Resources

For Fiscal Year 2021, the budget for the School Safety Division of the Metropolitan Police Department is nearly \$14 million dollars.⁵⁰ This budget is meant to support 127 FTEs in the Division for FY2021, which represents an increase from 24.7 in FY2019 and 110 in

⁴⁵ Katrina Jackson & Alexis Mayer, Demanding a More Mature Miranda for Kids, D.C. Justice Lab & Georgetown Juvenile Justice Initiative, at bit.ly/mature-miranda.

⁴⁶ ACLU-DC & ACLU Analytics, *supra* at 8.

⁴⁷ Monique Judge, *DC Cop Under Investigation for Wearing Shirt With KKK Symbol While on Duty*, THE ROOT (July 28, 2017), <https://www.theroot.com/d-c-cop-under-investigation-for-wearing-a-shirt-with-a-1797354445>

⁴⁸ Henning & Omer, *supra*.

⁴⁹ *J.D.B.*, 564 U.S. at 273 (2011) (citing *Roper v. Simmons*, 543 U.S. 551, 569 (2005)).

⁵⁰ Metropolitan Police Department, FY2021 Approved Budget, at https://cfo.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/ocfo/publication/attachments/fa_mpd_chapter_2021a.pdf.

FY2020.⁵¹ This increase comes despite the fact that MPD is no longer responsible for managing the security contract for DCPS and the absence of evidence that a floating patrol of school resource officers makes youth or schools safer. Indeed, the District is spending this money despite research demonstrating that the harms caused by the presence of school resources officers⁵² and the over-policing of youth.⁵³ This money would be better invested at the school or community level to keep schools safe, provide additional support services proven to reduce “juvenile victimization” and “delinquent behaviors.”⁵⁴

Recommendation 3: Eliminate the School Safety Division at the Metropolitan Police Department and reallocate that money for use in developing and implementing a more holistic approach to school safety and youth development in the District.

Conclusion

As we consider policing reform in the District, it is critical that we account for the differences between youth and adults in our new policies and practices. As a result, the Committee should make three amendments to the Comprehensive Policing and Justice Reform Amendment Act prior to mark up. First, the Committee should amend DC Code to create a more mature *Miranda* policy for the District that guarantees youth the right to consult with counsel prior to waiving their right to remain silent. Second, the Committee should make inadmissible the fruits of any such “consent” search involving a youth. Third, to ensure that we end the over-policing of Black youth in the District, the Committee should amend DC Code to eliminate the School Safety Division at the Metropolitan Police Department. The \$14 million budgeted for this division should instead be invested in the adoption and implementation of a holistic, public health approach to safety in our schools and communities.

⁵¹ *Id.*

⁵² See *The Presence of School Resource Officers (SROs) in America’s Schools*, The Justice Policy Institute, July 9, 2020.

⁵³ See Juan Del Toro et al., *The Criminogenic and Psychological Effects of Police Stops on Adolescent black and Latino Boys*, 116 PNAS, 8261 (2019) (finding that adolescent black and Latino boys who were stopped by police reported more frequent engagement in delinquent behavior six, twelve, and eighteen months later than boys who were not stopped by the police (independent of prior delinquency)).

⁵⁴ MPD describes the purpose of the School Safety Division as “safeguard[ing] and provid[ing] services to students and staff at District of Columbia Public Schools and Public Charter Schools [as well as] striv[ing] to reduce juvenile victimization and delinquent behavior through a variety of programs.” MPD, FY2021 Approved Budget, at https://cfo.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/ocfo/publication/attachments/fa_mpd_chapter_2021a.pdf