BIASED ADULTS, BRASH YOUTH, AND UNEVEN PUNISHMENT: THE NEED FOR INCREASED LEGAL PROTECTIONS FOR YOUTH

Our legal jurisprudence has only recently begun to take notice of adolescence as a stage of life from childhood and adulthood.1 Yet common notions of this unique developmental period stretch back at least 400 years to an old Shepherd’s lament in *A Winter’s Tale*:

I would there were no age between sixteen and three-and-twenty, or that youth would sleep out the rest; for there is nothing in the between but getting wenches with child, wronging the ancientry, stealing, fighting.2

Just as eternal is the angst of adults trying to figure out the best way to confront these teenage behaviors. Over the past few decades in America, confronting such classic misbehaviors through serious discipline has become increasingly common. Nowadays, teenagers accused of stealing, fighting, or otherwise “wronging the ancientry”3 increasingly face suspension from school, or even an introduction into the juvenile justice system.4

Take the story of Jerome, a sophomore in high school in the inner ring suburbs of Saint Louis.5 His high school is relatively diverse, but he is one of the only black males in the honor track classes. During his AP English class, the teacher assigns the students into groups, and tasks them to come up with a creative presentation about the assigned book. Jerome brings in a BB gun he has at home to use in his presentation. When he takes the gun out of his backpack in

2. WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, A WINTER’S TALE, act 2 sc. 3.
3. Many states have criminal statutes’ more modern takes on such a concept, such as the charge “interference with the educational process.” A.M. v. Holmes, 830 F.3d 1123, 1130 (10th Cir. 2016).
5. This story is based on the loose combination of a few real students’ stories from the author’s experience working as a youth advocate for a St. Louis education non-profit. Suspensions for toy guns are not limited to this story and are discouragingly common. See David Boroff, *Virginia 7th grader suspended one year for using zombie hunter airsoft gun, but family claims he did not use it on school property*, N.Y. DAILY NEWS (Sept. 13, 2013), http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/boy-suspended-school-toy-gun-family-property-article-1.1465745 [https://perma.cc/4CW9-8YCW].
class, the teacher panics. She calls the office to say there is an armed student in class. Startled, Jerome gets up and begins to yell at her that it is not a real gun. Jerome is tackled and handcuffed by the school resource officer. The school tells his mother he is expelled for bringing a weapon to school and for threatening the teacher. The superintendent tells his mother that he is doing Jerome a favor by only giving him a 180-day suspension rather than imposing the automatic expulsion rule for weapons in school. When Jerome returns to school the next year, he is behind in his credits, and angry with his white group members who did not get in trouble. His GPA has tanked, he is no longer on the college track, and his college applications are disrupted.

Jerome’s journey through high school is far from unusual. Since the mid-1990s, schools have been preoccupied with the fear of violent behaviors, adding penalties and housing law enforcement officers inside schools.6 In the 1970s, only about 3% of students were excluded from school due to misbehavior, whereas in 2011 around 15% of students have received some form of long-term school suspensions.7 Data shows almost all of these suspensions—95%—were either coded for “disruptive behavior” or “other.”8 There has also been a large-scale increase in uniformed police in school settings.9 The juvenile system has seen a documented influx of youth coming into the system for more minor offenses, many from incidents arising at schools.10 Persistent data has shown this increase in punishment has a distinct and disparate impact on youth of color, particularly young black men.11 Studies have indicated students from African-American families are about two to four times more likely to be referred to the office for problem behavior than white students, and are more likely to receive

7. LOSEN & SKIBA, supra note 4, at 2–3.
8. Id. at 9.
10. JUDITH A. BROWNE, ADVANCEMENT PROJECT, DERAILED: THE SCHOOLHOUSE TO THE JAIL TRACK 14 (2003), http://www.advancementproject.org/resources/entry/derailed-the-school-house-to-jailhouse-track. This has also been accompanied by an increasing number of youth who are certified as adults to stand trial and removed out of the juvenile system altogether. Kathryn Monahan, Lawrence Steinberg, & Alex R. Piquero, Juvenile Justice Policy and Practice: A Developmental Perspective, 44 CRIME & JUST. 577, 588–89 (2015).
expulsion or out of school suspension as a punishment where a white student
would not.12

There is little support for the idea that most youth who become “justice
involved” undergo meaningful rehabilitation through punishment. Studies have
not found that exclusion-based or “zero tolerance” school discipline policies
effectively reduce instances of misbehavior.13 In fact, studies have shown
suspension and expulsion can act more as a reinforcement of behavior than as a
deterrent for the affected student.14 The overuse of suspensions and expulsions
also appears to have a negative effect on overall student behavior and school
climate.15 Spending significant time out of school is also squarely linked to entry
into the juvenile justice system.16

Moving school systems away from this punitive, ineffective method of
addressing youth misbehavior will require reform. But any meaningful reform
will need to incorporate three coextensive factors.

First, contemporary neurological understanding of youth behavior shows us
this very behavior we punish is part of a natural stage of development.17
Researchers have shown it is natural for youth to seek out adrenaline “rewards”
despite risk;18 youth typically seek peer approval by experimentation with
problem behaviors;19 and how the phenomenon of youth difficulty in
communicating with and obeying adults is often a key part of development.20
Jerome’s behavior in bringing a BB gun to school and yelling at his teacher, seen
as threatening or violent, can be more correctly viewed as part of the natural
mistakes made in development.

Complicating that, cognitive science research shows that teachers and
principals may be making well-intentioned but biased decisions about which
behavior is worthy of expulsion or arrest.21 Researchers into decision making
reveal people often rely on heuristics or biases, which are commonly defined as cognitive shortcuts or rules of thumb that simplify decisions. These identifiable phenomenon such as “confirmation bias” or “belief in a just world” are adaptive traits which help us make quick decisions to deal with information overload. Yet research shows these decisions can be sub-optimal in a variety of predictable ways.

Finally, the structure of a typical school discipline process creates almost no way to check these biases in decisions, and in fact creates increased danger of bias. Schools are both comically underfunded and overloaded. Harsh and punitive sanctions are normalized as being necessary to control youth like Jerome. Accountability, which has been deemed as an essential element helping to reduce bias in decisions, is scarce. Our school discipline law gives mass, mostly unchecked, discretion to school officials. Although technically students in a school setting have due process rights before removal, those have been interpreted in such a lax and weak manner that it essentially amounts to relying on the good will of the school officials. Unsurprisingly, good will is not sufficient to prevent often chaotic school discipline decisions from being meted out in arbitrary, unfair, or even racially discriminatory ways.

A great deal of national attention in youth reform has justifiably been focused around ending juvenile capital punishment and life without parole, as well as challenging the practice of certifying children to stand trial as adults. Although school discipline seems comparatively more minor, these kinds of punishments have major impacts on the ability of young people to successfully grow up.

23. Id. at 216.
24. Id. at 207.
28. See infra Section III.
31. LOSEN & SKIBA, supra note 4, at 9–10. The experience of a young person starting with school consequences and spiraling deeper into the criminal justice system is known as the “school to prison pipeline.” Rappleye et al., supra note 11.
Successful reform should incorporate our understanding of successful youth development and the impact of trauma. To be truly impactful, however, reforms also need to focus on combatting the role of bias in adult decision makers. It is not enough to train or encourage adults to use a more forgiving approach toward teenagers without structural changes and procedural protections that can increase accountability and decrease discretion in adults.32

Part I will discuss the emerging scientific consensus around how adolescent brain development facilitates certain behaviors. Part II will discuss behavioral and psychological research in regard to bias in decision makers. Part III will show through case studies and national data how the legal framework in schools does not protect and in fact encourages biased decision making resulting in adverse outcomes. Finally, in part IV, I will argue that, although necessary to have increased training in trauma or decision making bias, we must also increase procedural and substantive protections available to youth.

I. EMERGING UNDERSTANDING OF YOUTH DEVELOPMENT

Systems of education and of juvenile justice have the common goal to guide young people safely to adulthood.33 Compulsory school attendance and juvenile courts both became widespread institutions in the early 1900s.34 At the time, this was touted as a government intervention for the benefit of the impoverished, yet modern critics view both as a tool of social control.35

Yet in recent years scientists have been able to show that what was once considered delinquent may in fact just be symptoms of the psychological transition between childhood and adulthood—what we now call adolescence.36 Historically, once a child appeared to have basic cognitive abilities then that child was subjected to adult standards.37 But research has demonstrated this period of time is marked by psychosocial immaturity and tendencies toward “antisocial” actions.38 Youth tend to engage in ways that seem at best bizarre, and at worst threatening. Additionally, a growing body of research demonstrates

32. Fraidin, supra note 27, at 926.
33. CTR. ON JUV. & CRIM. JUST., JUVENILE JUSTICE HISTORY 1 http://www.cjcj.org/education1/juvenile-justice-history.html [https://perma.cc/HEW3-QYC5].
35. Id. at 23 (“By 1910, the simplicity and lack of differentiation that often characterized earlier communities was being replaced…. New waves of eastern and southern European immigrants raised fears of crime, vagrancy, and a foreign-speaking pauper class. In response to these fears, schools were promoted as agencies of social control and assimilation.”).
37. Monahan et al., supra note 10, at 589.
38. Id. at 603–04.
trauma and toxic stress has a huge effect on the development and decision making of youth. 39

A. Natural Tendencies towards Risk-Taking and Peer Orientation

Neurobiological evidence shows there is a “dual system” change happening in the brain during adolescence. First, in early adolescence there is a significant redistribution and increase in dopaminergic activity specifically in our prefrontal cortex. 40 The increase in dopaminergic activity makes experiences inexplicably rewarding. Concurrently, but at a slower pace, our brain’s cortex is engaging in “synaptic pruning” where the most heavily used synapses become stronger and the least used wither away. 41 This affects our ability to set goals, weigh agendas, and make decisions. 42 Scientists hypothesize that this rapid increase in dopaminergic activity coupled with the slower development in the prefrontal cortex is exactly what leads to increases in reward seeking behavior—some call it akin to “starting the engine without someone behind the wheel.” 43

This dual system change means adolescents have different biological tendencies toward rewards and risks. 44 Evolutionary researchers theorize these are adaptive processes helping adolescents move from the safety of home into new and often scary adult territories. 45 Yet it has resulted in some specifically documented tendencies.

First, adolescents have a tendency to minimize the danger an action presents if it will allow them to engage in sensation-seeking conduct. 46 There are simple age differences in the likelihood to engage in criminal behavior. In fact, criminologists have found young people as a general group score as problematically prone to make antisocial decisions such as shoplifting, smoking marijuana, and riding in a stolen car because of a general appetite for exhilaration. 47

Second, the desire for sensation seeking and appetite for risk can also greatly affect what adolescents are willing to disclose and say. The frontal lobe, still

40. Laurence Steinberg, Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice, 5 ANNU. REV. CLIN. PSYCHOL. 459, 466 (2008) (discussing Dopamine’s role as a critical part of the brain’s reward circuitry); see also Dobbs, supra note 17.
41. Dobbs, supra note 17.
42. Id.
44. Steinberg, supra note 40, at 469.
45. Dobbs, supra note 17.
developing for adolescents, is what adults use to apply brakes to emotional verbal responses.48

Third, adolescents also have difficulty understanding the long-term consequences of decisions—one study concluded that only 25% of tenth graders, compared to 42% of twelfth graders, considered what future consequences might occur before making decisions.49 This can have heart-breaking consequences, such as the frequent documentation of cases where an adolescent will falsely confess to serious crimes, because the police promise they will be allowed to go home if they agree to the charges.50

Fourth, adolescents are naturally more oriented toward peers and away from adults. One recent behavioral study found that adolescents and adults performed similarly on a task prompting risk-taking when performing the task alone, but that the presence of same-aged friends doubled risk taking by the adolescents.51 Studies of adolescence-limited offenders found that a prime motivation for crimes was imitation of higher status peers.52 This puts youth at particular risk during the early high school years as pubertal changes combine with increased exposure to older adolescents, leaving those thirteen through fifteen-year olds eager to prove themselves.53 For example, psychologists working in delinquency court have testified the typical child carrying a gun wants to impress his friends and “look bigger” and rarely has actually anticipated using it.54 Youth in vulnerable situations also experience much greater anxiety than adults over the social consequences of refusing to engage in risky conduct.55

Fifth, most youth crave adult attention and support, but have simultaneous difficulty with the authority of adults in real life.56 Studies have shown as a result of general anxiety, most adolescents being questioned by adults in any context display suspicious behavior such as difficulty making eye contact, qualify

53. *Id.*
statements, respond in monosyllables, and provide nonlinear and confusing narratives.\footnote{Beyer, supra note 20, at 112 (noting that this is only more difficult with adolescents with learning disabilities and difficulty processing information, which is an estimated 17 - 53% of juveniles charged.)}

Luckily, desistence from many of these behaviors seems to be a natural process through improvements over the course of adolescence as the prefrontal cortex catches up with the higher emotions.\footnote{Kim Taylor-Thompson, States of Mind/States of Development, 14 STAN. L. & POL’Y REV. 143, 156 (2003).} The social attractiveness of engaging in crime also decreases as age increases.\footnote{Moffitt, supra note 19 at 675.} However, as this next section will show, the process of desistance may be complicated if the adolescent is dealing with other trauma.

\textbf{B. Trauma}

Childhood trauma is overwhelmingly common. Through an influential long-term study of over 17,000 people, researchers found that almost half of the youth reported serious ‘adverse childhood experiences’ (‘ACEs’) such as abuse, violence, or abandonment.\footnote{Felitti et al., Relationship of Childhood Abuse and Household Dysfunction to Many of the Leading Causes of Death in Adults, 14 AM. J. OF PREVENTIVE MED. 245, 250 (1998). The original study connected these original experiences to morbidity data, and found a clear connection between the higher the ACEs score was, the greater the risk for a long list of health outcomes, including ischemic heart disease. \textit{Id.} Interestingly, the first study participants were majority white, middle to upper class, with access to health care – yet the outcomes persisted. \textit{Id.} at 251.} Further research has shown a clear link between the number of ACEs a child has experienced and the likelihood of difficulty in school or entry into the juvenile justice system.\footnote{A study conducted in Washington State showed, “The 248 kids with three or more adverse childhood experiences had three times the rate of academic failure, five times the rate of severe attendance problems, six times the rate of school behavior problems, and four times the rate of poor health compared with children with no known trauma.” Jane Ellen Stevens, Spokane WA, Students’ Trauma Prompts Search for Solutions, ACES Too HIGH (Feb. 28, 2012), https://aces toohigh.com/2012/02/28/spokane-wa-students-child-trauma-prompts-search-for-prevention/ [https://perma.cc/BUU7-QQ5W].} For detained youth, almost all have experienced a traumatic event, with male juveniles frequently reporting experiencing or witnessing violent crimes and female juveniles experiencing domestic violence and sexual abuse.\footnote{Representative studies of youth in juvenile detention facilities reveal two complex trauma subgroups – about 20% of youth, report a combination of sexual or physical abuse or family violence, with 15% reporting emotional abuse and family violence (but no personal physical or sexual abuse). Keith R. Cruise & Julian D. Ford, Trauma Exposure and PTSD in Justice-Involved Youth, 40 CHILD AND YOUTH CARE F. 337, 338, 340 (2011).} This is unsurprising - the idea that
Traumatic experiences yield misbehaving youth was the origin of our juvenile justice system. However, how complex trauma manifests in actual behavior can be complex. Traumatized adolescents deal particularly poorly with changes in adult caretakers, and often engage in long periods of “testing” adults:

[Y]outh with complex trauma histories may react surprisingly negatively to well-intentioned and well-designed milieu programs—not simply to be “resistant” or “callous and indifferent,” but to maintain an avoidant and detached stance to not be either disappointed or victimized by those programs and the staff running them, as they too often have been betrayed and exploited by apparently helpful people in the past.

Adolescents with trauma react particularly poorly to physical or legal means of intimidation particularly out of sensitivity to perceived injustice or abuse of power. The after effects of trauma also make many adolescents poor at accurately perceiving threats, and leads to what seems like self-initiate aggression. This is particularly potent when combined with the natural inclination to take risks.

Adults, to be successful with any youth, need to be conscious of their own perspective and use of power. Society recognizes that an adolescent’s thought process in engaging in unlawful conduct is simply different than an adult’s decision to do so. As such, a key concern is how an adult perceives a youth’s decision making, and especially times when that perception might be skewed.

II. COGNITIVE BIAS IN ADULT DECISION MAKERS

Laws for American youth are built around the idea that rather than punitive action, the given decision maker – whether a Judge, a Superintendent, or a Probation Officer – will make a decision in the child’s best interest. Courts presume a given adult is objectively and fairly viewing the situation. Because in theory the decisions are not punitive, courts also allow unchecked discretion unheard of in an adult context.

63. KATZ, supra note 34, at 11, 21.
64. Julian D. Ford et al., Complex Trauma and Aggression in Secure Juvenile Justice Settings, 39 CRIM. JUST. & BEHAV. 694, 701 (2012).
65. Id.
66. Id.
67. Taylor-Thompson, supra note 58, at 143.
68. Schall v. Martin, 467 U.S. 253, 263–64 (1984) (holding the role of the judge and staff in addressing the best interests of the child through individual decisions “makes a juvenile proceeding fundamentally different from an adult criminal trial.”).
69. Id. at 263.
This is in tension with cognitive science research which shows even well-intentioned decision makers fall into predictable patterns of bias. In reality, people’s decisions are subject to common heuristics which function to speed up processing. These heuristics are essentially adaptive, serving as unconscious but necessary tools to help us deal with a complicated world. However, these patterns in the way we process and interpret information in the world can result in cognitive bias, which is an incorrect conclusion in certain circumstances with predictable and troubling outcomes.

A typical school discipline decision works in the following way: a teacher will have a negative interaction with a student or observe a forbidden behavior. The teacher will then report that behavior to an in-building principal or administrator, who will then take the information from the teacher—and potentially the perspective of the student or other students—and make a decision of what kind of discipline will help reform the student’s behavior. The student can then challenge the decision to the administrators, who are reviewing the principal’s decision for some kind of error. Each of those stages is ripe for the decision to be impacted by cognitive bias.

A. Cognitive Bias Impacting Initial Identification of Misbehavior: Priming and Self-Serving Bias

Primbing refers to the mental process in which our response to information is influenced by certain prior knowledge structures that are “primed” in our brain. Essentially if new information triggers an association with an accessible knowledge category, any new information will be more quickly and easily correlated with that knowledge category. We judge initially and remember later what we have been primed to look for. For example, if research subjects

70. DAN ARIELY, PREDICTABLY IRRATIONAL: THE HIDDEN FORCES THAT SHAPE OUR DECISIONS, xx-xxi (2010).
73. Fielder & von Sydow, supra note 71, at 146–49.
are told words suggesting violence—“leg, break, arm, his”—immediately before being asked to characterize behavior of people they encountered, those subjects are more likely to characterize the behavior as aggressive. People’s initial impressions of another person, especially if it creates particularly positive or negative emotions, will remain consistent despite new encounters in large part due to how we are primed to view them.78

Self-serving bias describes people’s tendency to interpret events in a way that is advantageous for their own esteem by taking credit for success and denying responsibility for failure.79 Self-serving bias is shown through behavior demonstrating, “a common human tendency to interpret the world to make it square more comfortably with one’s own interests.”80 People often overstate the role they have played in an event where they participated, particularly if they are proud of the outcome.81 This is adoptive behavior, and can give a person the confidence to reach beyond what he or she could otherwise initiate.82 These biases help decision makers feel better in difficult situations by relieving cognitive dissonance arising out of uncertainty.83

This bias is amplified in a profession like teaching, where a teacher’s belief in his or her own efficacy is essential for functioning.84 For example, research shows teachers will attribute students’ high grades to their own skill in teaching and preparing, and low grades to the students’ failure to pay attention or prepare.85 Teachers seem generally at a loss to identify causes for student misbehavior, but most teachers commonly cited students’ poor home lives as the

77. Id. “Once the encoding takes place and an overall impression of the target is formed, however, it may then be used as a basis for inferring traits of the target that are unrelated to either the original behavioral information or the material in the priming task.” Id. at 1670. The likelihood any information will be used to encode future inputs increases with the number of times the person has been primed with that specific information. Id.


82. Farnsworth, supra note 80, at 575 (discussing the role of self-serving biases and wishful thinking in motivating creative enterprises, arguing these biases, “create behavior and results closer to what the actor wants than he would otherwise be able to manage.”).

83. Id.

84. Leslie C. Soodak & David M. Podell, Teachers’ Thinking About Difficult-to-Teach Students, 88 J. EDUC. RES. 44, 45 (2001) (showing teacher feelings of efficacy are essential for daily management).

85. Id.
largest problem facing their students. Yet students report misbehavior really arising out of situations within the classroom - needing more attention from teachers, teachers being disrespectful to students, and non-meaningful class activities. Teachers reported spending immense amounts of time and frustration on student discipline—one stated they usually spent around forty minutes of a fifty-five-minute class disciplining. Yet studies show teachers are often unable or unwilling to think about which of their own actions might be leading to misbehavior.

B. Cognitive Bias Impacting Discipline Decisions: Belief in a Just World and Overconfidence

‘Just world theory’ posits that most people have intrinsically organized their mindset around the idea of ‘deservingness’ – that for both themselves and for others, the outcomes they receive are the ones they deserve. In the face of examples of injustice or suffering, people are motivated to minimize these examples to maintain the appearance that the world gives out resources and ill fate accordingly as people deserve them. For example, if people can compensate a victim for a one-time wrong, people have been shown to react with compassion, but if those same people were presented with an example of a victim suffering from larger systemic wrongs, people will begin to criticize the victim’s character.

Studies have shown those who need to maintain their own personal emotional well-being while being asked to participate in meting out punishments

86. Donetta J. Cothran, et al., *Attributions For and Consequences of Student Misbehavior*, 14 PHYSICAL ED. & SPORT PEDAGOGY 155, 160 (2009). A common answer from a teacher regarding student misbehavior reads, “I think it starts way back a long time ago. It starts at home. Unfortunately you have children who are coming from a single parent home.” Id.

87. Id. at 161–62.

88. Id. at 162. Another said, “You spend all day yelling and screaming. You spend so much time with the discipline you’re not able to do all the other kinds of things that make it fun.” Id.

89. Id. at 165. Cothran et al., also noted the student feedback also shows self-serving bias, and notes that children may not be positioned to understand the impact of a dysfunctional family structure if it is the only one they have ever known. Id. All in all, the authors noted neither side showed a willingness to “own” the problem of student misbehavior, and, “if one feels that they are not responsible then there is little reason to attempt to change behaviors.” Id. In another recent study where teachers who were shown a fictional case study involving a difficult-to-teach student, a large proportion suggested the solutions would need parent involvement, special education testing, or outside services – all solutions outside of the teacher’s control. Soodak & Podell, supra note 84 at 46–47.


tend to show a stronger bias toward the belief that there is a just world. 93 Like other identifiable cognitive patterns, this has a functional component—it allows individuals to invest in long-term goals because they know any investments they make will be rewarded. 94 Research shows the more an individual has invested in a certain system, the more that person will generally psychologically distance themselves from examples of suffering or injustice within that system. 95

The belief in a just world also leads people to re-interpret unjust events to see something that “‘make[s] up for’ the suffering itself.” 96 If there is an outcome with one positive aspect or one procedural protection, people with a strong just world orientation will use that to justify the entire situation. 97 This has a particular relevance for our juvenile and school discipline systems which claim to be non-punitive and only focused on the ‘best interest’ of the adolescent. Those with a strong ‘just world’ orientation might, for example, be more willing to overlook whether an adolescent needs to be on probation at all if they concurrently believe probation helps children.

Meanwhile, most human beings are confident in their own abilities regardless of actual outcomes. 98 For example, we generally consider ourselves to be better drivers than others, 99 and more ethical than others. 100 Almost all newlyweds assume their marriage is not at risk even with a divorce rate above 50%. 101 Lawyers tend to display unjustified confidence regarding the outcome

---

93. Jozef Dzuka & Carolyn Dalbert, *The Belief in a Just World and Subjective Well-being in Old Age*, 10 AGING & MENTAL HEALTH 439, 440 (2006) (“Numerous studies have shown that the belief in a just world serves to protect subjective well-being.”).

94. Carolyn L. Hafer, *Investment in Long-Term Goals and Commitment to Just Means Drive the Need to Believe in a Just World*, 26 PERSONALITY AND SOC. PSYCHOL. BULL. 1059, 1069 (showing that when circumstances were potentially threatening to the belief in a just world, people who were concerned with long-term investments, either because of situational pressures or because of chronic tendencies, acted to protect that belief (e.g., by blaming the victim for her fate) more than did people less so invested).

95. Id.

96. Hafer & Bègue, supra note 90, at 146.


101. Lynn A. Baker & Robert E. Emery, *When Every Relationship Is Above Average: Perceptions and Expectations of Divorce at the Time of Marriage*, 17 L. & HUM. BEHAV. 439, 442–43 (1993) (showing that recently married couples almost unanimously expect that they will not get divorced even when aware the average divorce rate is over 50%).
of litigation,102 and even medical professionals with sub-par outcomes overestimate the effect their clinical interventions will have on patients.103 In fact, anyone in a professional role who considers themselves to have “expertise” tends to be especially over-confident in their own judgments and more resistant to change.104

Overconfidence is especially prevalent in professional settings where uncertainty and vulnerability is discouraged, and in situations where a person is relied upon for instruction or guidance by others.105

C. Cognitive Bias Impacting School Discipline Appeals: Confirmation Bias

Confirmation bias is the tendency to bolster a hypothesis by seeking consistent evidence while minimizing inconsistent evidence.106 Once a person has an idea or theory, research shows people will undervalue, not notice, or not remember information conflicting with that theory.107 Research has shown even when a complete invalidation of evidence is shown, people tend to adhere to their initial conclusions.108

When there is a dominant perspective of a group, members often will look for evidence to help them conform their perspectives to the dominant beliefs out of a desire to achieve harmony and fit in.109 Research shows that in organizations like schools where there are a few central decision makers who give both implicit and explicit directions, lower level staff members will shape their perspectives to conform.110 For example, research shows school psychologists or counselors are likely to find agreement with the teacher’s referral in testing a

107. Id. at 316–17.
student for special education needs despite contradictory evidence arising in the actual testing itself.111 In another study, teachers were presented with a pool of students who were in actuality similar, but told some were referred for “Emotional Disturbance.”112 The teachers involved in the study were almost four times as likely to identify behaviors from the Emotional Disturbance group as “problem” despite there being no actual pre-determined clinical or logistical differences between the two sets of students.113

Unchecked confirmation bias has also been noted to impact a person’s ability to adequately investigate an issue. A recent study where participants were asked to evaluate a case file of an assault featuring several possible suspects showed the effects of confirmation bias on investigations in action.114 The participants who were asked early in the case to name a suspect showed a greater tendency to confirm that hypothesis by suggesting lines of investigation focusing on that suspect, doubting the applicability of motives only applicable to other suspects, and put greater stock in the reliability of witnesses incriminating that suspect.115 These same pressures and resulting preference for confirming information also affect defense attorneys tasked with evaluating the decision to plea or proceed to trial.116

D. What Increases and Decreases Use of Bias by Decision Makers

While cognitive scientists have been able to clearly document observable effects of various biases, research showing a clear path to reduce these bias is less promising. Initially researchers hoped awareness of biases alone would be enough to combat them, but have found that, “a crucial component of automatic processes is their inescapability; they occur despite deliberate attempts to bypass or ignore them.”117 People have a blind spot when it comes to biases that is resistant to education or even awareness.118

113. Id. at 68.
115. Id. at 328.
117. Patricia G. Devine, Stereotypes and Prejudice: Their Automatic and Controlled Components, 56 J. PERSONALITY & SOC. PSYCHOL. 5, 6, 15 (1989) (“Perceivers cannot attend to all aspects of a situation or their behavior. In situations in which controlled responses are precluded or interfered with, automatic processing effects may exert the greatest influence on responses.”).
118. Wilson, supra note 116, at 289 (showing how studies have demonstrated participants tend to believe they are less biased than others, and hold fast to those judgments even after receiving education about how they could have been biased.).
Given this body of research, it seems clear that a person overloaded with information will make more biased decisions, whereas a person who has more time and space will make less biased decisions. Unwanted implicated attitudes are used less as decision makers can access strategically induced controlled processes. But the use of bias in decisions is far more likely when a person is under cognitive load, defined as when an individual is asked to process too many complex and dense messages. As a result, their memory and ability to create higher order thought decreases. Fatigue, sleep deprivation, and feeling overwhelmed also appear, unsurprisingly, to increase reliance on intuitive processing. Theories of bounded rationality argue that as demands on a person’s cognition continue to increase a person will turn to strategies to allow coping —accessing more available mental images, spending less energy examining the validity of recent ideas, integrating less new information.

Cognitive load also means that bias can increase if individuals feel helpless or stuck. Research shows if someone has been tasked with making a large number of recent decisions about unsolvable problems, that individual’s attention will become increasingly fixated on easy and non-complex decisions.

Researchers have tried to mitigate the effects of heuristics by informing or training people about bias detection and bias avoidance, but they found that training had no long-term effect on the decision making. In part, this is due to how individuals making choices are often subject to multiple heuristics and made in conjunction with a group, leading to complex causal connections.

Further, because most heuristics are fundamentally adaptive — for example,

119. Jennifer T. Kubota et al, *The Neuroscience of Race*, 15 *Nature Neuroscience* 940, 946 (2012), https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22735516 [https://perma.cc/QR8P-9DAY] (arguing emotion regulation strategies can demonstrate a lasting effect on decision making but require effortful practice over time to be successful). For an interesting example of how increased time and decreased caseloads could impact bias, see Shai Danziger, Jonathan Levav & Liora Avnaim-Pesso, *Extraneous Factors in Judicial Decisions*, 108 *Proceedings Nat’l Acad. Sci.* 6889, 6892 (2011) (This shows evidence suggesting that as a panel of Israeli judges made repeated rulings, they showed an increased tendency not to rule in favor of the defendant regardless of the facts of the case. This tendency was overcome when the judges took a break to eat a meal, meaning the likelihood of a ruling in favor of a prisoner changed depending on how close to lunch the prisoner appeared.)

120. Shah & Oppenheimer, supra note 22, at 212.
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124. Babcock et al., supra note 102, at 916; see also Farnsworth, supra note 80, at 582.

people who engage in over optimistic biased-thinking also tend to be more productive and happier – total removal of heuristics is neither possible nor desired.126

However, researchers have demonstrated success with combatting various biases by implementing procedures that break through mental inertia and “break the habit.” One promising practice sets up a mandatory process where a given official has to explicitly consider counterarguments to their own thinking before making a judgment.127 Even if the decision maker thought of themselves as being open minded, the process of explicitly naming other options led the official to less biased decisions.128 However, researchers have also found that consideration of a counterargument can actually worsen bias if done in a cursory way without having another plausible option.129

There has also been tentative success with increased oversight and accountability. Knowing a decision will be open to scrutiny and future accountability increases accuracy. If a person knows they will have to justify a decision later, research shows that person will survey a wider range of conceivably relevant cues and think through potential alternatives.130 For example, requiring police officers to present evidence of how often their stops lead to finding contraband can improve bias in stops.131 Studies have shown that if experts receive constantly unbiased feedback, they learn more quickly to avoid egocentric biases.132 Other studies show subjects who will have to explain their actions were more likely to consider the actions of others in a situational context and less likely to attribute actions to alleged negative personality traits.133

This accountability, however, only works if the accountability is “pre-decisional” meaning that the person knows before making the decision that he or she will be asked to later justify it.134 Research shows a decision maker who

126. Id. at 1783.
127. Babcock et al., supra note 102, at 916.
128. Id.
129. O’Brien, supra note 106, at 330. For example, in the O’Brien study regarding confirmation bias in investigations, generating a hyper-factual (a theory about another suspect) did not decrease subject’s determination to stick with their initial suspect when there wasn’t any other real evidence leading away from that person. Id. at 329. O’Brien also cites to a similar study examining gender prejudice where men who were given the chance to show that they were not sexist (by disagreeing with a flagrantly sexist statement) went on to express more sexist ideas than the norm on later measure, with the theory being the men felt they had established virtuosity and could indulge in stereotypes. Id.
132. Rachlinski, supra note 81, at 1220–21.
134. Id.
is asked after making a decision to justify it will go to great lengths to bolster and defend the decision.135 Instead, if a decision maker is told in advance that they will have to justify future decisions in a certain way to a certain audience,136 research shows most people will then apply more self-critical attention to judgment processes and put more effort into the calculus.137

Finally, research on implicit bias also suggests that one of the most effective long-term ways to combat inter-group bias is to create and foster strong inter-group relationships.138 However, this integration takes further time and money—research on workplace integration shows it cannot be done through a few sponsored social outings; rather it must be done through intentional fostering over time of an inter-group team.139

E. Conclusion - The Impracticability of Unbiased Discretion

Courts have tried to recognize these loads by affording special deference to schools out of the belief a caring official who has the youth’s best interest at heart should have significant latitude to make decisions.140 These cognitive patterns are a large part of how a busy person bearing huge responsibilities handles an otherwise unmanageable load. Yet this research demonstrates how it is almost impossible that a responsible person is going to be able to neutrally take in information and make an unbiased decision in another person’s best interest. People most often want information that is consonant with their beliefs rather than dissonant. If exposed to dissonant information, people are motivated to defend their beliefs, scrutinize challenging information, and search for information that will confirm.141 This research fundamentally calls into question

136. It is also essential that the decision maker not know exactly how the decision maker will feel. For example, there is frequently criticism of the “close” nature of juvenile courts, leading some prosecutors and defense attorneys to self-edit valid arguments in front of judges who they know will not be pleased with certain challenges. See Josh Gupta-Kaga, Where the Judiciary Prosecutes in Front of Itself: Missouri’s Unconstitutional Juvenile Court Structure, 78 MO. L. REV. 1245, 1282 (2014).
139. Id. at 1396.
140. Mitchell v. Bd. of Trs. of Oxford Mun. Separate Sch. Dist., 625 F.2d 660, 662, 664–65 (5th Cir. 1980) (finding policy mandating expulsion for weapon possession wasrationally related to school official’s duty to provide a safe learning environment).
the structure of how and when adults are legally allowed to remove a youth from school.

III. STRUCTURAL ASPECTS OF SCHOOL DISCIPLINE LAW ENCOURAGES USE OF COGNITIVE BIAS

School discipline laws can differ from state to state, yet share certain structural similarities. In general, our system of meting out punishment to youth involves the following: an adult decision maker who has largely unchecked discretion, a strong belief in their own expertise, a limited understanding of the youth’s perspective, a recalcitrant youth who is often traumatized, immense pressures for a quick decision, huge caseloads, and little to no accountability. These structural aspects of how we discipline youth encourage and enhance the use of bias in decisions made about any particular child.

A. School Discipline Law Gives Startling Amounts of Discretion to Adult Officials

J.J. was a senior in high school, on the honor roll with no disciplinary record, when he was suspected of stealing a computer. 142 Within forty minutes of being confronted by the principal and vice-principal, J.J. had admitted to taking the computer and called his father to bring the laptop to school. 143 The two officials then accused him of taking other items around the school, and even accused him of stealing the iPad in his backpack. 144 The two threatened to contact the University he was planning to attend as well as call the police to have him “convicted of a felony.” 145 After his father arrived with the laptop, the two officials told J.J. and his father that J.J. would be suspended indefinitely and would not be permitted on school grounds from here on. 146 The entire conversation took about forty minutes. 147 The superintendent, who had not been present or spoken independently with J.J. or his family, issued a formal recommendation that J.J. be suspended from school. 148 Later that day, his father and mother went back to school to ask if there was anything to be done to allow J.J. to graduate given his previously clean disciplinary record, but the principal told them J.J. was “done.” 149 Earlier, the principal said he was troubled by how long it took J.J. to confess, and by not admitting to the other thefts he could see
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143. Jahn v. Farnsworth, 617 F. App’x. 453, 455 (6th Cir. 2015).
144. Id.
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146. Id. at 456.
147. See Jahn, 617 F. App’x. at 455–56.
148. See id. According to the school’s Code of Conduct, J.J. was supposed to be given an appeal to that very Superintendent despite her having issued a “final” recommendation. Id. at 457.
149. Id. at 456.
J.J. was, “very cold, calculating, and unremorseful.”\(^{150}\) Later that night, J.J. killed himself.\(^{151}\)

His parents brought suit against the school.\(^{152}\) The actual decision to expel this young man and undercut his stability and future could not be reached through a legal claim. Instead his parents argued that the procedure used to functionally expel J.J. violated his procedural due process rights to an education.\(^{153}\) His parents alleged many procedural violations: 1) the meeting was less than an hour; 2) that neither parent nor counsel was present; 3) that the Superintendent who formally issued the suspension was not there; 4) that the school did not follow the discipline procedure it had created itself; and 5) other thefts were being factored into J.J.’s suspension without any evidence actually connecting him to them.\(^{154}\) The Sixth Circuit found the school complied with procedural due process just by having a meeting where J.J. was told about the charges and given a chance to respond.\(^{155}\)

This decision shows the incredible amount of discretion given to school officials in making the decision to suspend or expel. Because public education has long been considered to be a property right, deprivation of the right to receive a public education does need to observe due process protections such as notice and the opportunity to be heard.\(^{156}\) However, only the process is reviewable—so a court will almost never consider whether the official made the right call in finding whatever offense justified the length of the suspension or exclusion.\(^{157}\) In J.J.’s case, this means the decision to indefinitely suspend an honor roll student based on a first offense—jeopardizing his college acceptance, his social connections, and his ability to become self-sufficient—is not reviewable in any way. Here, the official reasoning given for his suspension was the Principal’s perception that J.J., a pre-suicidal teenager with no discipline record who

\(^{150}\) Id.

\(^{151}\) Id. at 456. His parents brought suit against the school, alleging violations of both his procedural and substantive due process rights to an education. Id. at 458. The school district won on both counts. Id. at 458, 464.

\(^{152}\) Jahn v. Farnsworth, 617 F. App’x. 453, 458 (6th Cir. 2015).

\(^{153}\) Id. at 458. The school policies given to J.J. and his parents at the beginning of the year provided any student subject to a long-term suspension or expulsion receive written notice of the violation and consequences, be allowed the opportunity for a formal hearing, have the right to bring counsel, and be allowed two layers of appeal—one to the superintendent and one to the board. Id. at 457. The school district won. Id. at 458, 464.

\(^{154}\) Plaintiff’s Response to Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment, supra note 142.

\(^{155}\) Id. at 461. The court also found that J.J.’s substantive due process rights were not damaged based on the “state-created-danger” doctrine (liability where the state knows its actions specifically endanger the plaintiff) because the doctrine is generally inapplicable to suicide. Id. at 463.

\(^{156}\) See Warren v. City of Athens, 411 F.3d 697, 709 (6th Cir. 2005).

\(^{157}\) See Mitchell v. Bd. of Trs. of Oxford Mun. Separate Sch. Dist., 625 F.2d 660, 665 (5th Cir. 1980) (stating mandatory punishments do not violate substantive due process due to the wide latitude afforded schools to make disciplinary decisions).
confessed in forty minutes, was a “cold and calculating” character. J.J.’s family had no way to challenge this perception of the Principal, formed in less than an hour and then finalized into a life-altering decision.\footnote{158 See supra notes 142–154 and accompanying text.}

J.J.’s story exemplifies how the right to procedural due process has been interpreted with such flexibility as to be somewhat meaningless. In \textit{Goss v. Lopez}, the court held a student “must be given \textit{some} kind of notice and afforded \textit{some} kind of hearing.”\footnote{159 419 U.S. 565, 579 (1975).} Even though notice needs to be given, notice need not be formal, and there need be no time between the notice and the hearing.\footnote{160 Id. at 582.}

Forty-minute, one-time conversations count as a sufficient hearing.\footnote{161 Jahn v. Farnsworth, 617 F. App’x. 453, 464 (6th Cir. 2015); see Engele v. Indep. Sch. Dist. No. 91, 846 F. Supp. 760, 763, 766 (D. Minn. 1994) (holding school who declined to intervene in case of student who expressed fear of fellow classmates satisfied due process requirements through one-time meeting between student and school officials).}

The term “hearing” is vastly different in a school discipline context than a trial, and courts have been reluctant to recognize many rights. Youth are allowed to bring legal counsel, but the school does not have to allow attorneys to examine witnesses or speak in any way.\footnote{162 Sykes v. Sweeney, 638 F. Supp. 274, 278 (E.D. Mo. 1986).} There does not have to be testimony—but if there is, the district can have any employee testify without allowing the student to confront the official who observed the misbehavior.\footnote{163 Id. at 278–79 (“The courts have consistently declined to impose the formal procedures and rules of evidence which govern court trials on student disciplinary proceedings.”).} School officials can present hearsay evidence that would be impermissible in a court.\footnote{164 MO. REV. STAT. § 167.161.1 (1997). Specifically, the statute says school administrators cannot justify a suspension with only prior disciplinary actions but can consider those actions in light of a new situation. Id.}

Perhaps most importantly, in many states school administrators are allowed to take into account prior encounters with the youth when deciding whether to suspend or expel.\footnote{165 See Walter v. Sch. Bd. of Indian River Cty., 518 So. 2d 1331, 1336 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1987).} Students can be given multiple suspensions for the same offense.\footnote{166 See Reasoner v. Meyer, 766 S.W.2d 161, 164 (Mo. Ct. App. 1989).} It is also worth knowing that these loose procedural protections only apply for the most serious of disciplinary options. Schools can transfer a student to a different school within the same district, even if the school is seen as ‘inferior’ and even if it is being framed a disciplinary decision, without a youth being able to challenge that decision.\footnote{168 Zamora v. Pomeroy, 639 F.2d 662, 670 (10th Cir. 1981).}
cannot challenge the decision to deprive them of the right to play a sport or do an extracurricular activity. 169

This enormous amount of discretion is true even for physical contact with children. The Supreme Court held corporal punishment of two middle school students—one who received twenty swats with a paddle that left him out of school for days with a hematoma and another who was struck across the arms so hard the child was unable to use his arms for weeks—raised no Constitutional issues. 170 The Court held a child being beaten by an adult at his or her school has no procedural due process right to notice or a hearing. 171 The Court has also found it constitutional for a school official to use reasonable physical punishment even if the child was beaten after the parent tried to limit or restrict the use of corporal punishment. 172

The casualness with which these decisions are made belie their true importance. A long-term suspension or expulsion from school can impact a youth’s life as much or more than a criminal conviction. Youth are rarely able to find adequate resources for the time spent out of school. In Missouri, as soon as a student is suspended or expelled from one school, they are barred from transferring to another school district without explicit waiver of such bar by the superintendent in the new district. 173 The information about their suspension will be shared with a host of other adults regardless of other privacy interests. 174 Lost credits seriously delay and in some cases endanger graduation with a high school diploma. 175 A suspension or expulsion on record can diminish the chances the youth will be accepted into a four-year college. 176 Of schools who utilize disciplinary information in the admissions process, 93% report that an out of school suspension would influence their decision, while 76% report likewise for

169. See Hebert v. Ventetuolo, 638 F.2d 5, 6 (1st Cir. 1981).
171. Id. at 682.
173. MO. REV. STAT. § 167.171.
an in-school suspension.\textsuperscript{177} Time away from peers and from meaningful opportunities create deficiencies in social emotional skills and harms youth who are often already at risk.\textsuperscript{178} The seriousness of the consequences makes it even more disturbing that these decisions are made with such loose procedures and the absence of meaningful review.

B. Overloaded Officials

Schools, particularly those that serve high-need youth, are understaffed.\textsuperscript{179} School funding continues to fall in most states.\textsuperscript{180} Public schools serving low-income students are often less able to access state or local funding than their counterparts serving higher income communities. Teachers in urban or rural schools with high poverty receive comparatively low wages, often lack qualifications for the subject matter they are teaching, and cope with constantly fluctuating student populations in the school.\textsuperscript{181} The average national caseload for a high school counselor is 350 students to one counselor.\textsuperscript{182}

These funding problems lead to a few staff attempting to make a whole host of decisions. And unsurprisingly, studies have shown the larger the school is, the more frequently principals choose to suspend, expel, or report disciplinary

\textsuperscript{177} Id.
\textsuperscript{178} AM. ACAD. PEDIATRICS, POLICY STATEMENT: OUT OF SCHOOL SUSPENSION AND EXPULSION (2013), http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/131/3/e1000.full[https://perma.cc/9ZFW-JD87].
\textsuperscript{182} Brian A. Jacob, The Challenges of Staffing Urban Schools with Effective Teachers, 17 FUTURE CHILD 129, 132, 134, 139–40 (2007).
\textsuperscript{183} COLL. BD. NAT’L OFF. FOR SCH. COUNSELOR ADVOCACY, THE COLL. BD. ADVOCACY & POLICY CTR., NATIONAL SURVEY OF SCHOOL COUNSELORS AND ADMINISTRATORS 24 (2012), https://secure-media.collegeboard.org/digitalServices/pdf/nosca/Barriers-Supports_TechReport_Final.pdf [https://perma.cc/9YF4-8RG6]. Schools with 75% or more of the students on free and reduced lunch have averages reaching to 408 students to one counselor. Id. at 13. Counselors at larger schools often have as many as 500 students each. Id.
problems. Although this is often attributed to ‘urban issues’, often it can arise out of just a basic problem with numbers.

In Michigan, education researchers found that in one district, Muskegon Public Schools, in 2013–2014, there were 6,065 long-term suspensions a year, or around twelve a day. Statutorily, as in most states, only the superintendent, the school board, or a specific designee were able to long-term suspend or expel a student for an instance of violence, a gross misdemeanor, or persistent disobedience on school property. The district would need a fleet of employees to adequately investigate, give notice, or hold hearings. Unsurprisingly, this burden has led to disciplinary decisions that are likely unwarranted. While the officials were dealing with some violent incidents, other suspension-worthy actions were writing a cuss word on art work, kissing another student, and throwing a snowball. Increased demands with few resources means officials are more likely to skip a thorough evaluation and go immediately to the easiest solution.

Enhancing this, most teachers report choosing the profession out of an intrinsic motivation to help children and think of themselves as a caring person. Many teachers or others working in education believe they personally can improve outcomes for youth. Studies of adults training to be teachers showed the majority believed they have a special calling and will be more successful than other individuals at teaching, despite having no experience outside of limited student-teaching roles. Teachers typically overemphasize the importance of the affective variables like having a harmonious relationship

185. Lynn Moore, ‘Staggering’ Numbers of Students Expelled and Suspended, MLive Probe Finds, MLive (June 8, 2015, 5:00 AM), http://www.mlive.com/news/muskegon/index.ssf/2015/06/staggering_numbers_of_students.html [https://perma.cc/7SX5-C6S4]. The study quoted the President of the Muskegon School Board as saying, “It’s staggering the amount of kids we have out of school . . . . It’s frightening . . . . There are kids that figure out how to get suspended . . . . They do it deliberately. They do it on purpose.” Id.
186. Mich. Comp. Laws § 380.1311 (1976). It is worth noting that this statute applies to students in sixth grade and above, and only concerns acts of violence. Id.
187. Moore, supra note 185.
189. Id. at 134. One student, who has never taught before, said:
Special people are set aside. . . . I speak to God daily, “Lord, tell me I am suppose to do this. Tell me that again.” But in praying to God, I would be like, He’s led me to teach. I feel like this would be the best thing that I could do with my abilities and talents . . . . And trying to teach them why they live, the things that life has to offer that you wouldn’t get on the street, I’d rather be in school.
Id. at 133. The authors found it was common for students to speak in these religious terms about their abilities to teach. Id. at 134.
with students, while underemphasizing the actual technical skills needed in

teaching.\textsuperscript{190}

This emotional attachment to the work can trigger biases. Teachers who
badly want to believe they are making differences in the lives of their students
have a mental incentive to see their actions as positive and helpful.\textsuperscript{191} Burnout
happens faster and more seriously in situations where an individual undergoes
more stress.\textsuperscript{192} Professionals working as human service care providers
experience higher levels of chronic workplace stress than other professions.\textsuperscript{193}
Teachers are shown to suffer from motivational problems at higher levels than
other professions perhaps due to feelings of frustration and helplessness.\textsuperscript{194}
Teachers thus may exaggerate their role in a child’s success, if only to be
consistent with the dramatic rhetoric of teachers’ value. Yet we see this pride in
successful students too often accompanied by those same teachers minimizing
their responsibility or agency for adverse outcomes for youth.\textsuperscript{195}

Data from school exclusions shows the more subjective the offense is, the
more the decision maker will penalize minority students—offenses like
“disrespect” show more racial disparity than less subjective offenses like
“excessive noise.”\textsuperscript{196} Research shows teachers often report lower expectations
for black students than for white students.\textsuperscript{197} However, in a study wherein
teachers were asked to rate students’ academic profiles, requiring these teachers
to explain and account for their rankings made for much more accurate decisions
about students’ abilities, with reduced differences based on the ethnic
background of the student.\textsuperscript{198}

\textsuperscript{190} Id. at 134–35.
\textsuperscript{191} See McAllister, supra note 79, at 126, 128.
\textsuperscript{192} See Fernando Betoret, Stresses, Self-Efficacy, Coping Resources, and Burnout Among
\textsuperscript{193} See Vanda Lucia Zammuner, Lorella Lotto, & Christina Galli, Regulation of Emotions in
the Helping Professions: Nature, Antecedents, and Consequences, in MENTAL HEALTH AND
WORK: ISSUES AND PERSPECTIVES 217, 220 (Lou Morrow, Irene Verins, & Eileen Willis eds.,
2002).
\textsuperscript{194} See Ayesha Madni et al., Assessment of Teachers from a Social Psychological Perspective,
59 REV. OF RES. IN EDUC. 54, 58, 61 (2015); see also Sarah Marsh, Five Top Reasons People
B-QB6F].
\textsuperscript{195} See McAllister, supra note 79, at 126, 128.
\textsuperscript{196} Russel Skiba et al., The Color of Discipline: Sources of Racial and Gender
\textsuperscript{197} Emil Haller, Pupil Race and Elementary School Ability Grouping: Are Teachers Biased
Against Black Children?, 22 AM. EDUC. RES. J. 465, 466, 470, 476 (1985). Expectations of
students’ capabilities have long been shown to alter the way teachers treat and judge the students.
See Id. at 476.
\textsuperscript{198} Ineke M. Pit-ten Cate et al., Accuracy of Teachers’ Tracking Decisions: Short- and Long-
Term Effects of Accountability, 31 EUR. J. PSYCHOL. EDUC. 225, 236 (2016).
C. Baffling and Counterintuitive Behavior by Youth

While the high caseloads and lack of training on a case impact adult’s ability to understand a specific youth’s action, even an adult with unlimited training and time would face barriers. Youth are focused on rewards, negligent of risks, and overvalue peer approval in a way that defies adult logic. This disconnect inevitably influences an interaction between an adult official and a youth in trouble, and it can help explain why adult officials tend to interpret youth actions as dangerous in situations where youth are simply sensation seeking. This is particularly amplified by the difficulty most youth have speaking with authority figures, particularly if the youth is struggling with trauma.

In A.M. v. Holmes, a School Resource Officer was called down to a classroom to deal with a student who was supposedly out of control. The teacher explained to the police officer that the seventh grade youth (F.M.) had been generating fake burps in class to make other students laugh. After she ordered him into the hallway, he would lean back into the classroom to burp. The teacher told the police officer she needed F.M. removed because she could not control him. Despite F.M.’s compliance, the officer handcuffed F.M. and removed him from school to the juvenile detention center. He was charged with “interfering with the educational process.” This incident gained no small amount of local attention, much to the chagrin of the school officials—but F.M. continued to clash with his school. A year later, that same School Resource Officer suspected F.M. of being the culprit in a school rumor of drug sales. After a fairly invasive search, the officer found no drugs, but did find a belt buckle with a marijuana leaf and suspended F.M. for displaying inappropriate symbols.

That moody teenagers ended up incarcerated for both minor and frustrating behavior is consistent with national data. Experts argue that too often, officials rely on arrests or expulsions for situations that could be better resolved in other ways. Unfortunately, even just a few days in pre-trial detention is linked to
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recidivism, worsening mental health conditions, and difficulties with school.\textsuperscript{209} Yet, in both cases, the behavior seems to trigger the adult reaction, not due to the severity (or really, any, harm), but because of how baffling and frustrating the behavior is.

F.M.’s behavior is annoying and frustrating. Yet, it is so typical as to be a painfully familiar read for anyone who has a background in education. Through making his peers laugh, F.M. engaged in behavior designed to seek attention and a certain status from peers.\textsuperscript{210} This is exactly the sensation-seeking behavior which seems either silly or malicious to adults but which is \textit{irresistible} to an adolescent brain.\textsuperscript{211} Even though it is seemingly completely illogical that F.M. would risk escalating punishment after already being sent out of the class just to have that “reward” of getting more class laughter and attention, this is consistent with what we would expect to see from our understanding of his stage of brain development.\textsuperscript{212} Behaviors like carrying around a marijuana leaf belt—particularly for someone who doesn’t actually have any marijuana—is consistent with research showing certain behavior adults deem as anti-social is really desired.\textsuperscript{213}

The more irrational and the more counterintuitive the behavior is, however, the more it will complicate the judgment of adults. In F.M.’s case, the officer and the teacher found the burping to be \textit{so frustrating} that it left both helpless. The officer testified that he thought if he left F.M. in school the teacher would be unable to continue teaching.\textsuperscript{214} Adults in these situations have a mental bias toward interpreting these behaviors into previously understood categories and to support the desired outcome.\textsuperscript{215} An exasperated teacher may look at a burping student and, knowing she has the option to remove him quickly, mentally work to justify that conclusion.

Adolescence, which is ripe with seemingly incomprehensible behavior and yet squarely linked to brain development, creates behavior which can complicate adults’ ability to accurately read the situation.

\textbf{D. Conclusion}

Officials in youth-serving systems are set up for bias. The average adult staff member in a school likely fits the following description—overworked, tasked with making disturbingly quick decisions, knowing they will likely never have to explain or justify their actions, and confronted with a teenager acting in
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counterintuitive and frustrating ways. In advocating for similarly stricter standards in family court, Matthew Fraidin writes:

The decision-makers who chose a harsh option in these examples unlikely did so due to a conscious hatred of the youth or a desire to harm the child . . . . Like other humans, however, judges are subject to the vicissitudes of the human mind. Like the rest of us, judges seek to avoid embarrassment and to build self-esteem and achieve the respect of others.216

In all likelihood, any given youth official cares deeply about their job and about the youth they serve. However, the all-too-human susceptibility to act on biases can create havoc if any given individual is given such immense discretion to make such serious decisions. According to cognitive psychology, we should expect a person in this kind of suboptimal work environment to make decisions reliant on stereotypes and generalities—and the data shows us they do.

IV. HOW THE LESSONS OF YOUTH DEVELOPMENTAL SCIENCE AND COGNITIVE BIAS CAN BE USED TO HELP YOUTH IN NEED

Scholars, activists, lawyers, and statisticians have done heroic work in showing how the decisions made theoretically in the best interests of our children can all too often result in arbitrary and biased treatment. Many voices are advocating for reforms in our school discipline system.217 Yet transitioning from societal recognition of a problem to actual improvements in the treatment of youth will take systemic reform. Our youth systems have relied from the beginning on giving theoretically good-intentioned, caring officials the latitude to make decisions on behalf of youth.218 Now, decades of research in cognitive science have demonstrated a long-term reduction in biased or irrational decisions will take more than just better rhetoric.

To guard against arbitrary and counterproductive adult actions, we have to advocate for proven methods that can reduce bias in decision makers. Schools need to introduce and legislatures need to codify both procedural protections that respond to research around reduction in cognitive bias as well as substantive protections to limit what kinds of punishments can be inflicted on youth. Each will require a great increase in resources to allow for more nuanced thinking which can make those procedures possible.

218. CTR. ON JUV. & CRIM. JUST., supra note 333.
A. Why ‘Perspective Shifting’ Training Alone is Insufficient and Counterproductive as a Strategy to Combat Bias

Commonly, upon the discovery of bias, particularly of racial bias, the community and leaders will call for increased training.219 For example, in the last few years it has become increasingly common to provide “trauma-informed” training to help officials shift tactics in working with youth.220 In theory, this training could help informed schools follow advocates’ calls for increased mental health professionals on site and give teachers the appropriate tools to facilitate less punitive treatment of children.221

However, these trainings could also just ultimately pay lip service to reform if not introduced along with substantive limits on how those same teachers can suspend or expel youth. In a New York Times Magazine profile of a school attempting to shift discipline practices, a teacher described how, although excited with the program during training, when an actual confrontation with a student happened, she only complied with the program because it was required.222 She told the reporter she was enthusiastic for the training, but in the face of an actual conflict, advocated for suspension and strongly resisted mediation.223

At this school, the training was only a first step, and an insufficient one at that. Teachers enjoyed the training, but still did not implement mediations as a first recourse.224 Instead, the mediation actually only took place after the school created policy requiring a procedural protection (the mediation), and a substantive protection (no more long-term suspensions could be given for minor behavior).225 States looking to copy that success need to be looking at making those policy changes as well.

219. See, e.g., Mariah Stewart, Black Ladue Students Protest Incidents, Assault Charges Filed Over Student Burned by Glue Gun, ST. LOUIS AM. (Nov. 16, 2016), http://www.stlamerican.com/news/local_news/black-ladue-students-protest-racist-incidents-assault-charges-filed-over/article_e1e8c658-ac45-11e6-9eec-8b10a9322d88.html [https://perma.cc/ZX9D-GT5T] (reporting that after recent racial incidents at a local high school, involving a child burning another child with a hot glue gun, a district spokesperson said, the “district has had ‘a lot of piecemeal things’ on diversity and equity and will now pursue a more ‘concerted effort.’”).

220. See, e.g., Resources for Trauma-Informed Schools and Traumatic Situations, TRAUMA AWARE SCHOOLS, http://traumaawareschools.org/hsaResources/resourcecenter [https://perma.cc/R9PZ-LRKZ] (explaining that recent research in the area has led to increased utility of trauma-informed training in various areas).
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Recent events in Missouri can further serve to show the limits of a change in rhetoric alone. A national report found that Missouri had the highest suspension rates for elementary level students in the nation, with a “disturbing” disparity between discipline given to black and white children in schools. 226 In the reaction since, people have started to talk much more openly about school discipline and voice a commitment to progress. 227 A wide variety of school districts in the Saint Louis area, urged in part by activists, have stated their commitment to limiting use of out-of-school suspensions. 228 Accordingly, the Missouri state legislature recently passed funding for training certifying schools as “trauma-informed.” 229

Yet most policy remains unchallenged and undiscussed. The Missouri Safe Schools Act remains on the books. 230 This law, originally passed in 1996, mandates expulsions for certain offenses and increases the chances the police will become involved in a school dispute. 231 Even the school districts who have publicly voiced a commitment to decrease school suspensions have done so on limited terms. Although twenty school districts in the Saint Louis area participated in public events about lessening the use of school suspensions, only three districts agreed to change policies to reduce suspensions. Even then, those districts only agreed to limit suspensions and expulsions for children third grade and below. 232 Seventeen districts couldn’t even agree to that, and only committed publicly to study the issue. 233

Even more concerning, districts who have previously decreased suspensions are actually increasing the use of cyber “alternative education”—providing suspended students with a log-in to an online credit recovery program, but forbidding access to district buildings. 234 Yet to many, it is obvious this is simply a suspension by another name.
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The approach of the Missouri legislature in appropriating new funds for training could be seen as encouraging but is also completely insufficient. Research on bias shows that even once a person is convinced to change beliefs, the new perspective is essentially layered on top of older ways of thinking. When forced to react quickly, people are still likely to respond in accordance with their old beliefs. It takes dedicated habit breaking as well as a situation that allows for deeper thought to truly shift perspective. Training historically has had mixed results, with people reporting bursts of changed perspective but without long-term effects. The more successful programs work on a longitudinal basis with extensive cognitive re-training.

Many “trauma-aware” programs also primarily concern issues that youth may be facing at home but completely ignore issues in the school environment. Emphasizing youth’s status as previously traumatized without forcing the responsible adult to examine the current situation the youth is in...
could actually worsen bias. By priming adults to treat youth as damaged, these programs seem to perpetuate a self-fulfilling prophecy of child-trauma.241

What we know about confirmation bias and self-serving bias also shows individuals have a tremendous ability to rationalize decisions that are advantageous for their needs as the right decision all around.242 The teacher or principal in the Muskegon school tasked with appropriately resolving 6065 suspensions each school year243 will not be able to internalize or use an alternative, less punitive perspective if removing the troubled youth from the school is an option and will create what that adult sees as a calmer and better system. Training has to be accompanied by more resources and by real limits to be effective.

B. Reform Which Will Create Change

If we know and believe biased decision making flourishes in situations with few resources, high stress, immense pressure to be right, and little accountability, then our solutions must attack that exact situation. The way to a less punitive and more racially equitable system of discipline is two-fold. In the short-term, we need to shelter youth from being subjected to exclusion or carceral involvement as much as possible. Over the long-term, we will have to provide more resources and more accountability for adults to make better decisions.

Part of the rationale in advocating for these increased procedural protections, which limit adult decisions, comes from the vastly different law governing students with disabilities. In 1991, Congress updated the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 into the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (“IDEA”). The IDEA mandates a variety of actions public school officials have to take, which is intended to ameliorate the historic lack of adequate services for disabled students.244 The legislation contains two central requirements: (1) each child has a right to a “free appropriate public education” where public schools have to provide instruction and services designed to meet the unique needs of a child;245 and (2) each child has the right to be educated in the “least restrictive environment” which requires schools educate students with disabilities alongside non-disabled peers to the “maximum extent

241. See e.g., YOUTH VIOLENCE, supra note 55. Its “Introduction to Risk and Protective Factors” section provides a discussion of “risk assessment” underpinning adult understanding of youth misbehavior. Id.

242. See Babcock et al., supra note 102, at 915–16.

243. Moore, supra note 185.


appropriate." IDEA mandates that schools draft an “Individualized Education Program” (“IEP”) for each youth in collaboration with the youth’s parents, teachers, attorneys for each side, and other interested parties.

The IDEA provides procedural and substantive protections for disabled youth from school discipline far and above what non-disabled youth experience. Any suspensions or expulsions of a youth with an IEP beyond an initial ten-day threshold are subject to review. If a school wants to go beyond the ten-days, the entire IEP team must gather, review the student’s file and other relevant information, and make a group decision to determine whether the behavior was a manifestation of the student’s disability or school’s failure to implement the individualized education program. If so, then the schools cannot remove the youth unless the school can show the case is abnormally serious, and even then the removal is limited to forty-five days. In upholding this limitation on a school’s ability to remove a youth with a disability without a more thorough review, the Supreme Court wrote, “Congress very much meant to strip schools of the unilateral authority they had traditionally employed to exclude disabled students, particularly emotionally disturbed students, from school.”

The IDEA is far from a perfect law, and both schools, parents, disability advocates, and others rightly have critiques of how it could be improved. For example, patterns in disability diagnosis reveal racial disparities in what youth are diagnosed with before services are even brought up. But the IDEA has had a great deal of success in getting schools to provide services to youth who were previously excluded. The core of that success is the statutory limitations placed on school discretion. Schools did not choose to start educating youth with disabilities based on better training or individual teachers who decided to commit to fairness – it took a statutory private right of action opening the school to lawsuits to really create the incentive to change.

The lesson from twenty-five years of the IDEA is that states can reduce bias and achieve better outcomes if states are willing to extend these safeguards to all youth. This can be accomplished in part through mandating procedures school officials must take prior to subjecting youth to punishment or exclusion.

253. U.S. OFF. SPECIAL EDUC. PROGRAMS, supra note 244. In the early 1970s, only one in five students with a disability was able to receive a public education – currently, more than six million children are receiving specialized services. Id.
Although the Supreme Court is unlikely to recognize more Constitutional due process protections, states can create a statutory right to continue education without schools undertaking certain rigorous procedures.

Specifically, this should include ‘bias aware’ elements such as forcing responsible school officials to state specific and articulable facts behind the decision to suspend, with specific requirements that the official have explicitly considered counterfactuals and other arguments. Rather than having another employee of the district review the suspension, the state could create a body with independent review power, who can evaluate a situation without the goal of confirming the decision. States could create ‘pre-decisional accountability’ by requiring principals and teachers to do a yearly review in which each employee has to justify discipline decisions and explain inequities. Finally, states and localities could create a private right of action where families have an avenue other than due process rights to sue districts for violations of process.

Of course, this is all only accomplishable with a dramatic increase in school and juvenile system funding. Substantial evidence, in addition to common sense, shows that better funded schools have better outcomes for youth. Better funding means reduced caseloads and additional programs to use as alternatives to the more punitive options. Asking school officials—whether teachers, principals, administrators, or even just school security officers—to access more controlled thought processes will be almost futile without providing the time and space for them to do so.

We also need to re-examine the idea of substantive protections for youth. Data shows exclusion from school rarely serves a positive purpose for youth, but has directly negative results in actually facilitating entry into criminal behaviors and the juvenile system. Contact with the juvenile justice system and even short periods of detention can be damaging to a youth’s well-being, expose the youth to the risk of sexual and physical assault, and is “inherently
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criminogenic.” While we can make the process for exclusion or adjudicating more rigorous, and we can work on funding a system with alternatives, we also need to consider simply forbidding adults from utilizing certain practices. Proposals include formally banning the practice of shackling and restraining youth; no longer allowing armed police officers in schools or referring cases to the police; mandating the use of non-punitive practices instead of the wide use of both expulsions and one-day or activity suspensions to control behavior; and, of course, ending mandatory long-term suspensions and expulsions from school.

Ultimately, this is the choice the Supreme Court made in Roper v. Simmons. Justice Kennedy wrestled with the compelling evidence that we just don’t know enough about the teenage brain to know when a youth is a true sociopathic killer and when the youth just simply made a huge mistake. Given the lack of certainty, the Court chose the avenue of mercy, and ended the use of the death penalty for those who committed crimes when under the age of eighteen. A powerful message of humility can be taken from this. School officials who work with youth are faced every day with the uncertainty of truly understanding the actions of the young and still growing. But society as a whole is beginning to grapple with evidence that the judgments coming out of that uncertainty are far too often linked to adult convenience and adult bias. It is incumbent upon us to place affirmative restrictions on our adult officials’ ability
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to inflict lasting punishments if we want to give our youth the chance to outgrow their mistakes.

Maureen Hanlon*

* J.D. Candidate, 2018, Saint Louis University School of Law. Thank you to Professor Molly Walker Wilson for her valuable guidance and perspective as a faculty advisor, and to Charlie Rosebrough, Elizabeth Kramer, Gail Gentes, Robert Varner, and Brad Tharpe for your feedback and support.