Robert G. Schwartz Named Child Advocate of the Year

The Children’s Rights Committee has named Robert G. Schwartz, Esquire, co-founder of Philadelphia’s Juvenile Law Center, the first Child Advocate of the Year for the new millennium. The award was presented on June 8 during the PBA’s Committee/Section Day.

A graduate of Haverford College and Temple University School of Law, Schwartz has written extensively on service coordination and placement prevention in the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. He has represented children in abuse, neglect and delinquency cases and in state and federal class action litigation. He has testified before state and federal legislative committees advocating improvements in the provision of services to children.

In addition to his efforts to advance the legal rights of children at law, Schwartz has advocated jurisprudential changes as well. From 1986 to 1991 he was co-chair of the Philadelphia Bar Association’s Legal Rights of Children Committee. He chaired the Juvenile Justice Committee of the ABA’s Criminal Justice Section and served on the governing board of the ABA Center on Children and the Law. During his tenure, he helped author America’s Children at Risk: A National Agenda for Legal Action and served on the steering committee charged with its implementation.

Schwartz has served as executive director of the Juvenile Law Center since 1982. For his longstanding dedication to the welfare of children, his advocacy for their interests and legal rights at law, his efforts to challenge the prejudices which influence our decisions relating to children, and encouragement of others to follow in his footsteps, we are delighted to announce his selection as this year's award winner.
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Editor’s Comment

By Joan M. Smith, Esquire

Spring is a time of renewal. Yet, to take significant strides forward, it is also a time for reflection. The past several years have seen the Children’s Rights Committee grow from a handful of committed attorneys to over 75 dedicated child advocates. Many of those who were instrumental in the development of our committee are no longer involved in its day-to-day functioning. In their place has arisen a new group of leaders who have broad and insightful ideas to carry forward the mandate we established a few short years ago.

Less than ten years ago, a statewide training program was mere-ly a dream. Now we are reaching four times as many advocates with our spring seminar as when we began CLE training in 1997. We have added a second CLE program so it is now possible for those representing children to attain the required 12 credits each year in topics related specifically to our practice area.

This newsletter also has become a vehicle for communication between attorneys who are far-flung and often laboring in relative isolation from others with similar practices. Authors frequently call with ideas for articles. We welcome additional contributors and encourage authorship as an opportunity to use the resources of the state bar association to reach a larger audience.

We have become a visible presence in advocating PBA positions for children in the development of legislation. We have worked behind the scenes in drafting legislation. The Legislative Action subcommittee has been tireless in reviewing pending legislation and bringing forward recommendations.

A new committee year is upon us. Fortunately, Lucy Johnston-Walsh will again be chairing the committee with the able support of Scott Hollander. They will be seeking leadership for the many projects we will be undertaking. Please come forward with your ideas and commentary to strengthen the role the committee takes in child advocacy statewide.

Update on the Law


The authority of the juvenile court to issue protective orders is limited to criminal matters. School teachers and staff who are victims of crime cannot seek protection in juvenile adjudication proceedings.


Birth mother’s former same-sex partner who maintained exclusive intimate relationship with mother for several years before the child’s conception and birth, helped plan the pregnancy, participated in insemination, and was involved in child’s daily care for first three years of her life had standing to seek partial custody for visitation purposes. Partner maintained parental relationship with child.

Brian B. v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Dep’t of Education, 230 F.3d 582 (3rd Cir. 2000)

School-age county inmates convicted as adults not entitled to same educational opportunities as similar inmates placed in state facilities. Pennsylvania law restricting educational opportunities does not burden the inmate’s fundamental rights nor target them as a suspect class. Inmates failed to show a reasonable probability the statute should be overturned.

Board of Trustees of University of Alabama v. Garret, 2000 WL 33179681 (U.S.)

U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the 11th Amendment bars federal lawsuits against seeking money damages under Title I of the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA). Such suits must be resolved in state courts.

Free Speech Coalition v. Reno, 198 F.3d 1983 (9th Cir. 1999)

The U.S. Supreme Court has agreed to review a decision holding the Child Pornography Prevention Act of 1996 unconstitutional because it criminalizes all child pornography even if no child was ever used or harmed in its production.


No abuse of discretion by trial court to find that mother’s continued physical abuse resulting in multiple fractures to child’s legs and arms, developmental delays, and impaired physical functioning qualified as aggravating circumstances of serious bodily injury to the child. Forgoing reunification services to mother appropriate under circumstances.
Notes from the Chair

By Lucy Johnston-Walsh, Esquire

Congratulations to Bob Schwartz on receiving the Child Advocate of the Year Award! We are honored to present him with this award and feel fortunate that the Juvenile Law Center is located in Pennsylvania.

In April, the Children’s Rights Committee held its 5th annual CLE for attorneys that represent children. The number of people that attend this meeting has grown steadily from our first year: in 1997 we had only 14 attendees and in 2001 we had over 100! This annual spring CLE provides a wonderful opportunity to receive high-quality updates on the law, and a chance to network with other attorneys who represent children across the state. Thank you to Jim Flower (Cumberland County) and Bill Norvell (Philadelphia County) for all their work in planning such a successful event. The committee will soon start working on the plans for the fall 2001 CLE.

Thank you also to Eleanor Bush for her work in chairing the Legislative Action subcommittee. The subcommittee members have spent many hours reviewing the proposed re-write of the Pennsylvania Adoption Act and drafting detailed comments on the proposed changes. I appreciate all of their time and effort in reviewing this critical piece of legislation.

Committee Activities on Behalf of Children

Legislative Action

Chaired by Eleanor Bush, the subcommittee is charged with discussing proposed and pending legislation and with bringing recommendations to the full committee on a position which should be forwarded to the House of Governors. Anyone interested in joining the subcommittee should contact Louann Bell at 800-932-0311 or lbell@pabar.org. Anyone interested in commenting on the following bills should contact Eleanor at 215-625-0551 or ebush@jlc.org.

The Adoption Act

Legislation has been introduced that will redraft the State Adoption Act. The Legislative Action subcommittee has spent a great deal of time reviewing the legislation and submitting comments. In June, the Children’s Rights Committee reviewed the comments of the Legislative Action subcommittee and forwarded a resolution to the PBA Board of Governors.

Involuntary Commitment of Minors for Mental Health Treatment (SB 242)

Sponsored by Sen. Harold Mowery, this legislation would allow parents or guardians to commit children between ages 14 and 18 for inpatient or outpatient mental health treatment. This would bypass established procedures and standards for involuntary commitment in the Mental Health Procedures Act.

Serious Habitual Offender Comprehensive Action Program (SB 393)

Introduced by Sen. Charles Dent, this bill promotes and facilitates interagency sharing of information regarding “habitual” juvenile offenders.

Law for Kids

Fifty-six high school programs have indicated their interest in participating in the Law for Kids Web site contest slated for the 2001-02 academic year. Materials will be soon be forwarded to participants. Prizes will be awarded at the PBA Annual Meeting in May 2002.
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To Submit Articles

The Children’s Rights Committee newsletter invites members to submit articles or letters to the editor for publication in the newsletter.

Please contact Joan Smith at facsimile 215-635-5003.

We invite your comments or suggestions.
Minimum Practice Requirements Not Being Met by Child Advocates

On May 1, the Juvenile Law Center (JLC) released the results of a two-year study indicating that many of Pennsylvania’s abused and neglected children are routinely denied adequate legal representation by court-appointed attorneys who fail to do such basic tasks as meet with their clients prior to hearings, interview potential witnesses, and advocate for their clients’ physical and mental health needs. Promises Kept, Promises Broken: An Analysis of Children’s Right to Counsel in Dependency Proceedings in Pennsylvania details the results of a statewide survey, site visits and interviews across the state. JLC is one of the oldest non-profit advocacy groups for children in the United States.

Staff attorney Susan Snyder authored the report, which reveals that many children are deprived effective representation when actual practice is measured against American Bar Association (ABA) Standards of Practice and the minimum practice standards recently codified in Pennsylvania law. The report makes it clear that most Pennsylvania attorneys are neither meeting these requirements nor providing their child-clients with high-quality, effective representation, primarily due to a lack of resources and support, extremely high caseloads and inadequate pay.

The report reveals that most attorneys do not receive specialized training before first being appointed to represent children. Thus, they do not know what they can and should be doing on behalf of their child-clients. Additionally, county children and youth agencies frequently do not provide attorneys with critical information and documents about their clients. When not informed about when children are moved from one placement to another, attorneys cannot maintain regular contact with their clients.

An executive summary and the full report of Promises Kept, Promises Broken can be reviewed at www.jlc.org under the “What’s New” section. Concluding recommendations include:

- Attorneys should attend specialized training before accepting appointments to represent children.
- Attorneys should be appointed as soon as possible in the dependency process in order to allow them to perform such mandated — and essential — tasks as interviewing their clients and investigating alternative placements.
- Caseload size should be capped and compensation should be increased to ensure that attorneys are able to meet heightened standards of practice.
- Judges should expect and demand that attorneys who appear before them satisfy Pennsylvania practice requirements and ABA standards.

Upcoming Conferences

- **SEPTEMBER 29-OCTOBER 2**
  Advocacy for Children and Families: Moving from Sympathy to Empathy
  Information at NACCchildlaw.org or call 888-828-NACC.

- **NOVEMBER 12**
  PBA Children’s Rights Committee CLE
  PBI, Mechanicsburg. Contact Stacey Thomas at PBI (800-932-4637, X2298) if you are interested in helping with course planning.

- **AUGUST 2-7, 2002**
  11th World Conference on Family Life and Human Rights
  Call for abstracts and expression of interest. Sponsored by the International Society of Family Law in Copenhagen/Oslo. For information, contact Joan Smith at phone/fax 215-635-5003 or visit www.jus.uio.no/ifp/isfl.

- **FREE!**
  Training and Technical Assistance on Legal Ethics for the Child Welfare Attorney
  National Child Welfare Resources Center on Legal and Judicial Issues. Contact Mimi Laver, assistant director, at 202-662-1736, FAX 202-662-1755 or e-mail laverm@staff.abanet.org.
Agencies Go On Record Opposing Zero Tolerance
Congress, ABA and PBA Children’s Rights Committee Make Formal Statements Calling for Caution in Discipline

Congressional Report Issued

The preface of a report of the Bipartisan Working Group on Youth Violence of the 106th Congress, issued in February 2000, stated, “There are many misconceptions about the prevalence of youth violence in our society and it is important to peel back the veneer of hot tempered discourse that often surrounds the issue ... While it is important to carefully review the circumstances surrounding these horrifying incidents so that we may learn from them, we must also be cautious about inappropriately creating a cloud of fear over every student in every classroom across the country. In the case of youth violence, it is important to note that, statistically speaking, schools are among the safest places for children to be.”

ABA Recommendation Adopted

That Congressional report provided a context for the American Bar Association’s decision, on Feb. 19 of this year, to adopt a recommendation (See column 3, this page.) calling for an end to “zero tolerance” policies. The ABA policy is not binding on government agencies or school districts, but can be used to persuade schools, school districts, and state or local governments to rethink their zero tolerance policies. Under the recommendation, schools would be able to use all the disciplinary tools at their disposal, but they would not be required to do so.

ABA Recommendation

RESOLVED, that the American Bar Association supports the following principles concerning school discipline:

1) Schools should have strong policies against gun possession and be safe places for students to learn and develop;

2) In cases involving alleged student misbehavior, school officials should exercise sound discretion that is consistent with principles of due process and considers the individual student and the particular circumstances of misconduct; and

3) Alternatives to expulsion or referral for prosecution should be developed that will improve student behavior and school climate without making schools dangerous; and

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the ABA opposes, in principle, “zero tolerance” policies that have a discriminatory effect, or mandate either expulsion or referral of students to juvenile or criminal court, without regard to the circumstances or nature of the offense or the student’s history.

More information on the report and the American Bar Association recommendation is available online at: www.jlc.org/home/updates/updates_links/ABAresolution.htm or at: www.abanet.org/crimjust/juvjus/zerotolreport.html.

By Alma S. de León

Alma S. de León is an administrative law judge in Pittsburgh and a member of the Children’s Rights Committee. Her comments on “Opportunities Suspended: The Devastating Consequences of Zero Tolerance and School Discipline Policies” refer to a joint report issued by the Advancement Project and the Harvard University Civil Rights Project (June 2000).

The report is an eye-opener about the impact of zero tolerance policies in the school system and the ramification of problems derived from their implementation. In the introduction, the report is categorical about children being shut out of the education system through the application of zero tolerance policies. It points out that a body of compelling research indicates that these “get-tough” disciplinary measures often fail to meet sound educational principles and in many cases, their application simply defies common sense. More alarming than the punishment meted out in schools is the tracking of children into the juvenile court system for minor misconduct in school. Often African-American, Latino and disabled children bear the brunt of the consequences of these policies. This situation should be of great concern to policy makers, educators and parents when the effectiveness of these policies in ensuring school safety is highly suspect. Further, the long-term implications of denying educational opportunities to millions of children, when implementing these punitive measures is also of concern.

The report acknowledges the importance of school safety but it adds, “schools remain one of the safest places for children and youth.” It also highlights the particular circumstance of “sweeping up millions of school children who pose no threat to safety into a net of exclusion from educational opportunities and into criminal prosecution.”

Zero tolerance “has become a philosophy that has permeated our schools; it employs a brutally strict disciplinary model that embraces harsh punishment over education. As a result of this approach to discipline, students are losing out on educational opportunities.” This is a sad portrait of this restrictive policy. It becomes worse when children are not only being treated like criminals in school, but many are being shunted into the criminal justice system, due to the fact that “schools are relying heavily upon law enforcement officials to punish students.”

Another aspect discussed in the report that is quite troubling is the racial disparity in the application of school disciplinary policies. Zero tolerance policies are more likely to exist in predominantly black and Latino school districts. Attorneys representing students in disciplinary cases who were interviewed expressed the following: “African-American and Latino children are more likely to be referred for disciplinary action and to be disciplined. In addition, these students are more likely to be disciplined for minor misconduct and to receive punishments disproportionate to their conduct.”

The report is critical of this situation and demands action on this issue. The statistics about the disproportionate suspension of black and Latino children are quite alarming and it is imperative to determine what causes this inequality. The report recommends that the Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights and the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights should vigorously investigate these disparities. It emphasizes that we cannot leave behind a segment of our population and be indifferent about it.

Another area of concern is the profound impact zero tolerance policies have on children with special needs. The report states, “school officials often unfairly discipline children with disabilities” without taking into consideration that the federal law “Individuals with Disabilities Education Act” (20 U.S. C. 1400 et seq) was amended to insure that a child would not be punished for a behavior that is typical of his/her disability.

The report also discusses the psychological impact of exclusionary disciplinary policies and emphasizes that rigid and inflexible disciplines often further alienate students from school and aggravate the behaviors they intend to correct. They can have a damaging effect on children who are already considered “at risk” for school failure and may push them out of school completely. Suspensions and expulsions pave the way for dropping out. One fact that stands out in the report is “that suspensions and expulsions take place at the middle and high school level, when many adolescents are acutely tuned into issues related to fairness and justice.” According to the report, students at risk need to develop strong bonds with caring and compassionate adults whom they can trust. Zero tolerance policies restrict this bonding, undermining the ability of teachers and administrators to form trusting relationships with students. These policies do not convey a positive message about fairness, equity and justice, separating students from the educational process. They also worsen behavioral problems that were to be solved with these automatic/harsh punishments.

(Continued on Page 7)
One of the most insidious adverse effects of zero tolerance policies is the increase in criminal charges filed against children for in-school behaviors. The report indicates that students are “subjected to criminal or juvenile charges for conduct that poses no serious danger to the safety of others.” It asserts “in many instances the school districts are transferring their disciplinary authority to law enforcement officials.” The report informs that states require schools to report students to law enforcement agencies for certain conduct committed in school. Although most of the categories of offenses that require reporting to law enforcement agencies appear reasonable, evidence suggests that the application of the laws may be problematic. There is concern that “by enacting referral requirements and failing to monitor their implementation, the states have, perhaps unintentionally, set off an explosion in the criminalization of children for understandable mistakes or ordinary childhood behavior.” As an example, the report points out that assault is a common category of conduct for which schools are required to report students to law enforcement agencies. This category of offense is often broadly interpreted by school districts as one to be referred without considering the severity or the circumstances that provoked the incident. Yet, there is little evidence that zero tolerance policies are working to reduce violence or increase safety in our schools. Nevertheless, such policies have become the philosophy of how to deal with children extending to conduct typical of adolescents.

School districts have adopted a “take no prisoners” attitude toward discipline that in 1998 resulted in 3.1 million suspended students and 87,000 expulsions nationwide. The report affirms that the exclusion of students from the educational process is a crisis of epidemic proportions with long-term implications for the students affected and for society as a whole. This is a devastating picture of students thrown out without the tools that will help them to become useful members of their communities.

This “law and order” approach has harmful effects for students and it has not proven to be effective in providing more safety to the school community. It is understandable that school districts are feeling the pressure of protecting students from guns, violence and illegal drugs but this can be done without the exclusion of American children from the educational process. The report explores other options considered in schools where their efforts are oriented to eliminate certain behaviors and not the students. The report mentions some successful programs where pure zero tolerance is not the option. They are: Rachel Carson Elementary School in Chicago, DeWitt Clinton High School in New York City, Milwaukee Catalyst/Designs for Change and Canton Middle School in Maryland. These schools have succeeded in creating a safe and inclusive learning environment.

Another area of study in the report is the legal protection for students facing zero tolerance policies. Concluding that the law is an inadequate safeguard in many circumstances, it proposes the development of a comprehensive strategy for improving the law, such as amendments to federal and state laws, reform of school policies, improvement of administrative enforcement and litigation designed to develop more favorable precedents. The report notes that “federal laws provide an incomplete patchwork of legal protections against the imposition of harsh school disciplinary measures and many federal courts bend over backwards to defer to disciplinary decisions by school officials.” As stated in the report, there are three categories of federal rights that have the most potential for ameliorating some of the harshest consequences of the zero tolerance trend. They are: protections against discrimination on the basis of color or national origin, rights of students with disabilities, and the due process rights applicable to all students. The legal community should take the lead in this endeavor.

Zero tolerance has been the knee-jerk response to safety concerns as a result of the tragic school shootings but without pondering the long-term implications of such a policy. Based on the above, the report recommends an immediate review of disciplinary policies and reform to ensure that schools are safe but children’s civil rights are protected and their educational opportunities remain available. It emphasizes that education is the only route out of poverty for many children and they should have the best possible options. The report clearly states that the approach of one-size-fits-all is inadequate because it harms students who deserve more compassion and another opportunity.

The findings of the report suggest that schools should concentrate their efforts on the education of all children. Zero tolerance policies should be reevaluated in an objective manner. If our society and the school system want successful students, alienation is not the answer to those who have difficulties adjusting to their environment. It is time to take a second look.

NOTE: The report can be accessed at: http://www.law.harvard.edu/groups/civilrights/conferences/zero/zt_report2.html
The Children’s Rights Committee has joined the Juvenile Law Center of Philadelphia as a co-sponsor of a recently developed Juvenile Court Training Curriculum, which will be made available to members of the Pennsylvania Bar Association through a projected series of geographically dispersed presentations over a period of 18 months.

The comprehensive, multidisciplinary curriculum is the product of a four-year collaboration involving the Juvenile Law Center, the Youth Law Center of San Francisco and Washington D.C., and the American Bar Association Juvenile Justice Center, also located in Washington D.C. Together, these organizations sought to create “a training curriculum that applied the findings of adolescent development and related research to practical issues confronted by juvenile court practitioners at the various decision-making stages of the juvenile justice process.”

Contributions to the curriculum’s development were obtained nationwide from social scientists, social workers, psychologists and psychiatrists, experts in special education and mental health, juvenile court judges, probation officers, prosecutors and defenders.

Funding for the initiative was provided by a grant from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, which promotes projects throughout the country that are intended to better the lives of those children who become involved in the American juvenile justice system. The curriculum’s editor, and one of its key developers, is Lourdes M. Rosado, a staff attorney with the Juvenile Law Center.

Published in September 2000, the curriculum was tested and refined during an extraordinary two-year pilot program conducted with the cooperation of two jurisdictions seated in West Palm Beach, Fla., and Oakland, Calif. During this pilot program, the curriculum was organized into a number of distinct three-hour training modules, each addressing a specific topic through its presentations, exercises, discussions, literature and training materials. In both pilot test jurisdictions, the presiding juvenile court judge set aside a specific date on the court calendar for each training module, and either closed the juvenile courts or lengthened the courts’ lunch recess to accommodate the training program. The modules were presented to mixed groups of judges, prosecutors, defenders and probation officers. Critiques of the curriculum were elicited from program presenters and participants, as well as from numerous expert consultants.

The training modules were designed to apply in any jurisdiction, but can be easily adapted to incorporate jurisdiction-specific information, practices and procedure. The modules stand alone, such that each may be presented exclusively, or in any combination and in any sequence with the other modules. Each module contains a “tool kit” of interactive exercises, hypothetical cases, video clips, hand-out materials and other training aids. A pool of eminently qualified and well-respected experts from a variety of disciplines has been identified, from which presenters for each module may be drawn.

The six training modules are organized under the following themes:

1. Kids Are Different: How Knowledge Of Adolescent Development Theory Can Aid Decision Making In Court

   From this module, participants acquire a working knowledge of adolescent developmental features and learn how to apply this insight to decisions they make at critical junctures in the juvenile court process. Attention is given to five areas of adolescent development: (i.) cognitive, (ii.) moral, (iii.) identity and social, (iv.) biological, and (v.) competence. This module provides participants with a better understanding of the manner in which adolescents think, develop an identity, conceptualize right and wrong, cope with physical changes to their bodies, and acquire competence.

2. Talking To Teens In The Justice System: Strategies For Interviewing Adolescent Defendants, Witnesses And Victims

   This module enables participants to develop techniques for successfully interviewing adolescents in a variety of conditions and circumstances. Critiques of videotaped interviews and role-plays focus on putting the young person at ease, avoiding a judgmental demeanor and defusing an angry teenager.

3. Mental Health Assessments In The Justice System: How To Get High-Quality Evaluations And What To Do With Them In Court

   This module provides participants with the ability to recognize, interpret and demand high-quality mental health evaluations of youth in the juvenile justice system. Guidelines are presented for assessing the qualifications of mental health professionals conducting forensic evaluations, for establishing

(Continued on Page 9)
the minimum requirements of a good evaluation, and for drafting a court order that will prompt the production of a useful evaluation.

4. The Pathways To Juvenile Violence: How Child Maltreatment And Other Risk Factors Lead Children To Chronically Aggressive Behavior

This module focuses on the developmental dynamics of violent offending. “Risk factors” are identified that may cause the onset of violent behavior in children. “Protective factors” are also identified, which enable the participants to intervene and assist at risk children in breaking their cycle of violence.

5. Special Ed Kids In The Justice System: How To Recognize And Treat Young People With Disabilities That Compromise Their Ability To Comprehend, Learn, And Behave

This module provides participants with the means to identify and assist children in the juvenile justice system who are learning disabled, severely emotionally disturbed, or developmentally delayed. Checklists and diagnostic tools are introduced that are useful indicators of a child’s disability. Additionally, the module presents a series of simulation exercises that allow participants to personally “experience” a sense of being learning disabled.

6. Evaluating Youth Competence In The Justice System

This module enables participants to develop an understanding and appreciation for the different levels of competency required of a child at various stages of juvenile and adult criminal court proceedings. Participants will examine the minimum professional qualifications and proper role of persons called upon to evaluate a child’s competency. The module identifies the elements of a good competence evaluation and provides guidance for the effective use of a competency evaluation at various stages of the juvenile or adult criminal court process.

By contacting representatives of the various segments of Pennsylvania’s juvenile justice system, the Children’s Rights Committee and the Juvenile Law Center are currently laying the foundation for presentations of the Juvenile Court Training Curriculum throughout the commonwealth. To this end, Module Three on Mental Health Assessments was presented on June 1 as part of the Pennsylvania Bar Institute’s 18th Annual Criminal Law Symposium in Harrisburg. Additionally, family and juvenile court judges will be given an overview of the curriculum on July 27 during the plenary session of the annual Pennsylvania Trial Judges Association. For more information about the curriculum, please contact Lourdes Rosado of the Juvenile Law Center at 215-625-0551.

A Deskbook of Laws for Approved Private Schools in Pennsylvania provides a convenient yet comprehensive source of the various laws, including court decisions, that are applicable to approved private schools. This handy and honed sampling consists of:

• Selected federal regulations: the IDEA and Section 504
• Selected Pennsylvania statutes and regulations: eg. Chapters 14 and 15
• Case summaries of Supreme Court decisions
• Case summaries of Pennsylvania and federal court decisions
• Federal and Pennsylvania Department of Education policy letters.

This reference is useful not only to leaders and attorneys who serve approved private schools in Pennsylvania, but also to advocates and participants in the wider community of special education.

Copies are available for $40 from Dr. Linda J. Miller at Pace School: 412-244-1900 or lmiller@paceschool.org.

A Deskbook of Laws for Approved Private Schools in Pennsylvania provides a convenient yet comprehensive source of the various laws, including court decisions, that are applicable to approved private schools. This handy and honed sampling consists of:

• Selected federal regulations: the IDEA and Section 504
• Selected Pennsylvania statutes and regulations: eg. Chapters 14 and 15
• Case summaries of Supreme Court decisions
• Case summaries of Pennsylvania and federal court decisions
• Federal and Pennsylvania Department of Education policy letters.

This reference is useful not only to leaders and attorneys who serve approved private schools in Pennsylvania, but also to advocates and participants in the wider community of special education.

Copies are available for $40 from Dr. Linda J. Miller at Pace School: 412-244-1900 or lmiller@paceschool.org.

Substantial discounts are available to PBA members on American Bar Association Law Practice Management Section publications.

More than 70 different titles are available, focusing on subjects such as computers, software, marketing, financial management and law-office management. New titles are being added throughout the year.

Don’t miss out on a valuable member benefit!
Call the PBA at 800-932-0311, X2227 for a free brochure.
The Children’s Rights Committee was honored to have one CLE session presented by several members of the judiciary. Pictured are (from left to right) Judge Barry Feudale (Northumberland), Judge Stephanie Domitrovich (Erie) and Judge Dudley N. Anderson (Lycoming). Also speaking at the event was Judge Edward E. Guido (Cumberland) (not pictured).

Lourdes M. Rosado provided an overview on “Hot Topics in Juvenile Dependency.”

Participating in a panel discussing the Adoption and Safe Families Act were (pictured from left to right) James D. Flower, Jr. (moderator), Katherine M. Cross, Susan A. Docktor, Eileen M. West and Ruby D. Weeks.
Jennifer Bullock conducted a well-attended seminar titled “Communicating with Youth.”

“Crossing the Funding Stream” speakers included (left to right): John G. Lovelace, Prahba Sankar and Scott M. Hollander (moderator).

The judges panel was particularly well received. Pictured are (from left to right) Judge Stephanie Domitrovich (Erie), Judge Dudley N. Anderson (Lycoming), Judge Edward E. Guido (Cumberland) and Judge Barry Feudale (Northumberland).
Important News About Your PBA Listserv

PBA Listservs now reside on a new server. Please note the following new instructions. (You do NOT have to re-subscribe as long as your e-mail address has not changed.)

**To subscribe,** send a message to childrenrts-request@list.pabar.org with “subscribe” in the subject.

**To unsubscribe,** send a message to childrenrts-request@list.pabar.org with “unsubscribe” in the subject.

**To change your e-mail address,** you must unsubscribe the old e-mail address and then subscribe with the new e-mail address. Sending an e-mail to the list will not change your e-mail address on the listserv.

**To reply to the sender only,** use “reply” to the message. This response will only go to the sender.

**To reply to the entire listserv,** use “reply to all.” This response will go to the sender and the entire list. You can also use “reply,” and manually add the list name (childrenrts@list.pabar.org) in the “cc” field.

**What is a listserv?**
A listserv is an electronic mailing list that allows subscribers to exchange information with each other simultaneously. Joining a listserv is like having a live conversation with a group, only all communication is by e-mail. When you subscribe to a listserv, you are able to e-mail all listserv members via just one e-mail address.

**Can I subscribe to any PBA listserv I wish?**
No. Only members of a committee/section can subscribe to that committee/section’s listserv.

**For more information,** contact PBA Internet Coordinator Traci Klinger at (800) 932-0311, ext. 2255.

**PBA Children’s Rights Committee Listserv:**
Childrenrts@list.pabar.org.