

ON THIS WE CAN AGREE: CHILDREN REQUIRE SPECIAL CARE

Five Principles to Guide Any Changes to Immigration Law, Policy or Procedure May 2017

In recent years, increasing numbers of children have come to the United States across the southern border. Most children arriving today are from Central America but children come from countries around the world including China, India, Ghana, Somalia, Romania, Afghanistan, Mexico, Brazil and Ecuador. The majority come seeking protection from harm or abuse in their countries. Some have been trafficked. Others are fleeing severe poverty and come hoping to work. Many come to reunify with a parent or family member. Any child who wishes to remain permanently in the United States must raise a legal claim for protection and win their case before a government agency. Following are specific recommendations to guide any changes to immigration law or policy that would affect these children.

1. Children are different from adults and should be afforded special protections.

All 50 states recognize that children are different from adults. Each state has special court proceedings for children where the decision makers have special training or expertise and where decisions are made in consideration of the child's best interests: their safety, permanency, well-being and expressed wishes.

- Reform recommendations: (1) Any changes to immigration law, policy or procedure must preserve or provide special protections for all children and must require decision makers to consider each child's best interests—safety, permanency, well-being and stated interests—before rendering a decision. (2) While children await a permanent solution, they should be reunified with family or placed in the least restrictive setting and connected with services to address their immediate needs. (3) Children's ability to access educational, medical and mental health services at all times is vital to their safety and development.

2. Children cannot have a fair immigration proceeding without an attorney to represent them.

Currently, most children determined to lack lawful immigration status are placed in formal immigration court ("removal") proceedings where they must present and then win their cases to remain in the United States. They are required to present their cases to an asylum officer or immigration judge and face an attorney from the government agency trying to send them back. At present, these children have the right to a lawyer, but are responsible for finding their own lawyer—even children who are still toddlers, who are in elementary school, or who have a mental illness or developmental delay. Every child has the right to be heard in fair proceedings that determine where they will live and whether they will be safe if repatriated to their country.

- Reform recommendations: (1) No immigration proceeding should take place until the child is represented by an attorney. (2) The decision to return a child to his or her country of origin should only be made after the child has had an opportunity to make all possible

claims for protection in a fair proceeding before a judge (never in an expedited manner unless requested by the child's attorney) and only after considering the child's safety.

3. Children need time to establish trust.

Teachers, doctors, child welfare professionals and parents know that most children will not open up to a complete stranger, even (and sometimes especially) when that person holds a position of authority. Children need time to establish trust. This is both a learned behavior and developmentally appropriate. For children who have experienced trauma, it is critical that they have time to settle and establish trust before being subjected to any legal processes or immigration proceedings.

- Reform recommendations: (1) Children should have sufficient time to recover from trauma and establish a relationship of trust before they are asked to make or participate in important decisions. (2) Children's immigration cases should not be decided in the days or weeks immediately following their apprehension, and certainly not while they are held in immigration custody or separated from family against their wishes. (3) Particularly vulnerable children should be appointed an independent Child Advocate whose responsibility is to advocate for the child's best interests in all decisions.

4. Safety must be a paramount concern when investigating each child's unique story.

Children migrate for vastly different reasons under vastly different circumstances. No two children, even siblings, have precisely the same story. Turning children away at the border, or returning them to their home country without an individualized assessment of their safety by someone with child welfare expertise greatly increases the risk that they will be harmed. Children who have made the journey across international borders should be allowed reasonable time to tell their stories in a child-appropriate space, before officials trained in child development, and in a manner that does not further harm the child.

- Reform recommendations: (1) Protective laws and procedures must apply to all children, regardless of country of origin. (2) Each child should have the opportunity to have the specific facts of his or her case considered by government officials who are trained in developmentally-appropriate screening and trauma-informed approaches. (3) No child shall be repatriated to a circumstance that places the child at risk of harm.

5. The government should not disrupt the parent-child relationship except in extraordinary circumstances, and only then to protect the child's safety.

Family unity is a foundational principle of child welfare law. Parents' rights to the care and custody of their children are afforded particularly strong protection under the U.S. Constitution. Reunification with a parent, traditional caregiver or family member in the United States while the child's immigration case proceeds should only be denied when reunification poses a risk to the child's safety, though children should not be released to sponsors without a screening to assess the potential for abuse, neglect or trafficking or the need for services upon reunification. Moreover, unless the child's safety or well-being is at risk, policy should not require a child to be

separated from a parent in the United States simply because the parent is subject to immigration proceedings. Finally, when children leave a country where a parent, traditional caregiver or family member remains behind, careful consideration must be given to the decision to separate and the child's decision to seek protection in the U.S. In every situation, the child's claim for protection must be given fair consideration and the child must be afforded procedures tailored to the child's development.

- Reform recommendations: (1) No child encountered by government authorities without his or her parent should be denied temporary protective custody while the child's circumstances are investigated. (2) Reunification with family in the United States, while the child's immigration case proceeds, should not increase a child's risk of removal or result in the child losing access to child-friendly legal processes and procedures. (3) The presence of family in a child's home country should not negate or limit the child's ability to seek protection in the United States.

THIS STATEMENT IS SUPPORTED BY:

American Psychological Association	National Association for the Education of Young Children
Center for Child Trauma Assessment, Services and Interventions	National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials (NALEO) Educational Fund
Center for Law and Social Policy	National Association of Social Workers (NASW-National Office)
Center on Immigration and Child Welfare	National Center on Adoption and Permanency
Child Welfare League of America	National Center for Youth Law
Children's Defense Fund	National Kinship Alliance for Children
Family Focused Treatment Association	Ounce of Prevention Fund
First Focus	Partnership for America's Children
Juvenile Law Center	Save the Children
National Alliance of Children's Trust & Prevention Funds	Teaching Excellence Center

AND BY THE FOLLOWING STATE AND LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS:

Advocates for Children of New Jersey	Educare California at Silicon Valley	National Association of Social Workers (New York City)
Behavioral Bilingual Services (NV)	EPIC ‘Ohana, Inc.(HI)	National Association of Social Workers - Texas
Center for Children's Initiatives (NY)	FAMILY Arts (NV)	New Mexico Voices for Children
Center for the Human Rights of Children, Loyola University Chicago (IL)	Family Paths, Inc. (CA)	New Mexico Child Advocacy Networks—NCMAN
Chicago Children's Center for Behavioral Health (IL)	Florida's Children First	PICO California
ChicagoCAC (IL)	Foster Kinship (NV)	Prevent Child Abuse Indiana, a Division of The Villages
Child and Family Policy Center (IA)	Hawaii Children's Action Network	Ready At Five (MD)
Children Now (CA)	Illinois Childhood Trauma Coalition	Rhode Island Association for Infant Mental Health
Children's Advocacy Alliance (NV)	Illinois Collaboration On Youth	SAFY of Nevada
Clayton Early Learning (CO)	Juvenile Protective Association (IL)	The Children's Partnership (CA)
Connecticut Association for Human Services	Kansas Action for Children	Schuyler Center for Analysis and Advocacy (NY)
Connecticut Voices for Children	Metropolitan Family Services (IL)	Voices of Children San Antonio (TX)
DC Action Center for Children	National Association of Social Workers – Arizona	Westchester Children's Association (NY)
DJ Center for Youth, Inc (IN)	National Association of Social Workers – California	
East Bay Agency for Children (CA)	National Association of Social Workers - New Mexico	

