



*Annual Report*

1968

The

**JUVENILE COURT**

of

**CUYAHOGA COUNTY**

**CLEVELAND, OHIO**

HON. WALTER G. WHITLATCH

HON. JOHN J. TONER

HON. ANGELO J. GAGLIARDO

HON. JOHN F. CORRIGAN

The Honorable Hugh A. Corrigan, Frank M. Gorman, Frank R. Pokorny  
Commissioners of Cuyahoga County

The Honorable Denver L. White,  
Director, Ohio Department of Public Welfare

The Honorable Martin A. Janis,  
Director, Ohio Department of Mental Hygiene and Correction

The Honorable Daniel W. Johnson,  
Chairman, Ohio Youth Commission

Sirs:

In compliance with Section 2151.18 of the Revised Code we submit herewith the Annual Report of the Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court for the calendar year 1968, showing the number and kind of cases that have come before it, the disposition thereof ordered by the Court, and other data pertaining to the work of the Court of interest to you and to the general public.

Respectfully submitted,

Walter G. Whitlatch, Senior Judge  
The Juvenile Court of Cuyahoga County

Cleveland, Ohio  
March 31, 1969

# **UNDERSTANDING THE ROLE OF THE JUVENILE COURT IN THE COMMUNITY'S NETWORK OF SERVICES FOR FAMILIES AND CHILDREN**

The public focal point on delinquency in any community is its juvenile court. Since all alleged acts of delinquency are subject to its jurisdiction it has been regarded not only as a barometer of the incidence of this problem, but to a large extent, as the ultimate solution to it. Consequently, the effectiveness of the court has tended to be measured against the rise and fall of delinquency in the community. This constricted understanding of the problem completely ignores the personal and social factors which contribute to the causation of delinquency, and overlooks the responsibility of existing community agencies which are constituted to deal with these factors.

## **JUVENILE COURT IS PART OF A TOTAL PROCESS**

The work of the court cannot be separated from the entire community spectrum of child and family welfare services. How well they do their work affects both the need to refer children to the court and the success of rehabilitative efforts.

To properly understand the role of the court and its relationships to the other existing services dealing with families and children it is essential to realize that delinquency is not, for the most part, a spontaneous and isolated phenomenon. It is related to every consideration affecting a child's growth and development. In addition, we must examine both preventive and treatment resources as they are available in the community and as they ought to function in the alleviation of delinquency.

## **PROBLEMS ARE LONG-STANDING**

For example, as Dr. Oscar B. Markey, Director of the Court's Psychiatric Clinic observed this year in his annual report to the Court: "It appears to be a perennial fact of life in the court that the vast majority of delinquent children have suffered from significant family conflict" . . . and "though the diagnosis, 'transient situational personality disorder,' is most commonly used in our nosology, the adjustment reactions of adolescence really had their roots in the pre-school years."

This analysis is typical of the court's experience. Long-standing problems are left unserved, and in desperation the court becomes the depository for others' failures.

## **PATTERNS OF DELINQUENCY**

Delinquency, by state statutes, encompasses a variety of juvenile misconduct, including incorrigibility, truancy, burglary, auto theft, assault and homicide. However, to compartmentalize these offenses as indications

of causes and cures is to ignore the demonstrated pattern of delinquent behavior long evident in the court's experience.

Offenses such as truancy, incorrigibility and running away are mostly symptomatic of deeper problems and are frequently, if not the direct reason for a youngster's referral to the court, part and parcel of his behavior pattern which finds expression in more hostile and aggressive acts.

In our experience at court it is a rarity to have a case before us where the child or family has not previously evidenced some problem which may or may not have been dealt with by some other agency.

## **SCHOOL PROBLEMS EVIDENT**

Almost invariably, the delinquent has been a school problem; a slow learner, an under-achiever, an incorrigible, a truant. The pattern is evident. The outcome predictable.

## **PARENTS BROUGHT 70% OF INCORRIGIBILITY COMPLAINTS**

The problems of the schools are by no means reflected in the amount of complaints regarding truancy and incorrigibility emanating from them. For example, 70% of all official incorrigibility complaints filed in 1968 were brought by parents themselves. These cases involved not only incorrigible behavior at home, but truancy and school problems, as well.

Most of the youngsters appearing in court have been school and home problems long before they are brought to our attention. This situation shows a woeful lack of preventive services in our community.

## **CASE EXAMPLE**

Our case histories are replete with this experience. Take for example, the case of a twelve year old boy who recently appeared in court on incorrigibility charges filed by his mother because he was beyond control and refused to attend school on a regular basis. Upon investigation, the probation officer found the boy to be extremely "nervous". According to the mother, the boy was insensitive to pain and unresponsive to physical punishment. He was even, at twelve years of age, unable to control bowel and bladder movements.

According to school authorities, the boy has been a consistent grade failure since kindergarten, having an I.Q. of 64 and a PLR of 70. He was placed in the fifth grade solely because of his age. While not a destructive or aggressive youth, he is viewed as easily lead by others.

Family problems have consistently contributed to his tensions and insecurity and teachers feel that the boy's situation is rapidly deteriorat-

ing. He is not even able to sign his name. While he was considered for special classes, it was felt by the school that he wouldn't be able to achieve any more in a special class than he is achieving now. Yet, he is at twelve years of age, unable to write or read.

The boy has been known to police also for various thefts, break-ins and curfew violations since he was ten years old. Because of his age and apparent emotional disturbance he was never previously referred to the Juvenile Court. Yet this boy, despite all his school experiences had never received any evaluative testing or other remedial action. His career so far parallels that of the typical school dropout. What has happened in this case is manifestly typical of many others where children such as this do not receive psychological testing which could help them, and also obviate court action.

We could cite case after case, many of them even more dramatic than this one, to illustrate our point.

### **PROBLEMS MANIFESTED EARLY IN CHILDHOOD**

However, the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth made the same observation when it reported:

“Studies of early school leavers generally show that their vulnerability to dropping out of school before high school graduation is manifest very early in their school careers - sometimes as early as the third or fourth grade of the elementary school. They begin to fall behind their classmates in reading and arithmetic; interests in school wanes; truancy becomes frequent; unacceptable behavior or withdrawal from class activities occurs; in schools where retardation in class placement is permitted, these children will, by the eighth year, be retarded one or two years in grade, often in spite of average or better than average intelligence.”

And this is the type of child the court must, to a large extent, eventually deal with. Alternative measures that the schools could take are referrals to proper community family and children's agencies both public and private.

There is a highly significant correlation between school failure and delinquency. Practically every delinquent appearing in court is grossly under-achieving and the vast majority are failing most of their courses.

## **PREVENTIVE AND THERAPEUTIC SERVICES SHOULD BE PROVIDED IN EARLY STAGES OF PROBLEM**

This situation is primarily a problem for educators. We do not presume to have the answers for them. Neither do we pretend that the solutions will be easy. But it is eminently apparent to the court that some children are just not educatable under traditional school methods; and that children in need of highly specialized training will not receive it until this situation is recognized and corrected.

The responsibility is heavy upon our schools. They are in the most favorable position to spot and evaluate early behavior problems and to provide service to children exhibiting these problems through special facilities within the school system. While there are vocational training schools and distributive classes, the delinquent type child is perforce excluded from them.

## **RESIDENTIAL PLACEMENTS EFFECTIVE**

It is the common experience of the court that children who have been chronic failures and truants in the public schools are much better able to achieve according to their potential when placed in a residential school setting which provides them with the necessary controls and supportive therapy.

Residential placements should not be evaluated on the basis of the poor results produced by a placement of five or six months in our overcrowded state institutions. Given even optimal probation services, there are hundreds of children before the court who can not be educated in the public schools, and who can not be properly trained, controlled and directed in their unhealthy homes and dissocial neighborhoods. True, rearing children in properly staffed and programmed residential schools is expensive, but until educators, clinicians and sociologists devise other methods, the expense is indeed money well spent.

After-care service for these children and their families also need to be bolstered so that they do not regress to their previous behavior patterns. The court does, and will continue to give this service but the utmost cooperation is needed from the schools and community agencies when these children make their reentry into the community.

## **COURT NEEDS AGENCIES' COOPERATION**

Unless our agencies are more receptive to the needs of all family and children's problems, the schools, however, will fare no better than the court has in attempting to secure wider community services for its clients.

As a court, we cannot be selective, as private agencies are, about our caseloads. On seeking casework and related services for children and families, the court is typically confronted with long and selective waiting lists for service. The frequently given reason for the rejection of our requests for service is the fact that the child and, or family doesn't meet the agency's criteria for service. As a result, many of these rejected children are placed on probation as a last resort, where more often than not the outcome is unsuccessful.

The inability of the appropriate agency to accept the referral results in anguished, defeated parents appealing to the court for help. These children are our statutory obligation, and we can not reject them. We must, therefore, accept the case whether or not the child needs the authoritative intervention of the court. The added burden of having to deal with this type of case critically diminishes our effectiveness in working with the cases that unquestionably demand the authoritative intervention of the court.

## **STATE SERVICES ALSO NEED IMPROVEMENT**

A certain amount of encouraging progress in state services for delinquents has been made by the Ohio Youth Commission with the addition of two new facilities. However, the state and community cannot remain complacent about the need to replace the old over-crowded Fairfield School for boys so that longer stays may be achieved. The early releases, typical of this institution, allow its wards a continuum of delinquent pattern behavior in the community resulting in their precipitate return to court. The characteristic aggressive behavior of this type of offender demands, for the protection of the community, that he be isolated until a disposition of his case may be made by the court. Consequently, these prematurely released offenders also become an undo burden on our Detention Home where they must be so detained. In 1968 approximately 400 such boys had to be accommodated in the Home, with an additional 50 boys requiring detention in the County Jail. It is imperative that these youngsters in need of state services during a period of adolescent turbulence be given optimal care and treatment through the upgrading of such state services.

It is a grave error to encourage the belief that all, or nearly all, children can be cared for with social services in their own homes. To say this is to ignore the fact that hoodlumism has made our streets and homes unsafe, and threatens to make necessary an iron grill on every lower Euclid Ave. store front. The proper care for many of these law violators requires a long-term stay in a controlled and well-supervised setting where the child will have an opportunity to obtain an education and develop into a productive adult.

## **OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES NEED TO BE UPGRADED**

The services that a public child and family agency performs ought to be those that are concerned with the welfare of all children in order that a total approach to social problems may be achieved. More aggressive and far-reaching services of a preventive, as well as a treatment nature are needed. The public agency must concern itself with the hard-to-reach, multi-problem family and the neglect situations which plague the court. Existing services, therefore, need to be augmented and improved to meet community problems. For example, the recent development of group homes for dependent and neglected children is fine, but they need to be expanded to care for a great many more children from improper home situations so that they may not develop into delinquents. Court records clearly indicate the relationship between neglectful home situations and delinquency, with one-third of all delinquents appearing in court having been in their early years victims of legally adjudicated neglect on the part of their parents. Further, the public agency ought to be concerned with the development of local residential placement centers, as well as evaluative testing services, clinical diagnoses and other services and programs which ought to be made available to the community without the necessity of court intervention.

## **JUVENILE COURT USED FOR LACK OF OTHER ADEQUATE SERVICES**

Because of a lack of these private and public services, the Juvenile Court is expected to provide them on a crisis basis of a continuing nature. Providing service for children who have so long been neglected involves, of course, a high risk of failure, and in the long trail of non-service which eventually leads to the court, each failure then erroneously becomes a statistic of accusation against the court.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in its 1967 report realized this when it concluded, after its investigation, that:

“One reason for the failure of the juvenile courts has been the community's continuing unwillingness to provide the resources - the people and facilities and concern - necessary to permit them to realize their potential and prevent them from acquiring some of the undersirable features typical of lower criminal courts in this country.”

Unfortunately, for lack of these services, some juvenile courts have taken some of these services to varying degrees upon themselves. They have also received the criticism of the Crime Commission by being involved unnecessarily in dealing with so-called non-criminal offenses on

the part of youth such as incorrigibility, truancy etc. What is not recognized is that the courts have involved themselves in these matters by default of their performance on the part of the proper agencies, more in frustration to get some service for children than from conviction that such service is their proper function. If our private and public agencies were functioning properly, many youngsters now before us would not have been brought to court.

Recent United States Supreme Court and other court decisions, while critical of certain courts and their procedures, have nonetheless reaffirmed the importance of the Juvenile Court in the American judicial system. At the same time these decisions imply that the implementation of its judicial orders for rehabilitation depend upon the quality and quantity of services, programs and facilities provided to it by the community.

### **COURT HAS BEEN PERSISTENT IN CALLING FOR IMPROVED COMMUNITY SERVICES**

The Juvenile Court of Cuyahoga County has persistently called attention to these needs in the community. Its call for aggressive and realistic action on the part of schools, public and private agencies has been constant and recurring for many years. However, the failure of the community facilities to take heed each year places an undo burden upon the court. Its services are taxed beyond capacity. Citizens and some agencies besiege the court because, even though it is over-burdened, it does make an effort to get services for children and families.

In addition to its total intake of approximately 20,000 cases of all types within its jurisdiction, the court annually refers elsewhere many hundreds of other child and family problems brought to it by a public which identifies the court as its only source of help. In these situations, the services rendered by community agencies are more in the interest of the child and family than a court hearing can be. However, when such a referral is made there is little assurance that the case will be accepted for service.

It sometimes appears that our total community approach is that of a carousel of non-service. We are so geared to non-service, in fact, that it is difficult to measure the success rate of our referrals to other agencies due to the simple fact that being chronically refused, referrals in many cases are not even attempted, let alone documented.

The over-all dearth of public and private services in this area will, in the long run, result in the perpetuation of the delinquency problem. At the present, they strain the court at every point, not only in volume of cases, but in the supplying of attendant services not provided by the agencies such as clinical evaluations; as well as local residential centers.

## **PRIVATE AND PUBLIC AGENCIES ALSO NEED COMMUNITY SUPPORT**

It is certainly recognized by the court that budgetary limitations are critical to the expanse of services provided by both public and private agencies. With this consideration it behooves the community's funding bodies to re-examine the entire spectrum of services and allocate funds according to the areas of greatest need. Beyond that, our agencies need to recommit themselves to serving the hard core social problem families. There needs to be a greater acceptance of this group as clients. The court has been encouraged by the recent efforts of certain agencies to serve more directly in the inner city. However, much more needs to be done in this respect. With public and private agencies receiving proper support and serving social problem families, the court's role in the community would be clearly delineated, and not diluted in rendering services more appropriately the functions of these agencies.

Until the role of the court is understood in this respect, and its proper use is fostered by the existence and functioning of useful agencies, our community will not achieve success in meeting the delinquency problem.

To place the burden upon the court is unrealistic and impractical and ignores its foundation as stated by law. To be effective, the court must be allowed to function as an integral part of an entire community process committed to the welfare of children and families, each unit performing its respective and stated services in the most efficient manner possible.

## SUMMARY OF THE YEAR

The upward trend in the volume of cases appearing before the Court, evident for the past decade, continued in 1968, producing once again a record number of Court actions.

New filings taken during the year coupled with the reactivation of old cases resulted in a total volume in excess of 21,000 cases of all types within its jurisdiction, for an increase of six per cent over the year, 1967.

### **DELINQUENCY INCREASED BY 3%**

Delinquency cases increased from 7,853 to 8,091 cases, for a three per cent increase. Typically, more than one half of the cases against boys involved charges of theft, including auto trespassing and tampering. Theft offenses involving boys showed an increase of eleven per cent over those filed in 1967. These offenses include: auto theft, unlawful entry and stealing, theft from person, auto trespassing and other forms of stealing. Glue sniffing charges against boys declined from 218 in 1967 to 154 in 1968. On the other hand, drug and narcotic violations increased from 19 cases in 1967 to 55 cases in 1968. Incurability complaints increased 17 per cent, with 637 boys so charged in 1968 compared with 544 in 1967. All charges against boys increased by 4 per cent, from 6,165 to 6,405 cases.

### **THEFT CHARGES AGAINST GIRLS INCREASED**

While girls cases remained at virtually the same volume as last year, there was a noticeable increase in theft charges brought against them, particularly in regard to shoplifting. Such cases against girls increased from 331 in 1967 to 381 in 1968. Nearly 40 per cent of all girls' cases were filed on charges of incurability which also involved immoral deportment.

As in the case of boys, charges of glue sniffing on the part of girls also declined: from 21 to 12 cases; while drug and narcotic violations increased from 8 to 15 cases in 1968. (See Table 2, elsewhere in this report, for a listing of delinquency complaints by type).

### **PROBATION INVESTIGATIONS**

In attempting to arrive at a proper disposition of each case relative to possible rehabilitative programs, the Court undertakes pre-hearing investigations through its probation staff so that pertinent information surrounding the case may be considered by the Court in this respect. To this end, the probation staff conducted nearly 55,000 pre-hearing investigative interviews in providing the Court with needed information.

## **CLINICAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

Also available to the Court were the results and recommendations of the Court's Psychiatric Clinic. Such evaluations and recommendations required over 1,000 interview sessions on the part of the Clinic with the clients involved in addition to diagnostic consultations with the probation staff.

## **PROBATION MOST FREQUENT DISPOSITION**

Probation was again the most frequent method of disposition used by the Court. Including those restored to probation, those carried over from the preceding year and those added in 1968, the Probation Department supervised 3,713 boys and 1,311 girls for a total of 5,120 cases during the year. The Probation Department provided nearly 76,000 contacts with its probationers in the course of offering probation supervision to its probationers.

In official cases, about 20 per cent were committed to correctional institutions, including the two local facilities, Cleveland Boys School and Blossom Hill and the Ohio Youth Commission. Total commitments to these institutions amounted to 1,059 children.

## **RESIDENTIAL PLACEMENTS**

Another 137 children (111 boys and 26 girls) were placed by the Court in private residential treatment centers. Such placements are made in accordance with clinical recommendations. The financial situation of the family is assessed by the Court where such placements are made so that an equitable part of the total cost of care may be paid by the family. In addition, another thirty girls were placed at the privately operated local Marycrest School for Girls.

## **DAMAGES COLLECTED BY THE COURT**

During the year the Court collected over \$26,000 in damages and restitution ordered against adjudged delinquents for payment to victims of property damage or personal injury.

## **UNOFFICIAL CASES ADJUSTED**

In the unofficial category, nearly two-thirds (1,852 out of 2,903 cases) were adjusted by the referees. Adjustment means that a satisfactory and successful solution to the case was formulated by a referee in an informal hearing. Such cases are screened at the point of intake with that disposition in mind. (See Table 3 for dispositions).

## **TOTAL DAYS CARE IN DETENTION HOME REDUCED BY 30%**

Detention time involving minors before the Court was considerably reduced again in 1968 due to screening techniques regarding admissions and releases developed by the court in 1966. Because of this careful control, a total of 4,265 children were held in Detention Home in 1968 compared with 4,607 in 1967. Total days of care furnished declined by nearly 30%, from 55,235 days in 1967 to 39,166 days in 1968. This resulted in an average daily population decline of from 151 to 107 children. The average length of stay was reduced from 12 to 9 days. The typical stay in detention is, however, even less than 9 days since the average is distorted by longer stays on the part of children awaiting agency or institutional acceptances. The over-all effect of the intake method developed for the Detention Home has allowed the Court to more expeditiously process cases where detention is considered necessary pending the hearing. Detention is used when it is necessary to ensure the child's presence in court on the hearing date and also to protect the community from the offender and the offender from harming himself further.

## **THREE-FOURTHS OF DELINQUENTS OVER 14 YEARS OF AGE**

The majority of children referred to the Court were in the age group fourteen through seventeen (5,434 out of 7,177) representing 76% of the total number of children referred. See Table A for ages of delinquents at time of referral.

## **SIXTY PER CENT OF CITY DELINQUENCY CAME FROM FIVE AREAS**

As in past years, approximately 75% of all delinquency cases involved children resident in the City of Cleveland. The Glenville social planning area had the highest incidence of delinquency in the city with 1,036 cases reported in 1968 compared with 849 cases in 1967 for an increase of 22% compared with an over-all increase of 3% in delinquency for the entire county in 1968 over 1967. The next area in frequency of cases was the Hough social planning area with 993 cases recorded compared with 782 in 1967, an increase of 27%. The Central areas were third in frequency with 729 cases recorded, followed by the Near West Side area with 430 cases and the Mt. Pleasant area with 365 cases, for the five highest city delinquency areas. These areas combined accounted for 60% of the total delinquency cases coming from the City of Cleveland.

The three highest areas of delinquency outside the City of Cleveland were Lakewood, East Cleveland and Parma with 226, 209 and 165 cases recorded respectively. See Table B for delinquency cases by the area of residence.

TABLE A  
Ages of Delinquents

<u>AGE</u>	<u>BOYS</u>	<u>GIRLS</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Eight and Under	39	2	41
Nine	61	8	69
Ten	118	14	132
Eleven	207	32	239
Twelve	328	82	410
Thirteen	555	201	756
Fourteen	863	315	1,178
Fifteen	1,098	374	1,472
Sixteen	1,132	327	1,459
Seventeen	1,105	220	1,325
Eighteen	46	5	51
Unknown	26	19	45
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5,578</b>	<b>1,599</b>	<b>7,177</b>

TABLE B

Area of Residence, Minors Filed as Delinquents  
1968 and 1967

AREA OF RESIDENCE

City of Cleveland By Social Planning Areas	BOYS' CASES		GIRLS' CASES		TOTAL CASES	
	<u>1968</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1967</u>
Central	137	120	47	50	184	170
Central - East	198	213	71	86	269	299
Central - West	190	221	86	66	276	287
Clark - Fulton	101	86	15	25	116	111
Corlett	233	206	65	58	298	264
Denison	74	123	30	12	104	135
Downtown	13	2	1	2	14	4
Edgewater	33	32	2	4	35	36
Glenville	800	636	236	213	1,036	849
Goodrich	77	62	9	10	86	72
Hough	797	562	196	220	993	782
Jefferson	75	54	24	12	99	66
Kinsman	155	166	71	65	226	231
Lee - Miles	150	164	39	52	189	216
Mt. Pleasant	291	279	74	92	365	371
Near West Side	349	355	81	94	430	449
North Broadway	68	74	13	21	81	95
North Collinwood	44	68	13	10	57	78
Norwood	141	103	21	27	162	130
Purtis - Bellaire	73	74	26	17	99	91
Riverside	93	125	13	4	106	129
South Broadway	103	114	18	19	121	133
South Brooklyn	70	87	13	18	83	105
South Collinwood	93	83	16	24	109	107
Tremont	154	130	31	25	185	155
University	37	52	11	7	48	59
West Side	76	74	29	25	105	99
Woodland Hills	109	126	26	27	135	153
TOTAL, City of Cleveland	4,734	4,391	1,277	1,285	6,011	5,676

TABLE B, Continued

Area of Residence, Minors Filed as Delinquents  
1968 and 1967AREA OF RESIDENCE

Other County Municipalities:	BOYS' CASES		GIRLS' CASES		TOTAL CASES	
	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967
Bay Village	70	60	13	6	83	66
Beachwood	23	4	1	3	24	7
Bedford	23	41	8	19	31	60
Bedford Heights	18	14	5	5	23	19
Berea	54	50	8	19	62	69
Brecksville	6	6	6	4	12	10
Broadview Heights	8	23	1	5	9	28
Brooklyn	29	15	11	3	40	18
Brook Park	54	87	17	26	71	113
Cleveland Heights	61	124	12	11	73	135
East Cleveland	174	126	35	31	209	157
Euclid	83	109	18	23	101	132
Fairview Park	33	24	8	3	41	27
Garfield Heights	57	40	4	10	61	50
Independence	10	16	-	-	10	16
Lakewood	170	177	56	44	226	221
Lyndhurst	33	17	3	1	36	18
Maple Heights	61	31	6	11	67	42
Mayfield Heights	11	12	1	2	12	14
Middleburg Heights	7	10	1	2	8	12
North Olmsted	44	51	6	4	50	55
North Royalton	14	22	4	8	18	30
Parma	126	203	39	26	165	229
Parma Heights	39	40	14	9	53	49
Richmond Heights	14	14	2	-	16	14
Rocky River	36	40	7	9	43	49
Seven Hills	22	22	10	6	32	28
Shaker Heights	40	40	19	14	59	54
Solon	4	4	2	-	6	4
South Euclid	35	38	3	3	38	41
Strongsville	21	17	4	12	25	29
University Heights	8	24	11	2	19	26
Warrensville Heights	20	26	10	1	30	27
Westlake	56	32	5	5	61	37
TOTAL, Other County Municipalities	1,464	1,559	350	327	1,814	1,886

TABLE B, Continued

Area of Residence, Minors Filed as Delinquents  
1968 and 1967AREA OF RESIDENCE

County Villages and Townships:	BOYS' CASES		GIRLS' CASES		TOTAL CASES	
	<u>1968</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1967</u>
Bentleyville	2	1	-	-	2	1
Bratenahl	1	-	-	-	1	-
Brooklyn Heights	4	3	-	1	4	4
Chagrin Falls	15	13	2	8	17	21
Cuyahoga Heights	1	1	-	-	1	1
Gates Mills	-	1	-	1	-	2
Glenwillow	-	-	-	-	-	-
Highland Heights	3	1	1	2	4	3
Hunting Valley	1	-	-	-	1	-
Linndale	-	-	1	-	1	-
Mayfield	3	4	-	1	3	5
Moreland Hills	3	2	1	2	4	4
Newburgh Heights	8	6	4	1	12	7
North Randall	1	1	-	-	1	1
Oakwood	8	17	6	5	14	22
Olmsted Falls	1	6	-	2	1	8
Orange Village	5	2	-	1	5	3
Parkview	-	2	-	-	-	2
Pepper Pike	3	-	2	-	5	-
Valley View	5	-	-	1	5	1
Walton Hills	3	4	-	1	3	5
Westview	2	1	1	1	3	2
Woodmere	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chagrin Falls Township	-	-	-	-	-	-
Olmsted Township	11	21	-	2	11	23
Riveredge Township	-	2	-	-	-	2
Warrensville Township	1	2	-	-	1	2
TOTAL, County Villages & Townships	81	90	18	29	99	119
Agency Residents	42	41	33	20	75	61
Out-of-County Residents	83	73	8	21	91	94
Area Designation Unknown	1	11	-	6	1	17
GRAND TOTAL DELINQUENCY CASES	6,405	6,165	1,686	1,688	8,091	7,853

TABLE C

## Delinquency Cases, Official and Unofficial by Source of Referral

<u>SOURCE OF REFERRAL</u>	Boys		Girls		Total
	Official	Unofficial	Official	Unofficial	
Cleveland Police Department	1,925	479	130	30	2,564
Other County Police Departments	836	505	77	67	1,485
Other Police (State, Park, etc.)	73	43	6	1	123
Railroad Security Officers	15	105	-	2	122
Cleveland Fire Department	35	3	-	-	38
Store Security	89	283	47	216	635
Other Courts	38	2	3	-	43
Department of Liquor Control	3	49	-	9	61
Cleveland Board of Education	173	101	64	22	360
Other County School Boards	101	37	30	20	188
Public Social Agencies	30	11	37	-	78
Private Social Agencies	14	1	7	2	24
Parents, Guardians and Relatives	358	168	555	157	1,238
Citizen	464	427	52	140	1,083
Other Source	18	19	8	4	49
TOTAL	4,172	2,233	1,016	670	8,091

## **CLEVELAND POLICE FILED ONE-THIRD OF DELINQUENCY CASES**

The most frequent source of referral to the court was the Cleveland Police Department which filed one-third of all delinquency cases (2,564 out of 8,091). Other police departments in the county filed 18% of all delinquency complaints (1,485 out of 8,091). Parents comprised the third most frequent source of complaints, filing 1,238 complaints, or 15% of the total. Citizens comprised the next most frequent source of complaints. However, both parents and citizens, are very often referred to the court to file a complaint after first conferring with other authorities such as school boards and police departments. See Table C for source of referrals.

## **TRAFFIC OFFENSES: SUSPENSION OF LICENSE SALUATORY DISPOSITION**

In the vast majority of juvenile traffic cases before the Court, the suspension of the driver's license as a disposition had a salutory effect upon the violator. This is somewhat reflected in the relatively low incidence of repeaters in this category. Although total traffic cases show a statistical increase in 1968 over 1967 by about 22 per cent, the significance of this increase is diminished by the fact that a great many cases filed at the end of 1967 were included in the 1968 count. Therefore, a valid comparison of traffic cases for the two year period is unattainable.

Speeding, as in past years, remained the most frequent traffic violation. Toward the end of the year, the Court in cooperation with the Greater Cleveland Safety Council, began referring violators to the Driver Improvement and Instruction Program. Traffic Offenders are referred to the program in cases involving serious accidents where apparent lack of understanding of driving rules and courtesy seem to exist, in cases of reckless driving which are willful and wanton and in any other case where such instruction would seem to be needed.

## **ADULT CASES - NEARLY THREE MILLION DOLLARS COLLECTED FOR SUPPORT OF CHILDREN**

Adult cases under the Court's jurisdiction, including non-support, neglect and contributing to the delinquency of minors amounted to 2,325. Of these 943 involved new filings against fathers for non-support of their children. However, an additional 1,223 old cases were returned to Court for reactivation of original support orders through a concerted effort on the part of the Court and its Child Support Department to follow-through in effecting payment orders. To this end, the Child Support Department supervised 7,075 support cases during 1968, including those carried over from the preceeding year. The department also supervised support payments arising from peternity actions and other cases for a total of 12,027 cases

supervised during the year. As a result of the Court's diligence in these matters, support money collected by the Cashier's Officer rose from \$2,440,-167.12 in 1967 to \$2,746,017.17 in 1968.

Money collected by the court for clients of the County Welfare Department to which payments are disbursed by the Cashier's Office is running in excess of one million dollars per year, contributing greatly to the reduction of the general public burden in these welfare matters. In addition, a great many families are removed from the public relief rolls by virtue of the enforcement of support orders through the court.

The use of wage authorization assignments whereby the payments of money on the part of a number of employees are deducted by the employers and forwarded in one composite check to the court has helped greatly in the processing of support payments.

Other filings against adults included paternity charges (877 cases), neglect of children (181 cases) and contributing to delinquency charges (110 cases). See Table 4 for all adult offenses.

## **COURT - COMMUNITY RELATIONS**

In 1968 the Court continued to develop and strengthen its relationship with the professional as well as the general community.

### **BRANCH COURT ESTABLISHED**

Plans for the establishment of a branch court to serve the Cleveland Heights and University Heights areas which were developed by the Court in 1968 were realized with the January, 1969 opening of the branch office at 2969 Mayfield Road. Funding for the pilot project was made possible by a grant from the Cleveland Foundation. Mr. Brian Sexton, a former Court Case Supervisor was named as referee to head the branch office.

The branch office concept, as envisioned by the Court, seeks to expedite the filing of local complaints from all sources in those areas, as well as to encourage proper use of Court resources in the local communities. Provisions have been made by the Cleveland Foundation to evaluate the results of the branch office operation.

### **AGENCIES EXPAND SERVICE TO THE COURT**

Two other notable achievements in community relations involve closer cooperation for service with two local agencies. The Cleveland Child Guidance Center is providing psychological evaluation and testing for Court referred cases on a fee basis to augment the psychological ser-

vices provided by the Court's part-time staff of psychologists. The Family Service Association of Cleveland has stationed a caseworker at the Court two days per week to expedite initial interviewing of prospective clients referred for counseling service by the Court.

Cooperation between other agencies, including the Marycrest School for Girls, were also further advanced during the year.

## **COURT PROVIDES LEARNING EXPERIENCE FOR STUDENTS**

In addition to continuing as a field placement for students of the School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University, the Court also provided field placements and experience for students from the following colleges and universities: Notre Dame College, Cleveland State University, Baldwin Wallace College and the Sociology Department and Adelbert College of Case Western Reserve University. In addition, placements were also made available to students under the Cleveland Welfare Federation's Careers in Social Work Program as well as the International Youth Leaders Program.

In these instances the Court served as a valuable aid to the learning and experience of students desiring to pursue professionally the field of corrections.

## **VOLUNTEERS AID THE COURT**

Project Friendship, sponsored since 1966 by the Cleveland Presbyterian Society of the United Presbyterian Church also continued to aid girls referred to them by the Court. Under this program, volunteers help the girls referred by providing such services as foster home placements, employment assistance and special tutoring and counseling under the supervision of a trained caseworker.

For the past two years, volunteers have also served in the Court's Intake Department. An award of appreciation for their services was presented in November, 1968 to the following Intake Department volunteers: Mrs. Seward Covert, Mrs. Jack Day, Mrs. W. Ross Eames, Mrs. Ralph Gibbon, Mrs. Robert Gilkeson, Mrs. Scott Hayes, Mrs. Frederick Reuter, Mrs. John Bernet, Mrs. Martha Hickox and Mrs. Nathan Locksin.

The Court would like to take this opportunity to publicly acknowledge the invaluable service performed for it by all its volunteer workers.

## **INTERPETING THE WORK OF THE COURT TO THE COMMUNITY**

The Judges of the Court also continued in 1968 to serve many community agencies and institutions as members of boards of trustees and as

officers of various professional and civic groups. They also spoke extensively on delinquency and the work of the Court before several hundred professional and lay groups.

Senior Judge, Walter G. Whitlatch, continued to serve as a member of the Executive Committee of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges and served as vice-chairman of the Council's Federal Aid Committee. He is a member of the Board of Trustees of the Cleveland Welfare Federation and a member of its Juvenile Delinquency Committee. He serves as a member of several boards of trustees, among them are Pennsylvania Junior Republic, Ohio Boys' Town and Hillcrest Y.M.C.A. Judge Whitlatch also serves as principle lecturer to police candidates in their orientation to the Court.

Judge John Toner was named in 1968 as vice-chairman of the Catholic Counseling Center of Cleveland. In addition, he is a board member of Marycrest School for Girls, Merrick House, and the Police Athletic League, among others. In addition to his many speaking engagements concerning the Court, he also served in 1968 as a member of the United Appeal's Speakers Bureau. He is also a trustee of the Catholic Lawyer's Guild.

Judge Angelo J. Gagliardo was the main speaker at the Annual Conference of Ohio Juvenile Police Officers held in 1968 in Cleveland. He also spoke at Cleveland State University on the topic of Teacher Discipline and participated in several radio programs concerning delinquency. Included among his memberships are board of trustees, Cleveland Marshall Law School; Mayor's Council on Youth Opportunity and the Welfare Federation's Child Abuse Committee.

In addition to the judges' talks to various civic groups, other Court staff, among them Mr. Leo Chimo and Mr. John Alden the Directors of Legal and Social Services respectively and their assistants, also fulfilled many speaking engagements. Probation Officers were also assigned to participate in talks and panel programs before various interested groups in their respective geographical areas of service.

Several hundred other visitors and students were given orientation to the Court by personal interviews, court auditing and Detention Home tours undertaken by the joint efforts of the Directors of Legal and Social Services and their assistants, the Detention Home Superintendent and his assistants and the Statistician.

## **IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM**

Internally, the Court, under the direction of the Assistant Director of Social Services, Andrew J. DeSanti, re-developed an In-Service Training Program utilizing lectures by supervisory staff as well as guest lecturers.

Areas covered in the Training Program include court procedures, presentation and fundamentals of probation interviewing and supervision as well as psychiatric insights into behavior.

Members of Probation Department also participated in other training programs and seminars during the year, among them were the Ohio Probation and Parole Association Conference, an In-Service Training Seminar sponsored by the Ohio Youth Commission and Workshops in "Urban Community Services" sponsored by Cleveland State University.

## **STAFF DEVELOPMENT**

As this report is being written, the Court is continuing to upgrade its services and staff. Among the programs initiated in 1968 and still being further developed at this time are more efficient alignment of probation districts, recruitment of more probation officers and trained supervisors and the establishment of a job counseling and placement service for out-of-school delinquents. Toward the end of the year discussions were started with the Cuyahoga County Data Processing Center concerning the data processing needs of the Court, and a committee was formed to update the operational manual of the court.

The most significant of these moves was that of upgrading the probation staff by working for a compliment of eighty probation officers and by the hiring of trained social caseworkers as probation supervisors. These developments, along with several others tended to bolster court services in the face of the heaviest demands being made on them.

In all of these advances that have marked our progress during the year, the Court has had the support and encouragement of its Citizens' Advisory Board. Officers of the Citizens' Advisory Board are: Chairman, Morris Berick; Vice-Chairmen, Ronald Brown and Fred M. Hauserman. Other members include: Paul Briggs, Crede Calhoun, Neil Carothers, Msgr. Casimir Ciolec, A.F. Connors, Clarence Gaines, Mrs. Gilbert Humphrey, Frank E. Joseph, Bruce B. Krost, Dr. Middleton Lambright, Mrs. Frank H. Porter, Rabbi Rudolph Rosenthal, Louis B. Seltzer, Rev. Roger S. Shoup, Curtis Lee Smith, Herman Stein, Thomas Vail and Ben D. Zevin. Mr. Doyle Shackelford, Jr. serves as the Board's Executive Secretary.

## **JUDGE ALBERT A. WOLDMAN RETIRES**

Judge Albert A. Woldman retired from the Juvenile Court at the end of 1968 with the expiration of his last six-year term of office. He was first appointed to the Court on August 21, 1953 by then Governor, Frank J. Lausche. During his sixteen years with the Juvenile Court, Judge Woldman saw it progress from a two-judge to a four-judge court with nearly a 200% increase in case volume. For the last eight years of his office, he served as Presiding Judge.

During his office, many innovations in court services were established, including: intensive probation counseling, group psychotherapy programs, work-therapy programs and the forming of a Court Placement Department to effect residential placements in treatment centers for emotionally disturbed children. The construction of the Detention Home Annex to provide modern and additional detention facilities was also accomplished during his administration. Several years ago Judge Woldman appointed the Citizens' Advisory Board to help promote the work and goals of the Court.

Upon retiring from the Juvenile Court, Judge Woldman rounded out a rich and long career of public service. During his college years he served as a probation officer with the Court. Prior to his appointment to the Juvenile Court he served as State Director of Industrial Relations and Chairman of the Bureau of Unemployment Compensation Board of Review. He also served at one time as assistant law director of the City of Cleveland.

In addition to his judicial accomplishments, Judge Woldman is widely recognized as an authority on President Lincoln, having written such works as "Lawyer Lincoln" and "Lincoln and the Russians". A prolific author, his other publications include "Court Made History" and numerous articles which appeared in professional journals.

On this occasion, the Court extends to him and his wife Lydia, its wishes for a happy retirement.

## **JUDGE WALTER G. WHITLATCH BECOMES SENIOR JUDGE**

Judge Walter G. Whitlatch became Senior Judge of the Juvenile Court upon the retirement of Judge Albert A. Woldman. Judge Whitlatch first joined the Court in 1936 as an assistant in the Child Support Department. He later served as director of that department from 1943 to 1947. From 1947, until his appointment as Juvenile Court Judge in May, 1960, he served as the Court's Director of Legal Services.

In addition to his many memberships on boards of trustees of local agencies reported elsewhere in this report, Judge Whitlatch has spoken and written extensively on the Juvenile Court. His latest paper dealing with the Gault case was published in the Ohio Bar Association Journal

Currently a member of the Executive Committee of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, Judge Whitlatch is a past president of the Ohio Association of Juvenile Court Judges. He has also served as lecturer at the Law-Medicine Center at Case Western Reserve University

In January, 1968, Judge Whitlatch succeeded in implementing the plans developed by the Court several years previously for the establishment of a branch court serving the Cleveland Heights-University Heights areas (mentioned elsewhere in this report).

## **JOHN F. CORRIGAN ELECTED JUDGE**

John F. Corrigan was elected as Juvenile Court Judge in the November, 1968 election. In his election, Judge Corrigan returns to the Juvenile Court which he had served in other capacities in previous years.

He first joined the Court in December, 1953 as a Probation Officer and later served as assistant director of the Child Support Department. In 1961 he was named Referee for Paternity and Non-Support cases. Judge Corrigan left the Court in December, 1962 to become a member of the Ohio Legislature. He served two terms in the Legislature during the years 1963 through 1967. While in the Legislature he served as a member of the Judiciary Committee and the Ohio Code Revision Study Committee.

Judge Corrigan was born in Cleveland, Ohio and attended East High School. He was graduated from John Carroll University and received his LLB. in 1951 from the University of Detroit. He is a World War II veteran, having served in the Army Air Corps. Prior to his election to the Court he was associated with the law firm of Corrigan and Corrigan.

Judge Corrigan and his wife, Irene, have five daughters and reside in Lakewood, Ohio. He is a member of the Ohio Welfare Federation, the Ohio Probation and Parole Association and the National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

The Court takes this opportunity to welcome back Judge Corrigan in his judicial capacity and looks forward to his future contributions promised by his previous experience with the Court.

## **RETIREMENTS**

Edward DiLeone, Court Assistant, retired in May, 1968 to enter private business. At the time of his retirement he had been with the Court for 36 years, having served in various capacities prior to his appointment in 1956 as Court Assistant. He was succeeded in that post at his retirement by Mr. Stewart Woldman. Mr. Herbert Bauer, night superintendent of Detention Home also retired at the end of 1968 after 36 years of service to Detention Home. The Court wishes both Mr. DiLeone and Mr. Bauer the best in their retirements after so many years of devoted and selfless service.

## BOOK REVIEW

Mr. Andrew J. DeSanti, Assistant Director of Social Services, was the author of review of the book, "Children in the Courts - The Question of Representation" which appeared in the April, 1968 issue of the Child Welfare Journal.

## AWARDS

Mr. Sam Durante, a court intake officer, was one of the recipients of 1968 Public Service Awards bestowed by the Cuyahoga County Bar Association.



## FURTHER INFORMATION AVAILABLE

This report has been prepared and is issued under the direction of the Honorable Walter G. Whitlatch, Senior Judge of the Juvenile Court of Cuyahoga County. The Department of Research and Statistics, Richard A. Gallitto, Statistician, compiled the report. Citizens, students, and others who wish more particular information are invited to call at Room 310 where every effort will be made to give them courteous attention and service. It is hoped that this report may stimulate interest of the public in the services that the Juvenile Court provides the dependent, neglected, delinquent, and otherwise unfortunate children of the County; and that it will enlist their informed support and cooperation in extending and improving these services wherever needed.

Richard A. Gallitto, Statistician

TABLE 1  
Total Complaints, Official and Unofficial  
By Years, 1968 and 1967

Type of Complaint	1968	1967
<b>CHILDREN'S CASES</b>		
Delinquency:		
Boys - Official .....	4,172	3,860
Boys - Unofficial .....	2,233	2,305
Total Boys .....	6,405	6,165
Girls - Official .....	1,016	1,072
Girls - Unofficial .....	670	616
Total Girls .....	1,686	1,688
<b>TOTAL DELINQUENCY CASES .....</b>	<b>8,091</b>	<b>7,853</b>
Juvenile Traffic Offenders:		
Boys .....	7,241	5,988
Girls .....	773	684
<b>TOTAL TRAFFIC OFFENDERS .....</b>	<b>8,014</b>	<b>6,672</b>
Neglected Children's Cases .....	145 ✓	188 ✓
Dependent Children's Cases .....	227 ✓	200 ✓
Neglected and/or Dependent Children's Cases .....	1 ✓	66 ✓
Application to Determine Custody .....	227	223
Application for Approval of Permanent Surrender ....	120	142
Consent to Marry .....	151	110
<b>TOTAL CHILDREN'S CASES .....</b>	<b>16,976</b>	<b>15,454</b>
<b>ADULT CASES</b>		
Non-Support of Minor Children:		
Official Cases .....	459*	672
Unofficial Cases .....	484	721
<b>TOTAL NON-SUPPORT CASES .....</b>	<b>943✓</b>	<b>1,393✓</b>
Neglect of Minor Children:		
Official Cases .....	112	236
Unofficial Cases .....	69✓	132✓
<b>TOTAL NEGLECT CASES .....</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>368</b>
Contributing to Delinquency .....	110	242
Tending to Cause Delinquency .....	61	30
Paternity Complaints .....	877	849
Certifications and Motions .....	121	125
Other Adult Cases .....	32	15
<b>TOTAL ADULT CASES .....</b>	<b>2,325</b>	<b>3,022</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL, CHILDREN'S AND ADULT CASES .....</b>	<b>19,301</b>	<b>18,476</b>

\* In addition, 1,223 Non-Support matters were re-activated for court action obviating the need to file a new affidavit.

TABLE 2

Reason for Referral of Official and Unofficial  
Delinquency Cases 1968 and 1967

Type of Complaint	Boys		Girls		Total	
	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967
Auto Theft .....	528	549	13	8	541	557
Unlawful Entry and Stealing .....	906	835	23	16	929	851
Other Stealing .....	847	723	311	278	1,158	1,001
Other Property Offenses.....	105	74	11	15	116	89
Theft from Person .....	313	322	23	14	336	336
Injury to Person .....	538	519	143	158	681	677
Act Resulting in Death .....	5	8	1	-	6	8
Truancy .....	173	146	89	87	262	233
Running Away .....	46	41	90	121	136	162
Incorrigibility .....	637	544	657	621	1,294	1,165
Sex Offenses .....	110	147	109	163	219	310
Auto Trespassing and Tampering ..	811	658	63	33	874	691
Destruction of Property .....	307	470	24	20	331	490
Disorderly Conduct .....	173	188	25	28	198	216
Liquor Violation .....	270	234	41	42	311	276
Possession of Weapons .....	60	74	4	3	64	77
Trespassing on Land .....	109	94	7	11	116	105
Inhaling Glue Fumes .....	154	218	12	21	166	239
Drug and Narcotic Violation .....	55	19	15	8	70	27
Curfew Violation .....	119	141	8	29	127	170
Fire Setting .....	39	57	1	2	40	59
Other Offenses .....	100	104	16	10	116	114
TOTAL DELINQUENCY COMPLAINTS ....	6,405	6,165	1,686	1,688	8,091	7,853

TABLE 3

Disposition of Juveniles In Delinquency Cases  
Official and Unofficial By Sex - 1968

Disposition in Official Cases	Boys	Girls	Total
Placed Under Supervision of			
Probation Officer .....	1,544	446	1,990
Placed in Private Treatment Centers .....	111	26	137
Committed or Returned to Public Institutions:			
Ohio Youth Commission .....	610	167	777
Ohio State Reformatory .....	39	-	39
Cuyahoga County Training Schools .....	155	88	243
TOTAL Committed or Returned to Institutions	804	255	1,059
Transferred to Common Pleas Court .....	10	1	11
Continued Under Supervision of Parole Officer	17	-	17
Continued Under Supervision of Division of			
Child Welfare .....	13	7	20
Committed to Parents or Relatives .....	255	46	301
Fine and/or Damages Only .....	14	-	14
Order Made in Other Case .....	406	22	428
Other Disposition .....	80	20	100
Dismissed by the Court .....	282	88	370
Withdrawn by the Complainant .....	175	87	262
Continued, or Set for Hearing in 1969 .....	661	168	829
* TOTAL OFFICIAL DISPOSITIONS .....	4,372	1,166	5,538

\* Discrepancy between the amount of official dispositions and the number of filings results from multiple dispositions and inclusion of alias commitments to public institutions.

TABLE 3 (continued)

Disposition in Unofficial Cases	Boys	Girls	Total
Adjusted by Referee .....	1,576	276	1,852
Restitution Ordered .....	122	-	122
Probation Officer to Supervise or Invest- igate .....	111	89	200
Made Official .....	44	66	110
Other Disposition .....	37	80	117
Dismissed by Referee .....	105	46	151
Withdrawn by Complainant .....	121	67	188
Continued, Held Open .....	117	46	163
<b>TOTAL Unofficial Dispositions .....</b>	<b>2,233</b>	<b>670</b>	<b>2,903</b>

TABLE 4  
Reason For Referral of Adult Cases - 1968

Type of Complaint	Official	Unofficial	Total
Non-Support of Minor Children .....	459	481	940
Improper Subsistence and Care .....	56	37	93
Abandonment of Minor Children .....	21	6	27
Immorality .....	9	7	16
Abuse, Cruel Treatment of Minor Children ..	21	5	26
Improper Supervision of Minor Children ....	4	-	4
Intoxication .....	-	-	-
Other Neglect .....	1	17	18
Contributing to Delinquency .....	109	1	110
Acting in a Way Tending to Cause Delinquency	61	-	61
Paternity Complaints * .....	877	-	877
Certifications .....	121	-	121
Other Adult Cases .....	32	-	32
<b>TOTAL ADULT CASES .....</b>	<b>1,771</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>2,325</b>

\* Includes some minors filed on in paternity actions.

TABLE 5  
Disposition of Children in Official  
Neglect and Dependency Cases - 1968

Disposition	Neglect	Dependency	Total
Committed to:			
Parents, Relatives, Guardians .....	37	34	71
Referred to Child Caring or Placing Agencies:			
County Welfare Department - Family and Children's Services:			
Temporary care and custody .....	205	268	473
Permanent care and custody .....	14	27	41
Other child caring and placement agencies .	2	15	17
Total referred to Child Caring or Placement agencies .....	221	310	531
Dismissed and Withdrawn .....	41	42	83
Other Order .....	2	-	2
Continued, or Set for Hearing in 1969 .....	30	19	49
TOTAL Number of Children .....	331	405	736

TABLE 6  
Disposition of Adults Dealt with in Official  
Neglect, Non-Support and Delinquency Cases - 1968

Disposition	Neglect Non-Support	Contributing to Delinquency	Total
Committed to:			
* Cleveland House of Correction - Male ...	104	25	129
* Cleveland House of Correction - Female .	15	-	15
County Jail .....	-	-	-
Court Order to Support Minor Children .....	204	-	204
Sentence Suspended:			
On condition of proper behavior .....	28	-	28
Probation officer to supervise .....	3	3	6
Pay fine and/or costs .....	1	29	30
Other Order .....	10	8	18
Dismissed .....	88	28	116
Continued, or set for hearing in 1969 .....	218	30	248
Number of Adults Charged .....	671	123	794

\* Includes commitments made on alias hearings.

TABLE 7  
Cases Under Supervision By Probation Department - 1968

Movement of Cases	Total Cases	Number of Children			Total Children
		Delinquent Boys	Girls	Dependent Neglected Other	
Brought forward, January 1, 1968 .....	2,396	1,708	619	137	2,464
Received for supervision during year ..	2,724	2,005	692	37	2,734
Total under supervision during year ..	5,120	3,713	1,311	174	5,198
Removed from supervision during year ..	2,616	1,771	788	114	2,673
Carried forward, December 31, 1968 ...	2,504	1,942	523	60	2,525

TABLE 8  
Cases Supervised By Child Support Department - 1968

Movement of Cases	Non-Support	Contributing to Delinquency		Total
		Neglect	Paternity	
Brought forward, January 1, 1968 ....	6,276	830	3,357	10,463
Received for supervision during the year .....	799	200	565	1,564
Total under supervision in 1968 .....	7,075	1,030	3,922	12,027
Removed from supervision during the year .....	855	262	289	1,406
Carried forward December 31, 1968 ...	6,220	768	3,633	10,621

TABLE 9  
Children Under Care In Detention Home - 1968

	Delinquent		Dependent		Total
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	
Under Care January 1, 1968 .....	65	35	-	-	100
Admitted During Year .....	2,928	1,236	1	-	4,165
Total Under Care in 1968 .....	2,993	1,271	1	-	4,265
Released During Year .....	2,952	1,237	1	-	4,190
Under Care December 31, 1968 .....	41	34	-	-	75
<hr/>					
Total Days of Care Furnished in 1968 .....	28,179	10,981	6	-	39,166
Average Daily Population .....	77	30	-	-	107
Average Length of Stay in Days .....	9	9	-	-	9

TABLE 10

Collection of Money by the Court and Distribution of  
Money for The Support of Minor Children - 1968

Type of Collection	Amount
For Support of Children .....	\$2,746,017.17
Damages or Restitution .....	26,173.03
Poundage .....	27,954.76
Fines .....	12,098.90
Costs .....	90,743.12
Appearance Bonds .....	32,350.00
Maternity Hospital Collections .....	11,763.75
Miscellaneous General Collections .....	57,637.64
TOTAL Amount Collected .....	\$3,004,738.37

## Money for Support of Children Disbursed to:

Parents and Relatives .....	\$2,564,674.06
Public Agencies:	
Cuyahoga County Welfare Department, Division of Child Welfare .....	87,907.08
Other Tax-Supported Agencies and Institutions .....	2,929.61
TOTAL Public Agencies .....	90,836.69
Private Agencies:	
Out-of-Town Placements .....	63,353.53
Catholic Agencies and Institutions .....	23,904.44
Protestant Agencies and Institutions .....	1,511.00
Jewish Agencies and Institutions .....	168.00
Other, Non-Sectarian Agencies and Institutions .....	1,569.45
TOTAL Private Agencies .....	90,506.42

GRAND TOTAL of Support Money Disbursed ..... \$2,746,017.17

TABLE 11

## Report of The Intake - Affidavit Department

Action Taken at Intake	Number of Complaints Received
New Cases Accepted for Court Action:	
For Official Hearing .....	7,830
For Unofficial Hearing .....	3,457
Old Cases Set for Alias Hearing .....	2,026
* Traffic Cases Set for Hearing .....	8,014
Total Cases Set for Hearing .....	21,327
Disposed of Without Court Action:	
Referred to Social Agencies .....	279
Referred to Boards of Education .....	48
Referred to Police Departments .....	169
Referred to Other Courts .....	142
Referred to Other Services .....	566
TOTAL Disposed of Without Court Action .....	1,204
Transfer of Jurisdiction from Common Pleas Court .....	114

\* Traffic cases are not processed through the Intake Department but are set for hearing upon receipt of the arresting officer's notice of violation.

TABLE 12  
Incidence of Physical Defects Noted  
By the Court Clinic - 1968

Defect *	Boys	Girls	Total	
Eyes	Refractive Error .....	637	398	1,035
Throat	Hypertrophied Tonsils .....	12	9	21
Teeth	Dental Caries .....	458	159	617
	Poor Dental Hygiene .....	391	67	458
	Chipped Incisor .....	309	54	363
Extremities	Tinea .....	34	3	37
Skin	Acne .....	484	219	703
	General	Nutrition: Borderline, Impaired or Poor .....	51	14
Obesity .....		93	142	235
Physical Retardation .....		369	24	393
Advanced Physical Development .		98	7	105
Pediculosis: Capitis, Pubis, Corporis .....		21	34	55
Pregnancy .....		-	46	46
No Defect Noted: Child Found Normal .....		-	-	234
<hr/>				
TOTAL Number of Examinations .....	2,781	1,182	3,963	

\* Partial list; only defects occurring with greatest frequency are listed.

TABLE 13  
Diagnoses of Patients Examined  
By the Court Psychiatrists - 1968

Diagnosis *	Boys	Girls	Adults	Total
Mental Deficiency:				
Mild, Moderate .....	8	5	3	16
Psychotic Disorders:				
Schizophrenic Reactions .....	7	3	1	11
Other Psychotic Disorder .....	2	-	-	2
Psychoneurotic Disorders:				
Anxiety Reaction .....	5	-	3	8
Depressive Reaction .....	7	1	-	8
Conversion Reaction .....	-	-	-	-
Obsessive - Compulsive Reaction .....	-	1	1	2
Other Psychoneurotic Disorders .....	4	2	-	6
Personality Disorders:				
Personality Pattern Disturbances .....	15	8	1	24
Passive - Aggressive Personality .....	58	29	9	96
Emotionally Unstable Personality .....	4	5	-	9
Sociopathic Personality Disturbances ...	75	5	3	83
Other Personality Disorders .....	19	1	4	24
Transient Situational Personality Disorders:				
Adjustment Reaction of Childhood .....	18	3	-	21
Adjustment Reaction of Adolescence .....	294	128	-	422
Other Transient Situational Disorder ...	10	2	1	13
Chronic Brain Syndrome .....	2	1	-	3
Diagnosis Deferred .....	16	2	7	25
Disease None .....	1	-	-	1
Re-examined During Year .....	9	1	-	10
TOTAL EXAMINATIONS .....	554	197	33	784

\* Classification of "Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders"

# DIRECTORY OF PERSONNEL

2163 East 22nd Street

CUYAHOGA COUNTY JUVENILE COURT

Telephone: 771-8401

HON. WALTER G. WHITLATCH, *Senior Judge*  
HON JOHN J. TONER, *Judge*  
HON. ANGELO J. GAGLIARDO, *Judge*  
HON. JOHN F. CORRIGAN, *Judge*



WILLIAM A. NESI, *Administrator*

## BAILIFFS

Donald Gagliardo  
Andrew Ladika

Michael O'Grady  
Fred O'Malley

Bail Bonds-Police Liaison - Stewart Woldman

## ~~DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES~~

~~LEO G. CHIMO, *Director and Chief Clerk*~~  
~~PATRICK F. GALLAGHER, *Assistant to the Director*~~



**CHIEF CLERK + LEGAL  
ADVISO.**

## REFEREES

Louise Amico  
S. J. Berman

Elaine J. Chimo  
Wilma Sevcik

George McCready  
Pierce J. O'Connor

## INTAKE - AFFIDAVIT DEPARTMENT



JOHN J. SWEENEY, *Chief* ✓

Rosa Clark, Intake Officer  
Sam Durante, Intake Officer  
Saundra Malevan, Intake Officer

William Fraunfelder, Docket Review Officer  
Margaret Mazza, Intake Officer  
Sam Rubin, Senior Clerk

## CHILD SUPPORT DEPARTMENT



MYRON T. MOSES, *Chief*

John Bokoch, Chief Assistant  
John Harkins, Referee  
Bernard Easton, Counsellor

James Papp, Counsellor  
Stuart Weinberg, Counsellor  
Jeffrey Zucco, Counsellor

Jeanne Walsh, Senior Clerk

## CLERK'S OFFICE



ELIZABETH HOPKINS, *Chief Deputy Clerk*

*Judges' Clerks:*

Andrew Pierce  
Sue Fisher

Katherine Neudenbach  
Janice Szalkowski



## CASHIER'S OFFICE

ARTHUR W. DUDLEY, *Chief Cashier*



DIVISION OF SOCIAL SERVICES

JOHN J. ALDEN, Director  
ANDREW J. DeSANTI, Assistant Director

CASE SUPERVISORS

Rudiene Brabson  
Joseph Cabot  
William H. Dicken  
Milton F. Hay  
Josephus F. Hicks  
Lucille M. Jackson  
Millard F. Jones, Jr.

Dolores M. Mlachak  
Victor Macha, Jr.  
Donald Peak  
Charlotte Perry  
Robert Twohey  
Judith Winters

PROBATION OFFICERS

Carl Adlon  
Luther Alston  
Mary Ashdown  
Howard Baskin  
Nanee Bennett  
Kenneth Bossin  
Robert Bostick  
Jeannette Cephas  
Jack Cervelli  
Alfred Collingwood  
James Cummins  
Timothy Deegan  
Ralph DeFranco  
Jack DiCillo  
Jill Dworkin  
Mary Fallon  
John Gelski  
Blaise Giusto  
Barbara Gorgacz  
Ellen Greene

Julian Greenspun  
JoAnna Hairston  
Louis Hensley, Jr.  
Bruce Hinsdale  
Robert Horley  
Marwan Jadeed  
Andrew Jones  
Garlandine Jones  
Holly Krailo  
Jeffrey Largent  
Mary Lasch  
Peter Leon  
Carl LoPresti  
Lucia Mandalfino  
Daniel Mannix  
William Metropulos  
Judith Miller  
Michael Noble

Patrick O'Donnell  
Daniel O'Neil  
Roger Orris  
George Palda  
Doretta Pompiley  
John Rath  
John Reilly  
Jearline Rogers  
Val Schaffer  
Thomas Sheehan  
John Skopin  
~~Charles Stahler~~  
William Stephen  
Donald Switzer  
Anthony Tuschner  
Carol Vas  
Fred Wittenbrook  
Robert Wong  
James Zaas  
Kathy Ziegler

Eugene Strelec, Job Placement Officer

BUDGET AND PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT

BRICE W. MANNING, Chief

STATISTICS DEPARTMENT

Richard A. Gallitto, Statistician

Donna Fell, Clerk  
Thelma Barry, Clerk



PLACEMENT DEPARTMENT

DAVID C. ADAMS, Director

Ronald Born  
Thomas Edwards  
Robert Hanna  
Patricia Hudy

James Manuel  
James Mullen  
Vicki Rankin



*CLINIC*

COURT CLINIC

OSCAR B. MARKEY, M.D., *Director*

*Psychiatric Panel:*

Dr. John Barg  
Dr. Irving Berger  
Dr. John Hadden, Jr.  
Dr. Florence Matthews

Dr. Ake Mattsson  
Dr. Irwin Perr  
Dr. Edwin Roth  
Dr. Lawrence Schrieber

*Psychologists:*

Charles Ford  
James Irwin  
Isidore Helfand, Ph.D.  
Charles Winslow, Ph.D.

MEDICAL SERVICE

REGIS F. GOLUBSKI, M.D., *Director*

Katherine M. Alden, R.N., *Head Nurse*

STENOGRAPHIC SERVICE AND RECORD ROOM

Stella Papchak, *Chief, Central Stenographic Service*  
Rosamond B. Mench, *Chief, Family Case Records*

INFORMATION CLERKS

Frances Chambers  
Dorothy Davies

Eda Deggin  
Mary Newport

JUVENILE COURT BRANCH OFFICE

2969 Mayfield Road

Telephone: 321-7380

BRIAN SEXTON, *Referee*

Blaise Giusto, *Probation Officer*

Alice Carter, *Clerk*

CUYAHOGA COUNTY JUVENILE DETENTION HOME

2209 Central Avenue

Telephone Numbers: DAYS - 771-8400

NIGHTS, SUNDAYS, HOLIDAYS - 771-8421

Don B. Adamson, *Superintendent*

Janet Estadt, *Asst. Superintendent*

Martin C. Kelley, *Asst. Superintendent*

Eugenia Dziedzicki, *Office Manager*

Paul E. Baxter, *Referee of Admissions and Releases*

BAIL BOND ARRANGEMENTS

During office hours, 8:15 A.M. to 4:30 P.M., bail bonds may be arranged at the Clerk's Office in the Court Building. Between 4:00 P.M. and midnight, bail may be arranged in the Detention Home.

NUMBER OF COPIES ORDERED PRINTED: 2,000

APPROXIMATE COST PER COPY: 20 CENTS