

Annual Report

1970

The

JUVENILE COURT

of

CUYAHOGA COUNTY

CLEVELAND, OHIO

"Toward Fulfilling the Promise of the Juvenile Court"

HON. WALTER G. WHITLATCH

HON. JOHN J. TONER

HON. ANGELO I. GAGLIARDO

HON. JOHN F. CORRIGAN

The Honorable Hugh A. Corrigan, Frank R. Pokorny, Seth C. Taft
Commissioners of Cuyahoga County

The Honorable John E. Hansan
Director, Ohio Department of Public Welfare

The Honorable James T. Welsh
Acting Director, Ohio Department of Mental Hygiene and Correction

The Honorable William J. Ensign
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 1970, 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
June 1, 1971

TOWARD FULFILLING THE PROMISE OF THE JUVENILE COURT

*“But I have promises to keep
and miles to go before I sleep” - Robert Frost*

The original Juvenile Court concept of some seventy years ago promised solicitous care and regenerative treatment of youthful offenders of the criminal statutes. Implicit in the promise was non-punitive treatment whereby the child would be guided to healthy adulthood. To paraphrase Robert Frost, we do indeed have promises to keep and much to do before we sleep. The Juvenile Court has made this promise to children and such a commitment should be inviolate. Despite the malignment and calumnies that have been heaped upon Juvenile Courts nationally, we at the Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court have faith in the original concepts of the Juvenile Court and continuously strive to bring them into reality in service to children. Under the law of the State of Ohio (2151.01, Ohio Revised Code), our Juvenile Court is under the following mandate:

- A. *To provide for the care, protection, and mental and physical development of children under our jurisdiction.*
- B. *To protect the public interest in removing the consequences of criminal behavior and the taint of criminality from children committing delinquent acts and to substitute therefor a program of supervision, care, and rehabilitation.*
- C. *To achieve the foregoing in a family environment, separating the child from his parents only when necessary for his welfare or in the interest of public safety.*
- D. *To conduct judicial procedures through which the laws relating to children are executed and enforced and in which the parties are assured of a fair hearing, and their constitutional and other legal rights are recognized and enforced.*

It is our sincere purpose to carry out this mandate within the limitations placed upon us by a society whose avowed concern for children is not correspondingly expressed in providing the necessary wherewithal to give children the care they need and deserve. While our present facilities and resources leave considerable to be desired,

on the otherhand, we have had the consistent support of the Board of County Commissioners in meeting our needs within their financial limitations. Likewise, we have had the support of community agencies to the extent that their limited resources permit. Rather than permitting ourselves to be bogged down in despair by society's failure to provide us requisite support, we have gone forward, determined to utilize to the fullest extent the resources available to us. By doing so, and through the efficient, energetic and devoted efforts of the judges and the staff we have made substantial progress in the past year. The following areas are among those in which the Court made significant advances in 1970:

PROBATION DEPARTMENT IMPROVEMENTS

The Court well realizes that probation is a meaningless effort unless significant impact is made upon the probationer in substantially altering his behavior pattern in a positive manner. To make probation the effective tool of rehabilitation it was intended to be, the Court now employs the largest number of probation officers in its history. Of the seventy probation officers currently on the staff, two-thirds are responsible exclusively for probation supervision, with the remaining one-third responsible exclusively for the investigation and court presentation of new complaints.

STAFF

REORGANIZATION

This departure from the traditional concept of the probation officer's function; namely performing all three aspects of court service; supervision, investigation and presentation, was undertaken in mid 1969. During 1970, the Court had the opportunity to evaluate the merits of its new system and to further extend accountability of each worker's performance. Through the specialization of probation supervision and the careful control of caseload assignments so that each worker has an average of approximately 60 cases under supervision each month, personal contacts with probationers were considerably increased both quantitatively and qualitatively. A statistical analysis of probation contacts shows an 11% increase in personal contacts with probationers under this new system. In 1970, the average probation staff contacts with all probationers rose to 1,510 contacts, from the 1,366 average monthly contacts recorded in 1968, the year prior to the implementation of the new system.

**STAFF
ACCOUNTABILITY
UPGRADED**

We also have upgraded staff accountability by the modification of monthly statistical reports whereby individual work performance can be accurately measured, and remedial action taken when performance is not up to expectation. The probation officer's efficiency has further been increased by insistence upon advanced planning of weekly work schedules.

To further ensure the degree of accountability necessary to encourage full probation service, the position of Chief Probation Officer was re-instituted in 1970, to provide administrative supervision and direction to the probation staff. Mr. Andrew J. DeSanti, former Assistant Director of Social Services, was named to that post, and has under his immediate supervision thirteen trained casework supervisors, each of whom supervises a group of probation officers.

The specialization of investigative work has also enhanced the Court's performance in permitting the investigative worker the opportunity to conduct more in-depth and analytical investigations to aid the Court in making the most appropriate disposition of each case. This capacity has further been advanced by the careful control of case assignments for investigation, with each investigative worker averaging about 17 cases per month to investigate and present in court. The new system has further permitted us to deploy our probation officers in areas where they are most needed.

Above all, no longer do our probation officers have excessive caseloads, and we are now in a position to demonstrate that through good probation service, children can be averted from criminality and guided to healthy adulthood.

FEDERAL AND PRIVATE GRANTS

To augment our limited facilities we have taken advantage of federal and other grants available to us. Obtaining such grants takes time, initiative and creativity. We have been exceptionally gratified by our success to date, and are currently working on the development of other grant applications. The following programs have either begun or are about to be implemented as this report is being written.

**PURCHASE OF
PRIVATE SOCIAL
SERVICE**

For the past many years we have had a large volume of cases which are minor in so far as the need for the Court's authoritative intervention is concerned, but which nevertheless show a real need for social services. Many of these cases come to us by rea-

son that community agencies do not provide the services to keep these children from becoming statistics in the Juvenile Court. To compensate for this lack of community services, we obtained a grant from the Federal government through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in the amount of \$151,500 which will enable us to purchase social service from private agencies for approximately 500 children in the ensuing year. It is our hope to divert these children from the Juvenile Court as well as from the criminal justice system in the future. The project includes a research component which will enable us to measure the effectiveness of social services in the prevention of delinquency. We are hopeful that this project may prove to be the forerunner of a youth service bureau in our community which will provide service for problem-ridden children which has been so conspicuously absent in both the needed quality and quantity.

**REHABILITATION
CENTER**

With the aid of another federal grant in the amount of \$19,000 and with supplementation by the Greater Cleveland Y.M.C.A., we are launching a program to provide rehabilitation service for approximately 20 boys who would otherwise need to be committed to training schools. Under the Court's philosophy and by State statute we are enjoined to separate a child from his family only when necessary for his welfare or in the interest of public safety. Generally, what we are saying when we commit a child is that he cannot be controlled in his home environment. What we are seeking to do in this project is to furnish controls over these boys during most of their waking hours. We hope to arrange for their transportation to school and thus prevent truancy. At the end of the school day, the child will be transported to the Central Y.M.C.A. where he will be engaged in a program until he is returned to his home for the evening. The program at the Y.M.C.A. will consist of remedial education, enrichment activities, athletic programs and field trips to places of cultural and educational activities.

**IN-SERVICE
TRAINING PROGRAM**

Federal funding is also assured for the continuance of our In-Service Training Program for the Court's probation staff. In cooperation with Professor Serapio Zalba of Cleveland State University, the Court is formulating a curriculum which will include academic instruction in the behavioral sciences, particularly in the area of the adolescent, and the techniques of interviewing and casework. Another part of the curriculum will be strictly job oriented to deal with the procedures that the staff will employ in their day to day assignments. Overriding all considerations in the curriculum will be the upgrading of the staff's skills and techniques to enable them to work more effectively with their clients.

**BIG BROTHERS OF
GREATER CLEVELAND**

In 1970, through the joint efforts of the Court and the Big Brothers of Greater Cleveland and the Cleveland Foundation we launched a big brothers service for 40 boys from fatherless homes who are on probation. The necessity for such a program is well pointed up by the fact that nearly 50% of the delinquent youths known to the Court come from fatherless homes. The program has met such a vital need. The Big Brothers of Greater Cleveland and the Court have joined in an effort to secure a federal grant so that the program may be continued and expanded. In the past we have been able to make occasional referrals to the Big Brothers organizations of the community. Our present project with the Big Brothers of Greater Cleveland is, however, the first occasion where we have been able to systematically employ this service with a sizeable number of boys.

VOLUNTEER SERVICES

In further augmenting our services, we have tapped the abundance of warmheartedness and helpfulness so prevalent in our community and channeled it into the service of the troubled children who are wards of the Court. We look forward to the future expansion of the use of volunteers in our Court, and we plan to hire a director of volunteer services when we can do so within our budgetary limitations. Volunteer services presently being utilized by the Court include:

BIG BROTHERS

In the implementation of the Big Brother referral program mentioned above, we have been extremely gratified by the number of men who have come forward to offer their services as Big Brothers. Mr. Doug Adair of K.Y.C., N.B.C. television, and a director of the Big Brothers of Greater Cleveland, used his program to dramatize the need for Big Brothers, and achieved a tremendous response which produced many Big Brother volunteers. It is also gratifying that a number of lawyers in private practice who had formerly served our Court as probation officers have volunteered as Big Brothers. The Greater Cleveland Baptist Laymen's Association, under the presidency of Mr. Odie Smith, has also channeled Big Brother volunteers into the program.

This project epitomizes the kind of an organization that is required for a successful volunteer program. In addition to Mr. John Adams, a highly competent executive, and a very much involved Board of Trustees, the Big Brothers employ a professionally directed staff to solicit, train and guide the volunteer efforts. The program with our Court is further strengthened by the employment of a former probation officer, Mr. Luther Alston, as the Juvenile Court Project Director.

**PROJECT
FRIENDSHIP INC.**

For the past several years we have had the inestimable benefit of the services of Project Friendship Inc. This project is a volunteer service organization serving girls referred by the Juvenile Court which gives each girl a friend who accepts her as she is and shows concern for her life. Through the one-to-one relationship of one woman befriending one girl, the woman gives understanding and guidance and serves as an adult model while the girl gains inner strength and grows in self-confidence and positive values.

Project Friendship Inc. was originated by the Women's Association of the Lyndhurst Presbyterian Church with the encouragement of Judge Walter G. Whitlatch who is a member of that church. Originally sponsored with the Women's Presbytery of Cleveland, the project has now become an ecumenical organization supported by many individuals and groups. To date, the project has worked with over 200 girls for varying periods of time. The program has a very active Board of Trustees and a director who is a former Juvenile Court probation officer.

Volunteers in the program are carefully screened and trained. The training program is supervised by a professional caseworker with regular classes conducted by a social worker and a psychiatrist. Volunteers also attend Juvenile Court sessions to gain an understanding of the Court's philosophy and program. To the girl who comes before the Juvenile Court the world is sometimes a desolate and barren place; she feels worthless and unloved. Project Friendship Inc. provides a volunteer to guide her, to strengthen her and to give her the warmth and confidence necessary for her belief that life is good and that she is good.

TESTING PROJECT At the conclusion of a pilot project we were firmly convinced and persuaded as to the efficacy of using volunteers in administering tests to measure personality and emotional traits of children to be used in the diagnosis and treatment of children under the Court's jurisdiction. Such tests administered by volunteers and evaluated by two professional organizations, the Institute for Personality and Ability Testing in Champaign, Illinois, and the Probation Service Institute at the Boulder, Colorado Juvenile Court, are now being used by the Court as one of its aids in the disposition of its cases and by the probation staff as an aid in supervision. The Court wishes to acknowledge here the valuable contribution to this program made by Mrs. Ralph Gibbon, a volunteer, in administering the tests.

In addition to the specific areas listed above, volunteers have also served in the Court's Intake Department and in educational and enrichment programs in the Detention Home.

SUBURBAN COURTS

In 1970, the Court concluded a two-year demonstration project of operating a Branch Court in Cleveland Heights. The successful results of the project have led to the permanent establishment of the Branch Court in that municipality, serving practically all of the county's easterly suburbs. The project was launched in 1969 with a foundation grant to serve the Cleveland Heights and University Heights areas; midway in that year the operation was expanded to provide service to the adjoining communities which resulted in great time savings for police, school and agency officials, as well as relieving the burden on the Main Court facilities. The project further demonstrated that county, municipal and school officials can work together effectively in the solution of their common problems. In November, 1970, responding to persistent requests from public officials and citizens, the Court established another branch office in the city of Euclid. The operation of that office has received complete public support and approval. Through the agency of the Branch Courts we have been able to reach suburban children who desperately need the authoritative intervention of the Court, who otherwise would not have come to our attention. The Court is currently considering requests from other suburban areas to establish similar Branch Courts.

DOCKET BACKLOG ELIMINATED

In these days when the dockets of all courts are crowded and overburdened, we have been no exception. But despite the unprecedented volume of cases during the past two years we have been able to keep abreast of our docket; if this were not so, the improvements in our services would have lost much of their value and significance. By careful docket planning and administrative improvements we have been able to dispose of the majority of children's cases within three weeks after the filing date. Pre-trial procedures have enabled us to be free from any backlog of jury cases or other matters which consume lengthy trial time.

Through the Court's initiative, the Cleveland Police Department was persuaded to add more police officers to its Juvenile Unit, and a special juvenile police officer was assigned to the Court to process all Cleveland police complaints. This service assures the prompt filing and docketing of cases referred by the Cleveland Police Department. Further, the liaison service has resulted in a considerable man power savings to the Cleveland Police Department by relieving about 200 police officers per month from the necessity of coming to court to file complaints.

DETENTION HOME POPULATION GREATLY REDUCED

A rigorous screening procedure for admissions to, and releases from Detention Home, instituted in 1967, has had dramatic results. Because of the effectiveness of this procedure, the average daily population declined by 40%, from 151 children per day in 1967 to 91 children per day in 1970. More significantly, for the last six months of 1970, our average daily population was 77 children. The total days care furnished significantly declined from 55,235 in 1967 to 33,189 in 1970, a decrease of 40%.

The Court was instrumental in writing into the new state law the three main criteria for detaining a child prior to his hearing; they are: 1) That unless detained, the child would likely abscond from the jurisdiction of the Court; 2) That the child's custody was required for his own protection or for the protection of property, or other persons, and 3) That the child had no parent or guardian to provide for his care and supervision pending his court hearing.

As a result of the improved management of the Detention Home, begun in 1967, the Home can no longer be characterized by the news media as a "snake pit" and a "zoo", as it formerly was because of overcrowded conditions. The population during that period often reached 225 children per day, and it frequently became necessary to indiscriminately place children in the County Jail, where there were sometimes twenty-five children confined.

By establishing the position of Intake Referee in 1967 to screen Detention Home admissions and releases, and by adhering to the three criteria for admission mentioned above even before they became part of the law, the results in Detention Home control have been significantly noteworthy. Because of the reduction in population, we no longer have children sleeping on the floor of the Home; each child has his own individual room; we have no children in the County Jail. By reason of reduction of staff, we have been able to increase the salaries of our present staff to where they receive an adequate salary, and we have been able to reduce their work hours from 44 hours per week to 40 hours per week.

We have also been able to convert an unused unit of the Detention Home into modern classrooms for our school and we have converted the former school section into sorely needed space for our increased probation staff; our children are now in school for the normal school day of five hours instead of two hours, as was the case with the excessive population. We believe we now have a Detention Home

which is among the best in the United States, where children receive proper care, an institution of which all the citizens of Cuyahoga County can well be proud.

INCREASED CHILD SUPPORT COLLECTIONS

In 1970, the Court collected more than three million dollars for the support of children - the largest amount in its history - despite the diminished economy and labor disruptions which occurred in that year. Significantly, of the total amount collected for the support of children, over \$1,371,000 was paid to the County Welfare Department for the care of children supported by public assistance, an increase of \$125,800 over the previous year. Recently enacted statutes enabling the Court to attach the wages of those individuals who have demonstrated an unwillingness to assume their legal obligation in compliance with a court order for support have aided the Court immensely in raising its support collections.

LIAISON SERVICES WITH OTHER AGENCIES

In order to facilitate referrals to other community agencies who have a mutual concern for the welfare of the children and families before the Court, we have developed effective liaison relationships with several community social agencies, among them are:

FAMILY SERVICE ASSOCIATION

The presence of an intake caseworker from the Family Service Association to act on referrals to that agency has continued to be a very beneficial service for the problem-ridden families who come to the attention of the Court. This referral procedure has greatly improved the relationship between the Court and the Family Service Association, and has prevented many cases from becoming "lost" in the referral process as was all too prevalent heretofore. At this writing, the Court and the Family Service Association are jointly planning means by which referrals will be aggressively followed-up so that the families will be assured the service they so desperately need.

CLEVELAND BOARD OF EDUCATION

The long established close relationship with the Cleveland Board of Education, with three representatives of the Board presently stationed at the Court, continued to facilitate the processing of complaints from the Cleveland School system.

**COUNTY WELFARE
DEPARTMENT,
SOCIAL SERVICES**

The more recently developed relationship with the County Welfare Department, Social Services, continues with a caseworker supplied by the Welfare Department being almost an integral part of our Intake Department. This arrangement has been most efficacious in the service to dependent and neglected children, and has greatly strengthened the relationship between the two agencies.

**MILITARY
SCREENING**

Close cooperation has also been effective with military recruiting personnel where boys known to have court records have expressed a desire to enter military service. By aiding in a record check we have helped the military in screening out boys who, because of emotional or characterological problems, would not be appropriate candidates for military service. On the other hand, we have also been able to effect the entry of a boy into military service whose record of law violations belies his good potential.

In addition to the above liaison services, the Court also provides office space for the following services to expedite the referral of children and families who are mutual concerns of the Court and agencies, these include: The Ohio State Employment Services, the Job Corps., Project Friendship Inc., and the Big Brothers.

CONCLUSION

We believe that we have made some significant movement toward fulfilling the promise of the Juvenile Court during 1970. We concede that we have "miles to go" before we achieve the idealistic hopes of the Juvenile Court proponents and early reformers of seventy years ago. Our reach will continue to exceed our grasp in direct proportion to the unwillingness of society to provide the necessary personnel and facilities to give children the regenerative and solicitous treatment they need and deserve.

We cannot do it all at the Juvenile Court. The deficient systems which continuously add to our caseload must be strengthened and expanded so as to divert children from the Juvenile Court. Here we refer to the public schools, the social agencies, public and private, and the residential and after care services of the Ohio Youth Commission. The schools must provide more "work-study" opportunities for the great numbers of children who experience nothing but failure in the conventional academic programs. Clinical services must be available in the schools to cope with the many emotional and personality problems that manifest themselves in the classrooms.

Services for neglected and dependent children, including shelter care, foster homes and group homes must be greatly expanded. More social casework services designed to keep families from disintegrating and to furnish protective services for children are desperately needed in Cuyahoga County.

The Ohio Youth Commission presently has a pressing need for at least four additional 200-bed capacity residential schools to relieve over-crowding and ensure an adequate length of stay for treatment and rehabilitation. With the exception of a projected 200-bed school to be constructed in 1973, no further expansion is being planned. Counselors in the after-care program have excessive caseloads - two to three times the number of children under their care that they can properly supervise. As a result of these deficiencies in both residential and after-care service we have in excess of 500 children who are under the care of the Ohio Youth Commission admitted to our Detention Home each year.

If we must concede that the community is too impoverished to provide all of these urgent necessities, then we must marshal all of our resources, both public and private, and utilize them where there is the greatest need. Such a program would unquestionably mean much more service to the problem-ridden families who by reason of the default of appropriate community agencies become the burden of the Juvenile Court.

We will continue to strive to fulfill the promise of the Juvenile Court - we staunchly believe in the validity of its ideas and ideals. Given the proper ancillary services our Court as now constituted could greatly reduce the incidence of delinquency in Cuyahoga County. *The promise of the Juvenile Court can be kept - but only if the compassionate humanitarian interest in children that originally animated it is expressed in the kind of public support that will permit the Court to function fully and effectively.*

STATISTICAL HIGHLIGHTS - 1970

A total of 22,635 complaints were filed in the Juvenile Court of Cuyahoga County in 1970, a difference of only 24 cases from the unprecedented total of 22,659 recorded in 1969.

**DELINQUENCY,
UNRULY COMPLAINTS
DECLINE 3%** Complaints regarding delinquency and unruliness declined by 3% in 1970 over 1969. There were 9,363 such cases reported in 1970, compared with the all time high of 9,678 cases recorded in 1969. This decline of 3% is especially encouraging in view of the fact that procedural innovations facilitating the filing of complaints and the accessibility of our branch offices have undoubtedly resulted in cases being referred that would not have otherwise come to our attention. As related elsewhere in this report, since 1968, we have moved vigorously toward the decentralization of our Intake Department. This has been accomplished by the operation of branch offices in Cleveland Heights and in the City of Euclid which serve practically all the easterly suburbs, by the new procedures whereby all suburbs file their unofficial complaints by mail and by having a Cleveland Juvenile Police Bureau Officer stationed at the Court who processes all complaints of the Cleveland Police Department from written reports submitted to him.

As is generally known there are a great many incidences of delinquency and unruliness which do not come to the attention of the Juvenile Court. Too often some of these situations are allowed to "fester" to a point where re-direction and rehabilitation of the child becomes most difficult, if not impossible, before the child is finally referred to the Court. We believe that our effectiveness is increased by receiving these cases when the delinquency pattern is in its inipient stage rather than when the deviant behavior is firmly established.

When we take into account the increase in complaints attributable to improved intake procedures the 3% decline in delinquency and unruliness cases is particularly significant. It is our observation that the Court's improved probation services and our firm and consistent policy of effecting residential placements when probation proves ineffective has had a considerably greater effect on delinquency and unruliness than is reflected by the 3% decline.

**OHIO JUVENILE
COURT ACT REVISED**

The revision of Ohio's Juvenile Court Act, effective in November, 1969, redefined "delinquent" child into two separate and distinct categories, namely the delinquent child, and the unruly child. The present category of delinquent child encompasses only those children who commit acts which if committed by adults would be crimes and children who disobey an order of the court. The unruly child category relates to acts of deviant behavior, other than law violations, such as immoral deportment, habitual truancy from home or school, incorrigibility and violations of laws applicable only to children, such as curfew violations.

For the purpose of statistical comparison in this report, we have broken down the 1969 delinquency cases into the newly established "delinquent" and "unruly" cases in accordance with the present statutes. See Table 2 for comparable statistics regarding these two categories of complaints for 1969 and 1970.

**BOYS' CASES
DECLINE, GIRLS'
CASES RISE**

A total of 7,281 boys were filed on in both categories in 1970 compared with 2,082 girls. While the total number of boys filed on declined by nearly 6%, (going from 7,728 in 1969 to 7,281 in 1970), girls cases, on the other hand, rose by nearly 7%, (going from 1,950 in 1969 to 2,082 in 1970). The considerable increase in girls' cases evident for the past several years has resulted in narrowing the traditional four to one ratio of boys to girls, making it closer to three to one for 1970. The marked decrease in boys' cases is accounted for in the sharp decline in auto trespassing and auto theft cases, and the considerable increase in girls' cases is largely attributable to increased charges of shoplifting.

In 1970, delinquency complaints represented 81% of the total complaints against boys, with unruly charges accounting for 19% of total boys' cases. On the other hand, delinquency charges represented 49% of the total complaints against girls, with unruly charges accounting for 51% of the total complaints brought against girls.

**AUTO THEFT AND
AUTO TRESPASSING
CASES SHARPLY
DECLINE**

There was a marked decline in auto theft and auto trespassing cases, going from 1,968 cases in 1969 to 1,427 cases in 1970. We believe this decline reflects, in part, the Court's attitude toward such offenses. Rather than considering auto theft as a childish prank or "joy-riding", we consider it the serious offense which it really is - one which is charged with danger to the child, the police who may be pursuing him and the general pub-

lic, involving a high incidence of physical injury and property loss. When effective probation cannot prevent repetition of involvement in stolen autos, the Court considers this a strong indication that the child needs institutional controls for his protection as well as in the public interest.

We believe that the public campaigns on the part of the police, insurance companies and the news media to prevent such thefts by encouraging motorists to remove ignition keys and to lock their parked cars has significantly contributed to the decrease in auto thefts.

Auto theft and auto trespassing charges are considered together statistically because they frequently represent the same involvement with auto trespassing charges being filed rather than auto theft charges because the former presents less difficulty from an evidentiary standpoint.

UNLAWFUL ENTRY, DANGEROUS OFFENSE FOR CHILD AND VICTIMS As usual, the very serious crime of unlawful entry and stealing brought to the court a high number of boys; 1,041 in 1970 - about the same as in 1969. This is one of the most serious offenses in the criminal law and results in great property loss to the victims. The Court is greatly concerned about the victims of these offenses and wherever possible a strenuous effort is made to require the offenders to make restitution as part of the condition of probation. In many instances such activity is deemed as evidence that the child cannot be properly controlled and cared for in the home and therefore institutional placement is required. The Court, in making such placements, is aware that such acts are not only very detrimental to the victims and the community, but are also very dangerous for the youthful offender who risks the possibility of being wounded or killed in the attempted perpetration of such crimes.

INCREASING AVAILABILITY OF WEAPONS DEPLORED Possession of weapons charges rose nearly 100%, going from 108 in 1969 to 197 in 1970. This does not include the additional use of weapons frequently involved in charges of theft from person which amounted to 370 cases in 1970 - about the same as in 1969. The Court has observed that in many instances, the weapons used in these offenses, especially guns, have been taken from the child's home. As in our last Annual Report, the Court again deplors the altogether too easy availability of weapons to children. We categorize parents who keep weapons in their homes without proper precaution against their availability to children as being reckless and wanton.

The correlation between the increase in these charges and the easy access of weapons is all too apparent.

AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR CONTINUES INCREASE Following a trend of the past several years, there was again this year a noticeable increase in charges of injury to person, characteristic of a pattern of aggressive deviant behavior on the part of both boys and girls. The increase in such cases in 1970 was 20%, rising from 698 to 833 cases. Indicative of the continuation of this trend, also, was the increase in the number of homicides which went from 17 in 1969 to 22 in 1970. The annual average for this offense for the five-year period prior to 1969 was 7 cases per year which dramatizes the seriousness of its current frequency.

DRUG AND NARCOTIC VIOLATIONS INCREASE For the third consecutive year, there has been a sizeable increase in cases of drugs and narcotics violations which numbered 70 in 1968, 119 in 1969, and 189 in 1970, representing an increase of nearly 60% over 1969. Conversely, charges of inhaling glue and other toxic vapors has steadily declined, dropping from 166 cases in 1968 to 97 cases in 1969, and 75 cases in 1970. The Court has been encouraged by the acceptance for treatment at private residential centers of children afflicted with drug problems who are found to be in need of the same type of care as other trouble-prone youngsters.

PROBATION MOST FREQUENT DISPOSITION The most frequent disposition made by the Court in the treatment of the children referred to it was the use of probation. A total of 2,830 boys and girls were placed on probation in 1970 compared with 2,559 in 1969. Including the number of probationers carried over from 1969, the Probation Department supervised a total of 5,157 children during the year 1970. The Court is definitely treatment and rehabilitation oriented. However, we believe that probation can be over-used, and it is a prime responsibility of the Court to recognize when probation is not effective and thereupon to institute other treatment programs.

INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENTS AT SAME LEVEL AS LAST YEAR Commitments to training schools and residential facilities amounted to 1,231 boys and girls, about the same as last year. Twenty-three boys were bound over to the Court of Common Pleas compared with 27 in 1969. See Table 3 for all dispositions in delinquency and unruly complaints.

POLICE FILE 51% OF COMPLAINTS

The Cleveland Police Department filed 28% of the complaints against children for delinquency and unruliness. Police departments from all other County municipalities, villages and townships accounted for 23% of the complaints, making a total of 51% of our cases which were referred by police officials. The percentage does not include a large number of individuals referred to the Court by others as a result of police investigations. The next most frequent sources of referral were: citizens, 15%; parents, 13%; and store security officers, 10%. School officials in the county accounted for nearly 7% of the total filings. See Table A for sources of referral.

14 TO 17, LARGEST AGE GROUP

Following what appears to be an established pattern, children between the ages of fourteen and seventeen comprised nearly 80% of the total filings regarding delinquency and unruliness. Boys 16 years of age, numbering 1,349 comprised the largest age category, while girls 15 years of age, numbering 477 comprised the largest age group for girls. See Table C for age breakdowns.

GREATER ACCESSIBILITY INCREASES SUBURBAN REFERRALS

Consistently, over the past several years, approximately 75% of the delinquency complaints have come from the city of Cleveland, with the balance of 25% from all suburban areas. In 1970, however, suburban referrals amounted to 30% of referrals, with the city of Cleveland accounting for 70% of the complaints. Notable also is the fact that the number of complaints involving Cleveland children declined from 6,996 in 1969 to 6,397 in 1970, a decrease of nearly 9%. This perhaps reflects to some degree, the shift of population from the city to the suburbs experienced in recent years. The increase in suburban referrals, from 2,483 to 2,753, an increase of nearly 11% reflects the greater availability of court services through its Branch Office in Cleveland Heights which since mid-1969 has provided intake service for most of the county's eastern suburbs.

HIGHEST DELINQUENCY AREAS IN CITY SHOW DECLINE

While the Glenville and Hough social planning areas were the two highest delinquency areas in the city of Cleveland, with 986, and 794 cases reported respectively, they both showed declines in volume of cases for 1970 over 1969. Glenville, the area of highest delinquency, showed a drop of 26%, from 1,336 cases to 986 cases. Likewise Hough, the second highest delinquency area, experienced a decline from 1,058 to 794 cases, for a decrease of 25%.

INTENSIFIED PROBATION SERVICES

The Court's intensified probation services in those areas, made possible through its recently developed "split-staff system", appears to be reflected in the reduction of delinquency in those areas. Probation follow-up service in those sections of the city has been substantially bolstered by the assignment there of ten probation officers of the total of twenty-three serving the entire east side of the county. Through such staffing, caseloads have been more manageable so that more individual attention may be given to each probationer and effective intervention regarding more difficult cases has been instrumental in preventing recurrent acts of delinquency by the early return to court of children who are not cooperating with their probation officers.

Notable increases in delinquency came from the following City of Cleveland social planning areas: Goodrich, from 61 to 111 cases (up 82%); South Broadway, from 94 to 153 cases (up 63%); Woodland Hills, from 144 to 206 cases (up 43%); Tremont, from 238 to 305 cases (up 28%) and South Collinwood, from 153 to 194 cases (up 27%).

SUBURBAN DELINQUENCY

Suburban areas with the most frequent incidence of delinquency included: East Cleveland, 284 cases; Lakewood, 278 cases; Cleveland Heights, 211 cases; Euclid, 205 cases, and Parma, 161 cases.

The most significant increase in suburban delinquency occurred in the city of Euclid from which complaints rose from 88 cases in 1969 to 205 cases in 1970. The rise of reported delinquent behavior in that community reflects the general civic concern of responsible groups who were deeply concerned about obtaining services for their children in need of help. For this reason the court established its second Branch Court in the city of Euclid in November, 1970. (See Table B for geographical distribution of delinquency and unruly cases by resident of minors).

CLINICAL DIAGNOSIS SHOWS LOW RATE OF SEVERE MENTAL ILLNESS

Clinical diagnoses for children referred to the Court Clinic displayed the same pattern evident in past years, with the majority of diagnoses falling in the category of adjustment reactions of adolescence, 278 cases, and other types of adolescent behavior disorders, numbering 114 cases. Personality disorders were diagnosed in another 168 cases. The incidence of psychotic and neurotic reactions numbered 9 and 17 respectively. The clinical picture in 1970, confirms the Court's experience in that the problems of children before the Court are related to adjustment problems during the adolescent period, with a very small percentage being

related to severe mental illness. (See Table 11 for diagnoses of patients examined by the Court Clinic).

JUVENILE TRAFFIC CASES AT ALL-TIME HIGH Juvenile Traffic violations increased from 8,436 in 1969 to 9,339 in 1970, for an all-time high. The rise in traffic offenses on the part of juveniles is probably attributable to the increased number of youthful drivers, and to more police activity in respect to traffic violations. The suspension of the driver's license for a period of time in keeping with the offense was the most frequent disposition made in these cases; the costs of court were assessed and collected in almost every case, to help impress upon the child the necessity for careful driving habits and the responsibility required of them in operating motor vehicles. The penalties imposed, particularly the deprivation of the privilege of driving are most effective, and the great majority of juvenile traffic violators are first offenders.

NEGLECT AND DEPENDENCY CASES INCREASE There was an appreciable increase in neglect and dependency cases during the year. The number of neglected children complaints rose from 133 cases in 1969 to 178 cases in 1970, and the number of dependent children's complaints rose from 194 cases in 1969 to 298 cases in 1970. A total of 707 children involved in these official neglect and dependency complaints were committed to the Family and Children's Services of the County Welfare Department, the great majority being committed for temporary care and custody. (See Table 5 for the disposition of children involved in official neglect and dependency complaints).

Other children's cases, namely Applications to Determine Custody, Applications for the Approval of Permanent Surrender of Children and Applications for Consent to Marry, which numbered 209, 93, and 133 respectively remained at about the same level as last year.

ADULT CASES DECLINED Charges against adults declined somewhat in 1970 over 1969, going from 3,764 to 3,022 cases. Despite the reported increase in illegitimate births in the county, paternity cases filed in the Court decreased from 945 cases in 1969 to 802 cases in 1970. Adults involved in offenses relating to delinquency (and unruliness in 1970) also declined, going from 142 cases in 1969 to 121 cases in 1970. Complaints against adults in respect to failure to comply with court orders regarding payment in non-support cases, and motions to show cause in paternity cases declined from 2,432 cases in 1969 to 1,851 cases in 1970. This drop is attributable to the fact that a large backlog of these types of cases was disposed of in 1969.

TABLE A

Source of Referral - Delinquency and Unruly Cases, 1970

SOURCE OF REFERRAL	Boys		Girls		Total
	Official	Unofficial	Official	Unofficial	
Cleveland Police Department	1,906	479	95	90	2,570
Other County Police Departments	978	882	95	166	2,121
Other Police (State, Private, etc.)	78	22	11	3	114
Railroad Security Officers	31	80	—	3	114
Fire Departments	20	9	—	—	29
Store Security	127	362	58	344	891
Other Courts	46	3	5	4	58
Department of Liquor Control	1	41	—	8	50
Cleveland Board of Education	155	177	36	49	417
Other County School Boards	62	64	35	55	216
Public Social Agencies	61	8	42	2	113
Private Social Agencies	15	2	5	—	22
Parents, Relatives	372	109	598	138	1,217
Citizens	560	606	69	158	1,393
Other Sources	11	14	12	1	38
TOTAL	4,423	2,858	1,061	1,021	9,363

TABLE B
 Area of Residence, Minors Filed as Delinquents, Unruly
 1970 and 1969

AREA OF RESIDENCE

City of Cleveland By Social Planning Areas	BOYS' CASES		GIRLS' CASES		TOTAL CASES	
	<u>1970</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1969</u>
Central	142	140	38	40	180	180
Central - East	235	288	74	94	309	382
Central - West	200	345	59	79	259	424
Clark - Fulton	101	84	17	18	118	102
Corlett	323	309	86	84	409	393
Denison	87	87	22	23	109	110
Downtown	6	8	5	1	11	9
Edgewater	17	28	2	4	19	32
Glenville	738	1,019	248	317	986	1,336
Goodrich	88	49	23	12	111	61
Hough	618	858	176	200	794	1,058
Jefferson	83	78	20	17	103	95
Kinsman	153	166	77	63	230	229
Lee - Miles	206	251	44	37	250	288
Mt. Pleasant	259	269	70	87	329	356
Near West Side	421	426	84	86	505	512
North Broadway	71	77	20	17	91	94
North Collinwood	74	60	10	8	84	68
Norwood	123	150	28	29	151	179
Purtis - Bellaire	76	103	19	9	95	112
Riverside	74	66	28	17	102	83
South Broadway	125	72	28	22	153	94
South Brooklyn	81	84	15	9	96	93
South Collinwood	159	122	35	31	194	153
Tremont	261	199	44	39	305	238
University	57	53	17	12	74	65
West Side	103	88	21	18	124	106
Woodland Hills	168	116	38	28	206	144
TOTAL, City of Cleveland	5,049	5,595	1,348	1,401	6,397	6,996

TABLE B, Continued

Area of Residence, Minors Filed as Delinquents, Unruly
1970 and 1969

AREA OF RESIDENCE

Municipalities, Villages & Townships	BOYS' CASES		GIRLS' CASES		TOTAL CASES	
	<u>1970</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1969</u>
Bay Village	64	61	13	11	77	72
Beachwood	25	25	13	11	38	36
Bedford	65	44	16	4	81	48
Bedford Heights	19	34	14	7	33	41
Berea	53	41	10	9	63	50
Brecksville	17	16	2	1	19	17
Broadview Heights	32	22	12	3	44	25
Brooklyn	24	19	3	10	27	29
Brook Park	74	95	15	14	89	109
Cleveland Heights	169	158	42	42	211	200
East Cleveland	205	203	79	55	284	258
Euclid	161	73	44	15	205	88
Fairview Park	35	37	6	8	41	45
Garfield Heights	58	34	17	6	75	40
Independence	21	11	6	8	27	19
Lakewood	192	222	86	68	278	290
Lyndhurst	30	53	7	4	37	57
Maple Heights	77	77	32	18	109	95
Mayfield Heights	50	22	3	3	53	25
Middleburg Heights	24	10	6	6	30	16
North Olmsted	83	63	34	15	117	78
North Royalton	20	23	5	4	25	27
Parma	120	142	41	33	161	175
Parma Heights	36	29	11	14	47	43
Richmond Heights	12	7	-	4	12	11
Rocky River	45	62	26	15	71	77
Seven Hills	21	14	7	6	28	20
Shaker Heights	49	48	21	19	70	67
Solon	13	21	3	-	16	21
South Euclid	48	46	8	8	56	54
Strongsville	24	9	6	5	30	14
University Heights	26	31	11	13	37	44
Warrensville Heights	28	52	9	19	37	71
Westlake	38	46	20	6	58	52

TABLE B, Continued

Area of Residence, Minors Filed as Delinquents, Unruly
1970 and 1969

AREA OF RESIDENCE

Municipalities, Villages & Townships con't.	BOYS' CASES		GIRLS' CASES		TOTAL CASES	
	<u>1970</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1969</u>
Bentleyville	1	-	-	-	1	-
Bratenahl	-	-	-	1	-	1
Brooklyn Heights	2	1	-	-	2	1
Chagrin Falls	26	32	1	5	27	37
Cuyahoga Heights	1	6	-	-	1	6
Gates Mills	6	-	1	-	7	-
Glenwillow	-	-	-	-	-	-
Highland Heights	12	5	3	3	15	8
Hunting Valley	-	1	-	-	-	1
Linndale	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mayfield	10	9	2	2	12	11
Moreland Hills	2	5	-	1	2	6
Newburgh Heights	11	14	2	5	13	19
North Randall	-	2	-	-	-	2
Oakwood	11	17	7	5	18	22
Olmsted Falls	8	7	5	-	13	7
Orange Village	4	1	1	1	5	2
Pepper Pike	12	6	4	3	16	9
Valley View	7	7	1	-	8	7
Walton Hills	2	6	-	1	2	7
Westview	6	5	-	3	6	8
Woodmere	2	1	-	-	2	1
Chagrin Falls Township	-	-	-	-	-	-
Olmsted Township	7	12	7	1	14	13
Riveredge Township	1	-	1	-	2	-
Warrensville Township	-	1	1	-	1	1
TOTAL, Suburbs	2,089	1,988	664	495	2,753	2,483
Agency Residents	58	52	34	33	92	85
Out-of-County Residents	74	89	33	19	107	108
Area Designation Unknown	11	4	3	2	14	6
GRAND TOTAL DELINQUENCY CASES	7,281	7,728	2,082	1,950	9,363	9,678

TABLE C

Ages of Individual Delinquent - Unruly Children, 1970

<u>AGE</u>	<u>BOYS</u>	<u>GIRLS</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Eight and under	41	10	51
Nine	48	7	55
Ten	127	19	146
Eleven	192	38	230
Twelve	344	97	441
Thirteen	647	233	880
Fourteen	973	378	1,351
Fifteen	1,241	477	1,718
Sixteen	1,349	423	1,772
Seventeen	1,284	297	1,581
Eighteen	49	8	57
Unknown	10	4	14
TOTAL	6,305	1,991	8,296

Handwritten notes:
 5,142 (next to Girls column)
 62 (next to Girls column)

TABLE 1
Total Complaints By Years, 1970 and 1969

Type of Complaint	1970	1969
CHILDREN'S CASES		
Delinquency: Boys	5,917	6,172
Girls	1,026	870
TOTAL DELINQUENCY	6,943	7,042
Unruliness: Boys	1,364	1,556
Girls	1,056	1,080
TOTAL UNRULINESS	2,420	2,636
TOTAL DELINQUENCY and UNRULINESS *	9,363	9,678
Juvenile Traffic Offenders: Boys	8,362	7,484
Girls	977	952
TOTAL TRAFFIC OFFENDERS	9,339	8,436
Neglected Children's Cases	178	133
Dependent Children's Cases	298	194
Application to Determine Custody	209	216
Application for Approval of Permanent Surrender	93	94
Application for Consent to Marry	133	144
TOTAL CHILDREN'S CASES	19,613	18,895
ADULT CASES		
Non-Support of Minor Children, New	724	872
Non-Support of Minor Children, Reactivated	1,127	1,560
(Total Non-Supports)	1,851	2,432
Neglect of Minor Children	112	118
Contributing to Delinquency	58	124
Tending to Cause Delinquency	13	18
Contributing to Unruliness	42	—
Tending to Cause Unruliness	8	—
Paternity Complaints	802	945
Certifications and Motions	73	72
Other Adult Cases	63	55
TOTAL ADULT CASES	3,022	3,764
GRAND TOTAL, CHILDREN'S AND ADULT CASES	22,635	22,659

* Although the distinction between delinquency and unruliness was not effected until November 19, 1970, a breakdown for statistical purposes was made for the filings made in all of 1969.

TABLE 2

Delinquency and Unruly Complaints, 1970 Compared with 1969

Complaint	Boys		Girls		Total	
	1970	1969	1970	1969	1970	1969
DELINQUENCY:						
Auto Theft	192	544	3	5	195	549
Auto Trespassing	1,235	1,424	58	95	1,293	1,519
Unlawful Entry & Stealing	1,041	1,088	41	17	1,082	1,105
Other Theft	954	982	523	435	1,477	1,417
Theft from Person	353	346	17	22	370	368
Other Property Offenses	115	118	42	17	157	135
Act Resulting in Death	19	15	3	2	22	17
Injury to Person	662	553	171	145	833	698
Destruction of Property	378	435	15	26	393	461
Disorderly conduct	207	150	51	39	258	189
Possession of Weapons	188	97	9	11	197	108
Fire Setting	29	20	—	4	29	24
Trespassing on Property	123	91	11	5	134	96
Inhaling Glue Fumes	66	91	9	6	75	97
Drug and Narcotic Violation	159	108	30	11	189	119
Other Delinquency Complaints	196	110	43	30	239	140
TOTAL DELINQUENCY COMP.	5,917	6,172	1,026	870	6,943	7,042
UNRULINESS:						
Incorrigibility	584	680	650	741	1,234	1,421
Truancy	240	207	154	76	394	283
Running Away	59	61	135	107	194	168
Sex Offense	92	131	60	84	152	215
Liquor Violation	236	259	29	34	265	293
Curfew Violation	153	218	28	38	181	256
TOTAL UNRULY COMPLAINTS	1,364	1,556	1,056	1,080	2,420	2,636
GRAND TOTAL DELINQUENCY and UNRULY COMPLAINTS	7,281	7,728	2,082	1,950	9,363	9,678

TABLE 3
Dispositions Made in Delinquency and Unruly Cases, 1970

Official Cases	Boys	Girls	Total
Placed on Probation	2,128	702	2,830
Placed in Private Treatment Centers	136	69	205
Committed or Returned to Public Institutions:			
Ohio Youth Commission	752	161	913
Mansfield Youth Center	64	-	64
Cleveland Boys School - Blossom Hill	159	95	254
TOTAL Committed or Returned to Institutions	975	256	1,231
Transferred to Common Pleas Court	23	-	23
Continued Under Supervision of Parole Officer	27	10	37
Continued Under Supervision of Family and Children Services	36	12	48
Committed to Parents or Relatives	185	28	213
Order Made in Other Cases	494	30	524
Other Disposition	78	7	85
Dismissed by the Court	316	33	349
Withdrawn by Complainant	180	136	316
Continued, or Set for Hearing in 1971	368	136	504
TOTAL OFFICIAL DISPOSITIONS *	4,946	1,419	6,365
<hr/>			
Unofficial Cases	Boys	Girls	Total
Adjusted by Referee	2,089	724	2,813
Restitution Ordered	30	-	30
Probation Officer to Supervise	177	61	238
Referred to Agency	52	50	102
Made Official	56	21	77
Other Disposition	61	33	94
Dismissed by Referee	166	50	216
Withdrawn by Complainant	44	38	82
Continued, Held Open	183	44	227
TOTAL UNOFFICIAL DISPOSITIONS	2,858	1,021	3,879

* Discrepancy between the amount of official dispositions and the number of filings results from multiple dispositions made regarding children returned to Court during the year.

TABLE 4
Complaints Against Adults - 1970

Complaint	Official	Unofficial	Total
Non-Support of Minor Children	361	363	724
Improper Subsistence and Care	68	26	94
Abandonment of Minor Children	-	-	-
Abuse of Minor Children	13	3	16
Other Neglect	-	1	1
Contributing to Delinquency	43	15	58
Contributing to Unruliness	40	2	42
Acting in a Way Tending to Cause Delinquency	12	1	13
Acting in a Way Tending to Cause Unruliness	6	2	8
Paternity Complaints	802	-	802
Certifications	73	-	73
Other Adult Cases	54	1	55
TOTAL ADULT CASES	1,472	414	1,886

TABLE 5
Disposition of Children in Official
Neglect and Dependency Cases - 1970

Disposition	Neglect	Dependency	Total
Committed To:			
Parents, Relatives, Guardians	10	12	22
Referred to Child Caring and Placing Agencies:			
County Welfare Department -			
Temporary Care and Custody	261	381	642
Permanent Care and Custody	24	41	65
Other Child Caring Agencies	-	1	1
TOTAL Referred to Child Caring Agencies	285	423	708
Dismissed or Withdrawn	42	43	85
Other Order	-	8	8
Continued, or Set for Hearing in 1971	24	9	33
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN	361	495	856

TABLE 6
Cases Under Supervision of Probation
and Placement Department - 1970

Movement of Cases	Delinquent-Unruly		Dependent and Neglected Children	Total Children
	Boys	Girls		
Brought Forward January, 1970	1,700	570	36	2,306
Received for Supervision, 1970	2,128	702	21	2,851
Total Under Supervision	3,828	1,272	57	5,157
Removed From Supervision	2,104	711	37	2,852
Carried Forward to 1971	1,724	561	20	2,305

TABLE 7
Disposition of Adults Dealt With In Official
Neglect, Non-Support, Delinquency and Unruly Cases, 1970

Disposition	Neglect Non-Support	Delinquency and Unruly	Total
Committed To:			
Cleveland House of Correction.	22	4	26
County Jail	2	-	2
Court Order to Support Minor Child- ren	65	-	65
Sentence Suspended:			
On condition of proper behavior	142	11	153
Probation Officer to supervise	4	3	7
Pay fine and/or costs	-	18	18
Other order	3	7	10
Dismissed or Withdrawn	76	28	104
Continued, or Set hearing in 1971 .	128	30	158
Number of Adults Charged	442	101	543

TABLE 8
Children Under Care In Detention Home, 1970

	Boys	Girls	Total
Under Care, January 1, 1970	54	16	70
Admitted During Year	2,782	1,165	3,947
Total Under Care During Year	2,836	1,181	4,017
Released During The Year	2,794	1,166	3,960
Under Care December 31, 1970	42	15	57
Total Days of Care Furnished			
	24,002	9,187	33,189
Average Daily Population			
	66	25	91
Average Length of Stay in Days			
	8	8	8

TABLE 9
Collection of Money by the Court and Distribution
of Money for the Support of Minor Children

Type of Collection	Amount
For Support of Children	\$3,150,146.87
Damages or Restitution	26,182.33
Poundage	31,900.67
Fines	10,989.50
Costs	104,755.74
Appearance Bonds	29,215.00
Maternity Hospital Collections	11,133.02
State of Ohio - Educational Subsidy	56,010.45
Miscellaneous General Collections	85,043.52
TOTAL AMOUNT COLLECTED	\$3,505,377.10

TABLE 9 (continued)

Money For Support of Children Disbursed To:	
Parents and Relatives	\$2,922,676.90
Public Agencies:	
Cuyahoga County Welfare Department,	
Family and Children's Services	107,219.71
Other Tax-Supported Agencies and Institutions	452.60
TOTAL PUBLIC AGENCIES	107,672.31
Private Agencies:	
Out-of-Town Placements	85,105.35
Local Agencies and Institutions	34,692.31
TOTAL PRIVATE AGENCIES	119,797.66
GRAND TOTAL OF SUPPORT MONEY DISBURSED	\$3,150,146.87

TABLE 10
Report of The Intake - Affidavit Department

Action Taken at Intake	Number of Complaints Received
New Cases Accepted for Court Action:	
For Official Hearing	7,867
For Unofficial Hearing:	
At Main Court	3,913
At Cleveland Hts. Branch	379
At Euclid Branch (opened Nov. 1970)	10
Old Cases Set for Alias Hearing	2,598
* Traffic Cases Set For Hearing	9,339
TOTAL Cases Set For Hearing	24,106
Disposed of Without Court Action:	
Referred to Social Agencies	495
Referred to Boards of Education	56
Referred to Police Departments	162
Referred to Other Courts	131
Referred to Other Services	171
Handeled by Correspondence	391
TOTAL Disposed of Without Court Action	1,406

* 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 11
Diagnoses of Patients Examined
By the Court Psychiatrists - 1970

Diagnosis	Boys	Girls	Adults	Total
Psychoses				
Schizophrenia, various types	5	2	2	9
Neuroses				
Phobic Reaction	3	-	-	3
Depressive Reaction	6	3	-	9
Hysterical Reaction	3	-	-	3
Anxiety Reaction	2	-	-	2
Personality Disorders				
Passive-Aggressive Personality	66	26	-	92
Inadequate Personality	11	3	3	17
Antisocial Personality	21	1	-	22
Hysterical Personality	4	2	-	6
Schizoid Personality	3	-	-	3
Paranoid Personality	3	-	2	5
Other Personality Disorders	24	4	1	29
Transient Situational Disturbances				
Adjustment Reaction of Childhood	16	2	-	18
Adjustment Reaction of Adolescence	189	89	-	278
Adjustment Reaction of Adult Life	-	-	2	2
Behavior Disorders				
Runaway Reaction	6	6	-	12
Hyperkinetic Reaction	4	1	-	5
Withdrawing Reaction	6	2	-	8
Overanxious Reaction	11	2	-	13
Unsocialized Aggressive Reaction	23	4	-	27
Group Delinquent Reaction	24	1	-	25
Other Behavior Disorders	19	5	-	24
Other Disorders				
Mental Retardation	12	2	-	14
Chronic Brain Syndrome	2	-	-	2
Encopresis	1	-	-	1
No Mental Disorder	4	1	-	5
Drug Dependence	7	-	-	7
Alcoholism	1	-	3	4
Other Diagnosis	11	8	-	19
Diagnosis Deferred	12	5	4	21
TOTAL EXAMINATIONS	499	169	17	685

DIRECTORY OF PERSONNEL

CUYAHOGA COUNTY JUVENILE COURT

2163 East 22nd Street

Telephone: 771-8400

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

DAVID ADAMS, Assistant

BAILIFFS

Donald Gagliardo

Andrew Ladika

Michael O'Grady

Fred O'Malley

Bail Bonds-Police Liaison - Stuart Woldman

DIVISION OF LEGAL SERVICES

PATRICK F. GALLLAGHER, Legal Advisor

REFEREES

Louise Amico

S. J. Berman

William Fraunfelder

Blanche Dierenfeld

George McCready

Jeanne Winkler

INTAKE - AFFIDAVIT DEPARTMENT

JOHN J. SWEENEY, Chief

Rosa Clark, Intake Officer

Sam Durante, Intake Officer

Sandra Malevan, Intake Officer

Margaret Mazza, Intake Officer

Jeffrey Largent, Docket Review Officer

Sam Rubin, Senior Clerk

CHILD SUPPORT DEPARTMENT

MYRON T. MOSES, Chief

John Bokoch, Chief Assistant

Jerome Burke, Counsellor

James Hansen, Counsellor

Robert Leuthner, Counsellor

Roberta Oleksiak, Counsellor

James Papp, Counsellor

Gerard Viscardi, Counsellor

Jeffrey Zucco, Counsellor

Jeanne Walsh, Senior Clerk

CLERK'S OFFICE

ELIZABETH HOPKINS, Chief Deputy Clerk

Judges' Clerks:

Andrew Pierce

Sue Fisher

Ruth Gorman

Janice Szalkowski

CASHIER'S OFFICE

ARTHUR W. DUDLEY, Chief Cashier

DIVISION OF SOCIAL SERVICES

JOHN J. ALDEN, Director
ANDREW J. DeSANTI, Chief Probation Officer

CASE SUPERVISORS

Rudiene Brabson
Joseph Cabot
Milton Hay
Josephus Hicks
Francis Hogan
Lucille Jackson

Millard Jones, Jr.
Dolores Mlachak
Donald Peak
Charlotte Perry
Robert Twohey

PROBATION OFFICERS

Harris Allen
Phyllis Anderson
Howard Baskin
Peter Baumgartner
Sylvia Baugham
Nanee Bennett
Robert Bostick
Andrew Bunch
John Carlin
Jeanette Cephas
Jack Cervelli
Joseph Clift
Timothy Deegan
Ralph DeFranco
Jack DiCillo
Terry Dodson
Jill Dworkin
Martin Farraher
Wade Fraser

Peter French
John Gelski
Gregory Graham
Ellen Greene
JoAnna Hairston
Christina Hamlin
James Hauger
Bruce Hinsdale
Richard Hoose
Robert Horley
Patricia Hutchinson
Holly Krailo
Carl LoPresti
Catherine Lore
William Lyons
Earl Matthews
John Miller
Michael Noble

Lorenzo Norris
Patrick O'Donnell
Daniel O'Neil
George Palda
Carolyn Penn
Doretta Petree
John Rath
Jearline Rogers
Donald Schwallie
Larry Smith
Tyler Somersshield
William Stephen
James Streetz
Donald Switzer
Tom Washington
Kevin Weiler
Fred Wittenbrook
James Zaas
Robert Zak

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

VICTOR MACHA JR., Director

Ronald Born
Robert Hanna
Edward McCabe
Patricia Mannix

James Manuel
James Mullen
David Novak

COURT CLINIC

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

Psychiatric Panel:

Dr. Irving Berger
Dr. Ferdinand Carino
Dr. John Hadden, Jr.

Dr. Florence Matthews
Dr. Samuel Nigro
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. Keaton, *Chief, Family Case Records*

INFORMATION CLERKS

Frances Chambers
Eda Deggin

Matilda Ingeborg

COMMUNITY BASED CORRECTION SERVICES PROJECT

THOMAS EDWARDS, *Project Director*

JUVENILE COURT BRANCH OFFICES

CLEVELAND HEIGHTS, BRANCH

2969 Mayfield Road

Telephone: 321-7380

Brian Sexton, *Referee*
Mathias Novak, *Probation Officer*

Alice Carter, *Clerk*

CITY OF EUCLID OFFICE

545 East 222nd Street

Telephone: 731-9555

Kenneth Bossin, *Referee*

CUYAHOGA COUNTY JUVENILE DETENTION HOME

2209 Central Avenue

Telephone Numbers: DAYS - 771-8400

NIGHTS, SUNDAYS, HOLIDAYS - 771-8421

Martin Kelley, *Superintendent*
Janet Estadt, *Asst. Superintendent*
Paul Baxter, *Referee of Admissions and Releases*

David Quigley, *Asst. Superintendent*
Eugenia Dziedzicki, *Office Manager*

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: 23 CENTS

CITIZENS' ADVISORY BOARD

MR. RONALD BROWN, *Chairman*

Dr. Arthur Blum

Mr. Bruce B. Krost

Dr. Paul Briggs

Mr. Richard M. Kelley

Mr. Crede Calhoun

Mr. Frank L. Kelker

Mr. Neil Carothers

Mr. James H. Miller

Msgr. Casimir Ciolek

Mr. John Petten

Mr. Charles F. Clarke

Judge George Pillersdorf

Mr. A. F. Connors

Mrs. Frank H. Porter

Mr. Victor E. DeMarco

Mr. Louis Seltzer

Mr. Clarence Gaines

Rev. Roger Shoup

Mr. Fred Hauserman

Mr. Curtis Lee Smith

Mrs. Gilbert Humphrey

Mrs. Paul A. Unger

Mr. Frank E. Joseph

Mrs. Robert P. Wright

Mr. Ben D. Zevin