

*Annual Report*

1975



**THE  
JUVENILE COURT DIVISION  
COURT OF COMMON PLEAS**

**CUYAHOGA COUNTY  
CLEVELAND, OHIO**

*Hon. John G. Jones*

*Hon. Walter G. Whitlatch*

*Hon. Angelo G. Gagliardo*

*Hon. John F. Corrigan*

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

The Honorable Kwegyir Aggrey  
Director, Ohio Department of Public Welfare

The Honorable Timothy Moritz, M.D.  
Director, Ohio Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation

The Honorable George Denton  
Director, Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction

The Honorable William K. Willis  
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 1975, 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,

John J. Toner, Judge

Common Pleas Court  
Juvenile Court Division

Cleveland, Ohio  
May 30, 1976

## ANNUAL REPORT - 1975

In 1975, the Juvenile Court of Cuyahoga County made significant strides in handling the demands of the high volume of new complaints; and in providing for a great demand of services to meet the needs of the children and families referred to it; as well as accepting the challenge of its responsibility to the community in general. Therefore, the activities and functions during the year required introspection and planning for the future rather than evaluation of the past. It is evident that the problems of delinquent children and status offenders are highly complex and at times overwhelming. This phenomenon has created a highly complicated and overburdened system in order to provide for appropriate intervention. Request for Court intervention in the lives of delinquent and unruly youth did not come from the police alone; but also from social agencies, from schools and from bewildered parents, who feel that there is no other place from which they can secure help in handling the problems that their child presents.

This report is chronicle of the Juvenile Court's functions and activities as the Court carried out its mission during the year, in addition, it depicts a statistical analysis of the Court's capabilities and operational procedure in handling its input processes and its outputs.

### **CHILD'S RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS IS PROTECTED**

During the past decade, the steady increase in delinquency and unruly complaints filed in the Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court has reached alarming proportions. Determined efforts are being made by the Judges, Court administrators, and staff to understand the basic causes of delinquency and unruliness; and to alter the conditions that are responsible for the deviant behavioral tendencies among those youth who came to the Court's attention. Regardless of the needs of the child or the severity of the problems, the Juvenile Court cannot implement a plan for service to children, prior to their being adjudicated delinquent or unruly. The Court encourages assistance of legal counsel in the defense of the child during the adjudicatory hearing, and in constructive planning for the child's needs. The Court continues to purchase legal assistance for those who cannot afford it from the Legal Aid Society. In addition, prosecuting attorneys are assigned to the Juvenile Court to ensure proper presentation of all the evidence and to provide all complainants representation. Consequently, every child's right to due process is protected. The primary mission of the Court is to apply its legal authority to the extent necessary to provide for the child the proper care and control that will foster his growth and development and which will afford society the requisite protection. Court intervention in most cases is an extension of, or substitute for, the social controls that should be provided by the parents and/or the schools in helping the child to grow to healthy adulthood.

**COURT ATTEMPTS TO  
DIVERT THE STATUS  
OFFENDER**

The Court's impact upon meeting the service needs of the child depends upon its organizational structure, its staff and the dispositional alternatives available. During the

year the Court refined its service delivery system by developing new programs, increasing the capabilities of its staff and maintaining professional relationships with many social agencies in order to effectively meet the needs of its clients which range from those who require little or no control to those who require a high degree of control. This process required the Court administrators to resolve issues around its client input at the point of intake, where intensive effort is made to utilize other community resources, thereby preventing Court involvement.

The process of referring status offenders to community resources has proven to have many hazards, and all too frequently the child and family referred do not obtain the planned services. This can be attributed to the failure of the family and agency to establish the necessary relationship that would facilitate the counseling process. Since the services of many agencies are already overtaxed with their own clients and waiting lists, the clients the Court refers to them must be motivated to receive help. Moreover, many youth who come to the Court's attention as a status offender are also engaged in delinquent behavior. Consequently, the Juvenile Court along with its Advisory Committee took the position that the status offender should be handled by the Juvenile Court until a resource has been developed in the community to provide appropriate services to this group of clients.

**COURT DIVERSION  
PROJECT COMPLETES  
SUCCESSFUL YEARS**

The Court continued diverting such youngsters from the Juvenile Justice system through its Court Diversion Project and by processing many adolescents unofficially. In 1975

the Diversion Program referred two hundred and ninety-four (294) youth to community agencies for counseling. The high rate of success of counseling with families in the Court Diversion Program can be attributed to the continued use of Court authority even though the child is not directly involved with the juvenile justice system. The staff in the Court Diversion Program maintains close communication with the agency once a referral has been made, in order to ensure the family's involvement; thereby enabling the child to receive the necessary services. The basic concept of referring appropriate delinquent and unruly clients to community based non-correctional agencies on the basis of differing individual needs has proven that some children can be successfully diverted from the Juvenile Court system. This program has amply demonstrated its capabilities during its five years of working with community agencies such as the Center for Human Services, Catholic Counseling Center and the Neighborhood Centers Association.



**PROBATION STAFF  
MAINSTAY OF COURT**

Naturally, most youngsters who were referred to the Court were handled officially. It is at this point that the Court through its Probation Department determines the degree of social and legal intervention that is necessary to modify the child's behavior. The Ohio Revised Code mandates that the Court works with the child in his own home whenever this is possible, and separates the child from his parents only when necessary for his welfare or in the interest of public safety. Employing this approach usually means that our initial efforts in working with the child is through the use of probation services. Therefore, forty-five probation officers supervised 5,461 cases during 1975. A properly staffed, well-trained Probation Department worked diligently to affect the child's behavior to the extent that would enable him to continue his growth and development in his own home and school. The primary treatment modality used was short term counseling designed to get the child and his family back into the mainstream, thereby facilitating their acceptable functioning.

**WEST SIDE BRANCH  
OFFICES OPEN**

Much of the Probation Department's work with clients has been augmented by the development of two additional community counseling offices on the West Side of Cleveland. The basic philosophy of the West Side Community Counseling offices (working with clients in their own neighborhoods) is the same as that of the East Side Branch offices. However, the treatment modality is different. The West Side project is based on the premise that the problems of most youth are deeply rooted in their family and/or in their community. This project is dealing with those family and community forces which impact on youth and consequently affect their behavior. The youth's negative and self-destructive reactions to those forces are dealt with through two multi-service offices geared to provide probation and other expanded services. In addition to thirteen (13) probation officers, the project employs a family therapist and a group worker to expand their service delivery capability. Appropriate community resources are also utilized. The probation services are designed to use a differential treatment approach, thereby enabling the clients to receive more specialized attention. This is made possible through the use of the classification system, where the clients are assigned according to treatment needs with probation officers being trained to provide differential treatment. The use of extended hours enables the staff to be more accessible to clients. These two offices are serving clients on the Near West Side (located at 4115 Bridge Avenue) and the Far West Side (located at 3730 Rocky River Drive).

The four East Side Branch Probation offices are continuing to provide intensive probation services to their probationers with additional aid given by the Youth Workers.

**PROJECT FRIENDSHIP AND  
BIG BROTHERS CONTINUE  
TO WORK WITH COURT**

It is evident that all of the children who come to the attention of the Court will not only need social controls defined by the Court's

authority, but many are frequently alienated, friendless, and unloved. Some of these youngsters were referred to Project Friendship and Big Brothers Program who furnished effective supplemental services to them. These programs continued to provide companionship and role-modeling opportunities to those children lacking adequate parental figures. These two programs, which are staffed by volunteers from the community under the supervision of trained workers, have successfully worked with 261 children referred to them by the probation staff in 1975.

There was a serious loss of community resources in Cuyahoga County due to the lack of federal funding in 1975. Traditionally, the Court has referred probationers and their families to social agencies to augment official probation services under the Court's authority. Approximately one thousand referrals were made to the Center for Human Services, Catholic Counseling Center, Comprehensive Offenders Services, Community Mental Health Centers and Neighborhood Centers Association. Far too many of these children and families were placed on waiting lists because these agencies' services were already overtaxed.

**RESIDENTIAL**

**PLACEMENTS INCREASED**

While the Court worked diligently to provide services to children in their own homes, there are situations in which the need for separating the child from his family either because of his emotional well-being and/or his need for more controls have necessitated out-of-home placement. Placement in residential facilities for children in need of treatment outside of their own home setting is administered by the Court's Placement Unit. In 1975, the unit placed 249 children, of which one hundred and six (106) referrals were received on new complaints. An additional 143 children were transferred from probation status for placement. Including the 420 children either in placement or in after-care supervision, the placement unit supervised 669 children. The appropriateness of a child's placement in a private residential facility is determined on the bases of clinical diagnosis, social study and the child's capacities to function in a group setting. The Court uses a variety of residential settings that employ varying degrees of control and treatment intervention. This is a prime concern in selecting a residential placement for a particular child.

In further meeting the need for residential placement, the Court has been seriously handicapped by the controlled intake and limited bed space at the Youth Development Center. Most of the children who were placed in this facility were unruly children with some delinquencies, who have not responded to probation and have demonstrated the need for a controlled setting which will meet their educational needs.

Those children who are more seriously delinquent and need stronger controls are committed to the Ohio Youth Commission. The affect of the

decision by the legislature to remove the five month minimal stay of every child committed to an institution has not yet been determined. However, potentially this could mean more complaints filed in the Court.

The process of managing a system as complicated and diverse as the Juvenile Court has necessitated innovative planning which involves coordination and integration of all departments in order to achieve some level of coherence. However, with the growing number of clients, it has been difficult to always focus on client needs as opposed to agency function. Consequently, the Court is continually attempting to upgrade its services as well as taking an active role in the community to help create needed resources. In retrospect, the year 1975 was most critical for the Court because of its high volume of intake and the loss of many community resources. In spite of this, the Court's goal continues to be that of developing techniques for upgrading its service delivery system through updated methods of using both human resources as well as facilities to provide services in a more expeditious and effective manner for both the community and the children it refers to the Court.

**CITIZENS ADVISORY**

**COMMITTEE FACILITATES  
COURT'S FUNCTIONING**

In order to determine the best approach in obtaining its goal, the Court continues to work closely with its Advisory Committee to evaluate existing programs and to aid the Court in securing new services. The Advisory Committee is structured in steering committees to work more closely with each department. During the year the involvement of this committee has been invaluable to the Court's functioning.

**COURT CONTINUES TO  
UPGRADE SERVICE  
DELIVERY**

For the past several years, the Court has outlined a program of continued development both in operational procedures and quality of service provided to the community. Among these programs, has been the significant decentralization of probation services which has been accomplished as reported earlier in this report, with the latest step being the operation of the West Side Project in 1975. Another much needed improvement of Court service has occurred in the use of a family therapist and group worker in conjunction with the West Side Project, and its unique feature of the classification and treatment program.

Clinical services were increased to include diagnostic consultation with Dr. Irving Berger who has been appointed the director of this department.

A broader area of Court development is being achieved through the efforts of the Training Director's Office, responsible for the training of new staff as well as the on-going training and development of all staff. The Training Director served as a project director for a Management Training Program

conducted early in 1975 by Ernst and Ernst Consulting Firm, which was designed to improve administrative skills and techniques of the fifty Court and Detention Home supervising personnel. The program consisted of 60 hours of training and was enthusiastically received by the participating staff. Additional specialized training will be available for all staff levels in early 1976 and will be coordinated by the Training Director under the auspices of the Court Management Project.

Progress continued to be made regarding the development of a computerized information system. From a conceptual design proposed in 1974 by Touche-Ross and Company a detailed design of the system was developed by Arthur Andersen and Company. Late in 1975 the first step in the detailed design was implemented by beginning to computerize the Court's family record index, consisting of a half million references. Currently on-line entries of the data are being made from the Court's record room into the County Data Processing Center's facilities. When completed, the system will allow on-line retrieval of existing family record data regarding the clearing of new files as they are made through the intake section of the Court. As this system progresses, plans are also being made to implement the computerized programming of other aspects of Court operation.

The experiences and accomplishments of the Court during 1975 can be described only as milestones in its growth and development process. The improvement and refinement of these accomplishments will be the immediate goal of the Court.



## STATISTICAL HIGHLIGHTS

**COMPLAINTS INCREASED BY 2%** The moderate two percent (2%) increase in juvenile complaints filed with the Court in 1975, represents a leveling-off from the approximate 39% increase experienced since 1972. This trend appears to be following a pattern evident during the past decade of a moderation in complaints following a two-to-three year period of substantial increase. In the ten year period, 1966-1975, juvenile offenses have risen 61% from 7,296 to 11,887. An all time high of 11,887 juvenile complaints, i.e. 9,425 delinquency complaints and 2,462 unruly complaints, were filed in 1975. In addition to the delinquency and unruly complaints, 10,378 other children's cases were filed in 1975; which included: 9,807 Juvenile Traffic offenders, 115 Neglected Children's cases, 287 Dependent Children's cases, 57 Applications to Determine Custody, 25 Applications for Approval of Permanent Surrender, 56 Applications for Consent to Marry and 31 other cases involving children's matters.

The number of charges filed against adults were 1,311 cases which included: 282 cases of Non-Support of children, 859 Paternity complaints, 54 Contributing to Delinquency and Unruliness complaints, 41 Contempt of Court cases, and 75 other adult cases related to children's matters. Total complaints filed during the year, i.e. children's and adult cases, were 23,576 cases. In addition to these cases, 3,819 re-activated matters were filed during the year concerning further hearings on previously made Court orders; i.e. probation violations, motions, and review of earlier orders. The number of new filings and re-activated matters were 27,395 for 1975 compared with 26,733 in 1974, which indicates an increase of 2.5%. Other motions which were not docketed, but disposed of in chambers, included 532 motions filed by the County Welfare Department, Division of Social Services to terminate custody over children placed under its supervision by the Court in earlier matters. The Court also processed 210 applications for expungement of Juvenile records in accordance with the provisions of the Ohio Revised Code, which deems such record never to have existed under conditions of rehabilitation, if a child does not have additional Court involvement within two years of termination of the case.

In processing and providing service to the cases before it in 1975, the Court's experience was similar not only in volume, but in conditions prevalent in 1974. Additional staff secured in 1975 has permitted the Court to merely keep pace with the high volume of caseloads. In this regard, the Court's intake and Assignment facilities were taxed to full capacity in interviewing complainants and reviewing the charges brought by them. This process also involves the scheduling of Court hearing dockets and the assignment of cases for investigation and Court presentation to the Court's investigation staff to

ensure as prompt a hearing as possible. Along with this responsibility, this service also includes the preparation, issuance and documentation of all legal instruments attendant to the processing of the matters before the Court.

After notification of case responsibility for investigation and Court presentation from the assignment office, an investigating probation officer prepares a case history for the Court, which is obtained through interviews with the family and other pertinent sources including schools and social agencies. In 1975, as in 1974, the average number of case investigations conducted by the staff of approximately 40 investigators amounted to 18 for male staff and 13 for female staff per month. In the course of investigating the assigned cases, the investigating staff conducted 66% of their interviews in the home setting with 34% conducted in offices in the Court setting. In addition to the new cases for which the staff were responsible, they also had an average of 14 continued cases which were carried over from previous hearings for each month, which means that total case responsibility is approximately 32 cases per month that are in for Court hearings.

Probation supervision services were provided to 5,461 cases in 1975, by 45 supervising probation officers. The probation caseload increased by 3% over the 5,297 cases supervised in 1974. The average monthly caseload for male probation officers in the central office was 66 cases in 1975, compared with 64 cases in 1974. The average caseload for female staff in the central office was 62 in 1975 compared with 52 in 1974. The Neighborhood Counseling Center's male staff averaged a monthly caseload of 47 in 1975 as compared to 43 in 1974. The average caseload for the female staff in the Centers was 42 cases per month for both years. Approximately 75% of all probation supervision contacts occurred away from the central setting, in the child's own community.

**POSITIVE RESULTS OF  
DECENTRALIZATION**

As a result of the continued decentralization, there are only nineteen (42%) supervising probation officers based in the central Court building with twenty-six (58%) of the supervising probation officers being housed in field offices. These include Neighborhood Counseling Centers located in the Glenville, Hough and Cedar Social Planning areas of the city of Cleveland; additionally there are two west side offices and an office located in the city of East Cleveland that provide probation services to youngsters who live within these communities.

The Cleveland Heights Branch, Euclid and East Cleveland Branches also provide probation services to residents in those neighborhoods, in addition to maintaining intake and referee hearings of unofficial Court cases. Complaints processed through these three local facilities amounted to 1,921 cases, with 1,226 cases filed through the Cleveland Heights office (taking complaints from the eastern suburbs in the county); 359 cases from the city of Euclid office, and 336 cases from the city of East Cleveland office, the



latter two being restricted to complaints involving local residents.

The result of all probation experiences in 1975 depicted an output of approximately 5,000 cases with a high degree of positive outcomes. Seventy-two percent (2,117 cases) were terminated because of successful adjustment while on probation. Repeated offenses and probation violations resulted in commitment to public correctional institutions of sixteen percent (475 cases) of the total cases closed. Other closings in 1975 included: one percent transferred to other public agency supervision and eleven percent removed from the caseloads for other than successful adjustments such as absconding and the family moving to other jurisdictions.

The Court's dispositional process as well as probation services was facilitated by its clinical services. Clinical diagnoses to add further dimension to the development of treatment planning was ordered for 451 children in 1975. The results of the clinical examinations conducted by the Court's psychiatric and psychological panel are included in the diagnostic case material available to the Court for dispositional purposes. As in past years, the most frequent diagnosis made by the Court psychiatrists was that of adjustment reactions to adolescence, a transient situational disturbance (213 cases). See Table 9 for a listing of psychiatric diagnoses made during the year.

**DETENTION HOME  
SHOWS INCREASE**

The number of admissions to the Detention Home increased to 3,532 in 1975 compared with 3,267 in 1974, which indicates an increase of 8%. With the increase in admissions, the total number of days of care furnished amounted to 33,377 compared with 32,108 furnished in 1974. However, the average length of stay was reduced from 10 days in 1974 to 9 days in 1975. Detention Home services continued to serve the needs, both through remedial education programs, sponsored by the Cleveland Board of Education, and recreational activities of those children for whom a temporary period of detention was felt necessary prior to their Court hearing.

The Detention Home intake unit was quite successful in screening out inappropriate requests for admission to the Detention Home. A Detention Home hearing is conducted within 72 hours for every child in order to determine the necessity for holding the child. When a child remains in the Detention Home after the hearing with the Detention Home Referee, the case is scheduled for Court hearing within ten days of the child's admission into the Detention Home. A unit of four probation officers, i.e. three male and one female, were set up to facilitate this process.

Overall, there was little change in the number of delinquency and unruly filings in 1975 compared with those filed in 1974. As noted earlier in this report, the 11,887 filings recorded in 1975 represented an increase of 2% over the 11,615 cases recorded in 1974.

The most significant change occurred in delinquency complaints regarding girls, which increased by 9%, going from 1,527 in 1974 to 1,662 in 1975. Boys' delinquency complaints, on the other hand, increased slightly, by 1.3% from 7,663 complaints to 7,763 complaints. Unruly complaints regarding both boys and girls remained virtually the same as in 1974; 1,310 and 1,313 for boys in 1974 and 1975 respectively, and 1,115 and 1,149 for girls in 1974 and 1975 respectively. Total unruly complaints for boys and girls, therefore, amounted to 2,462 in 1975 compared with 2,425 in 1974. Total delinquency complaints for boys and girls amounted to 9,425 complaints in 1975 compared with 9,190 in 1974.

The increase in girls' delinquency complaints reflects the continuation of a pattern evident for the past decade. Since 1966, girls' delinquency cases have risen steadily from 507 complaints recorded in that year to the 1,662 complaints recorded in 1975, for an increase of 228% or more than three times the number dealt with ten years ago. Boys' delinquency complaints, on the other hand, during the same period increased by 72%, going from 4,491 complaints to 7,763 complaints. Unruly complaints for both boys and girls in the past decade have increased at a much lower rate than delinquency complaints. For boys in the unruly category, the ten-year increase was 3.3%, from 1,271 to 1,313 complaints, while for the girls, such complaints increased by 12%, from 1,027 complaints to 1,149 complaints.

For the five-year period, 1966 through 1970, the proportion of delinquency complaints for all boys filed on was 80% of the total, with 20% being filed on as unruly. The five-year period, 1971-1975, produced a shift to a ratio of 85% delinquency filings of the total boys filed on compared with 15% of filings regarding unruliness.

Delinquency complaints for girls accounted for 54% of the total complaints against them, compared with 46% of the complaints being for unruliness for the five-year period, 1971-1975. This is a virtual reversal of the delinquency-unruly ratio experienced for the five-year period, 1966-1970, when delinquency complaints comprised 42% of total girls' complaints, with unruly complaints at that time in the majority, representing 58% of the total complaints against them.

For the year 1975 alone, 86% of the complaints against boys involved delinquency filings and 14% were for unruliness. For girls in that year the ratio was 59% delinquency and 41% unruly.

As in past years, the single most frequent complaint regarding boys was for unlawful entry and stealing which numbered 1,382 complaints in 1975 compared with 1,334 in 1974, and accounted for 15% of all boys' cases. Other theft offenses, including shoplifting, amounted to 1,509 complaints in

1975 compared with 1,607 in 1974, and accounted for 17% of all boys' cases. The next most frequent offense for boys was that of injury to person, with 763 complaints recorded in 1975 compared with 676 in 1974. Other most frequent offenses regarding boys included: auto trespassing, 683 cases compared with 667 in 1974; incorrigibility, 669 compared with 703 in 1974; theft from person, up to 572 cases compared with 521 in 1974; drug and narcotic violations, at 535 compared with 665 in 1974, and possession of weapons complaints, up to 230 complaints compared with 207 in 1974.

For girls, theft complaints, including shoplifting, represented the most frequent reason for complaints against them. These amounted to 774 cases compared with 819 cases recorded in 1974, and represented 28% of the total complaints regarding girls. Incorrigibility was the next most frequent complaint regarding girls with 729 cases recorded compared with 816 in 1974, representing 26% of the total complaints against girls. Injury to person complaints were the next most frequent complaints against girls, with 307 cases reported in 1975 compared with 237 for 1974, representing 11% of all girls' cases. Other most frequent complaints regarding girls included: truancy, 181 cases; running away, 144 cases; and disorderly conduct, 113 cases. A significant increase was noted in possession of weapons complaints involving girls which rose from 5 cases in 1974 to 42 cases in 1975.

Complaints brought by the police departments in the county accounted for nearly 60% of the total filings. Those brought by the Cleveland Police Department specifically accounted for 30% of the total, and those brought by other police departments in Cuyahoga County accounted for 28% of the total filings. Parents and relatives were responsible for 12% of the filings and store security personnel filed 10% of the total complaints. Eight percent of the filings were made by citizens, and 6% came from the various school systems in the county; those filed by the Cleveland Board of Education numbered 376, and constituted 3.5% of the total. Those filed by suburban school systems amounted to 325, and accounted for 3% of the total filings.

For the third consecutive year, juvenile complaints increased in the City of Cleveland after a decline of 7% recorded in 1972. Since then, each year has produced an increase. In 1973, the increase was 6%, and in 1974, City of Cleveland cases increased by 14%. The increase recorded for 1975, however, moderated to slightly less than 3%, from 6,860 cases to 7,037 cases. Complaints regarding children living elsewhere in the county declined by slightly less than 3%, from 4,214 cases in 1974 to 4,102 cases in 1975.

The City of Cleveland-Suburban ratio of cases distribution was approximately the same as last year, with 62% of the cases involving children living in the City of Cleveland, and 36% concerning children living elsewhere in the county compared with a ratio of 61% and 38% respectively in 1974.

Two percent of the 1975 complaints involved children who lived out of Cuyahoga County or in agency placements, compared to 1% in those categories in 1974.

The child population, ages 11 through 17, living in the City of Cleveland is estimated to be approximately 102,275, or 40% of the total county population in this age group. The suburban population in this age group is estimated to be 136,209, or 60% of the total population in this age group. Relating these population estimates to the number of cases filed, produces a juvenile offense rate of 68.8 per 1,000 children living in the City of Cleveland compared with 67 per 1,000 in 1974, and a rate of 30.1 per 1,000 children living elsewhere in the county, compared with a rate of 30.9 per 1,000 children last year.

The geographical distribution of juvenile cases from the entire county was as follows: 7,372 cases, or 66% from the eastern part of the county and 3,767, or 34% from the western part of the county. The distribution within the City of Cleveland was as follows: 71% from the eastern part of the city, and 29% from the western part of the city. The suburban distribution within the county was 57% from the eastern suburbs and 43% from the western suburbs.

Within the City of Cleveland, nearly one-third of all juvenile cases came from the Central, Glenville and Hough social planning areas with 707,823 and 662 cases respectively. An additional 14% of the city's cases came from the Near West Side and Tremont social planning areas, with 689 and 301 cases respectively. Another high delinquency area, the Corlett Social planning area registered 517 cases, or 7% of the total juvenile cases. In 1973 and 1974, the incidence of juvenile offenses increased in the Glenville and Hough social planning areas. Prior to that time, however, the two areas evidenced declines in juvenile offenses for the three-year period, 1970 to 1972. While Glenville was the first highest area in 1975, and Hough was the third highest (the Near West Side was second) the complaints from both areas were virtually the same as in 1974, with 823 for Glenville compared with 830 in 1974, and 662 for Hough compared with 657 in 1974. The Near West Side social planning area, while the second highest in juvenile offense frequency, evidenced a decrease of 9%, from 775 cases in 1974 to 689 cases in 1975. The Central areas increased by 18%, from 602 cases in 1974 to 707 cases in 1975. Other social planning areas in the City of Cleveland experiencing increases over 1974 were: Kinsman, from 119 to 171; Lee-Miles, from 255 to 284; South Broadway, from 128 to 191, and Tremont, from 277 to 301.

For suburban municipalities, the incidence of highest juvenile offenses were ranked as follows: East Cleveland, 472 cases (up from 431 in 1974); Cleveland Heights, 393 cases (up from 319 in 1974); Lakewood, 307 cases

(up from 283 in 1974); Euclid, 295 cases (down from 348 in 1974); Parma, 285 cases (down from 344 in 1974); and Brook Park, 210 cases (down from 250 in 1974). These six communities accounted for 48% of the total suburban juvenile offenses.

Total commitments to public correctional institutions (including those reported earlier in this report committed from a probation status) increased 15% in 1975 over 1974, going from 860 in that year to 988 in 1975. Commitments of boys to the Ohio Youth Commission increased by 26%, from 533 in 1974 to 699 in 1975. Those of girls to the Ohio Youth Commission, on the other hand, declined by 23%, from 106 to 82. There were 13% less boys committed to the Youth Development Center, operated by Cuyahoga County, in 1975 than in 1974, going from 159 to 138 in 1975. Commitment of girls to the Youth Development Center increased by 64% over 1974, from 42 to 69. It should be noted that the 1974 commitment rate of girls to the Youth Development Center was unusually low, and was occasioned by the transfer of girls' facilities from Blossom Hill School for girls in Brecksville, Ohio to the campus of the Cleveland Boys' School in Hudson, Ohio which was renamed the Youth Development Center and serves as a co-educational facility.

Transfers to the General Division of the Common Pleas Court rose to 92 boys' cases in 1975 from 55 cases in 1974, for an increase of 67%. The annual average for such transfers for the five-year period 1970 to 1974 was 33 cases. Transfers to the General Division of the Common Pleas Court to be tried as an adult may be made by the Juvenile Division in cases where the offense committed by a child of at least sixteen years of age would be a felony if committed by an adult, and, if after duly prescribed testing, the child is found not to be amenable to rehabilitation through the Juvenile Court facilities.

Dismissal of delinquency and unruly complaints by the court amounted to 1,738 cases, an increase of 34% over the 1,296 dismissals made in 1974. Included in these are not only those cases dismissed for procedural reasons, but also those cases for which dismissals of the charges were made after a successful adjustment to a temporary probation order or compliance with the requirements of certain programs such as the Court Diversion Project and the Comprehensive Offender Service Program.

In other matters before the Court, a total of 507 children were placed in the custody of the Cuyahoga County Welfare Department, Division of Social Services as a result of neglect and dependency complaints made in their behalf. Placements for temporary care and custody involved 486 children, and orders for permanent care and custody involved 21 children. In addition, 25 applications for permanent surrender of children were granted to the Welfare Department for purpose of adoption. The number of juvenile traffic offenders referred in 1975 were virtually the same as in 1974, 9,807 in 1975

compared with 9,786 in 1974. The suspension of the driver's license continued to be the most effective and frequent disposition in traffic cases used to impress upon the offender the need for safe driving habits.

Charges against adults increased from 1,241 in 1974 to 1,311 in 1975. The most significant change occurred in the filing of paternity complaints which rose by 19%, from 723 cases to 859 cases. A total of 54 adults were filed on for contributing to delinquency or unruliness in 1975 compared with 63 filed on for such charges in 1974.

In addition to several hundred re-activated child support matters for non-compliance with previously made support orders, 282 new non-support matters were filed in 1975. In all support payment matters, including non-support and bastardy cases wherein the payment of support is ordered by the court, follow-up referral is made to the court's Child Support Department, which in 1975 had an active caseload of approximately 10,000 cases under its supervision, including those carried over from previous years.

Money for the support of children paid and disbursed through the cashier's office of the court amounted to \$2,830,005.76. Of this amount, \$1,284,537.29 was disbursed directly to the mother or relative caring for the children. An additional \$1,437,778.22 was disbursed to the Cuyahoga County Welfare Department. Of this amount, \$64,055.26 was disbursed to the Division of Social Services in payment for care rendered, and \$1,373,722.96 was disbursed directly to welfare services in relation to welfare clients in whose behalf court orders for support were made. Other collections made by the Cashier's Office included: \$22,258.07 in damages for disbursement to victims of delinquent acts and \$107,084.74 in court costs. The total amount collected by the Cashier's Office amounted to \$3,229,670.68.

Please see Tables A, B, C and 1 through 10, for a complete listing of all the statistical data covered in this report.



The judges of the Juvenile Court Division continued in 1975, as in past years, to participate in a variety of local, state and national programs and organizations dedicated to youth services and to promoting the development and improvement of the juvenile justice system. In addition to innumerable talks given to various civic, professional and social groups, the judges participated in the following 1975 activities.



JUDGE JOHN J. TONER continued to serve as Administrative Judge during 1975. He also continued to serve as Chairman of the Youth Services Advisory Board of the Ohio Youth Commission. In addition, he served as a member of the Criminal Justice Co-ordinating Council, the Family Law Committee of the Ohio State Bar Association, the Cuyahoga County Welfare Department Advisory Board, the Police Athletic League Board of Trustees, the Juvenile Information System Requirement Analysis Committee of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges, and as Chairman of the Council's Time and Place Committee. Judge Toner's other memberships include: The Catholic Counseling Center Advisory Board, Court Management Project, the Administration of Justice Committee, the Board of Trustees of the Federation for Community Planning, and the Boys' Town Advisory Board. Judge Toner also participated in the 1975 Institute on Criminal Justice conducted by the Urban League.

JUDGE WALTER G. WHITLATCH served in 1975 as President of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges. He was also appointed by the Department of State as a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations Congress on Crime and Treatment of Offenders. The Congress, held in Geneva, Switzerland, was of a two week duration. Among the many groups he addressed during the year were the National Association of Secondary Principals and the National Advisory Council of the Federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Included among Judge Whitlatch's many youth services activities are memberships on the board of directors of the Ohio Boys Town, Pennsylvania Junior Republic, the Hillcrest Y.M.C.A. and Project Friendship, Inc.

JUDGE ANGELO J. GAGLIARDO was elected in 1975 as Second Vice-President of the Catholic Family and Children's Services. He is the past president of the Nationalities Services Center and currently continues as a member of the Center's Executive Committee. Judge Gagliardo served as a lecturer on In-Service Training for Juvenile Judges for the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges. He also served as Chairman of the Advisory Committee to the Ohio Supreme Court on Juvenile Rules.

JUDGE JOHN F. CORRIGAN served in 1975 as Chairman of the Accreditation Committee of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges. The Council is seeking to improve the quality of justice for juveniles by setting standards for the Accreditation of Juvenile Courts. Judge Corrigan is also the Chairman of the Government Relations Committee of the Ohio Juvenile Court Judges Association. He served in 1975 as a lecturer at the North Star Council of Government Seminar. Judge Corrigan initiated and led the successful effort to amend the Public Employees Collective Bargaining Bill so that the independence and integrity of the Judicial Branch of Government in Ohio would be preserved.

TABLE A

## Area of Residence, Minors Filed as Delinquents, Unruly

1975 and 1974

AREA OF RESIDENCE

City of Cleveland By Social Planning Areas	Boy's Cases		Girl's Cases		Total Cases	
	1975	1974	1975	1974	1975	1974
Central	135	122	45	40	180	162
Central - East	162	130	77	60	239	190
Central - West	235	200	53	50	288	250
Clark -Fulton	190	143	38	41	228	184
Corlett	383	423	134	142	517	565
Denison	103	103	19	32	122	135
Downtown	20	9	6	2	26	11
Edgewater	30	38	20	22	50	60
Glenville	603	641	220	189	823	830
Goodrich	55	59	11	7	66	66
Hough	478	488	184	169	662	657
Jefferson	91	90	36	26	127	116
Kinsman	127	83	44	36	171	119
Lee-Miles	199	192	85	63	284	255
Mt. Pleasant	240	251	79	71	319	322
Near West Side	533	633	156	122	689	755
North Broadway	117	106	31	43	148	149
North Collinwood	83	91	25	23	108	114
Norwood	210	190	33	40	243	230
Puritas-Belaire	121	117	31	47	152	164
Riverside	121	114	24	30	145	144
South Broadway	150	105	41	23	191	128
South Brooklyn	112	94	26	20	138	114
South Collinwood	190	193	58	61	248	254
Tremont	244	210	57	67	301	277
University	49	47	15	16	64	63
West Side	149	148	46	47	195	195
Woodland Hills	232	267	81	84	313	351
TOTAL, City of Cleveland	5,362	5,287	1,675	1,573	7,037	6,860

TABLE A, Continued

## Area of Residence, Minors Filed as Delinquents, Unruly

1975 and 1974

AREA OF RESIDENCE

	Boy's Cases		Girl's Cases		Total Cases	
	<u>1975</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1974</u>
Suburban Cities						
Bay Village	90	88	17	8	107	96
Beachwood	15	54	2	7	17	61
Bedford	86	61	9	13	95	74
Bedford Heights	49	69	15	14	64	83
Berea	52	53	14	18	66	71
Brecksville	6	31	4	12	10	43
Broadview Heights	16	34	3	7	19	41
Brooklyn	29	38	10	10	39	48
Brook Park	172	200	38	50	210	250
Cleveland Heights	285	241	108	78	393	319
East Cleveland	369	342	103	89	472	431
Euclid	221	278	74	70	295	348
Fairview Park	40	52	10	15	50	67
Garfield Heights	126	116	38	33	164	149
Independence	14	9	2	2	16	11
Lakewood	259	221	48	62	307	283
Lyndhurst	51	46	10	9	61	55
Maple Heights	90	123	26	32	116	155
Mayfield Heights	40	43	23	13	63	56
Middleburg Heights	40	45	11	13	51	58
North Olmsted	107	82	21	20	128	102
North Royalton	36	48	8	8	44	56
Parma	227	253	58	91	285	344
Parma Heights	75	83	17	10	92	93
Richmond Heights	11	22	1	2	12	24
Rocky River	39	51	9	12	48	63
Seven Hills	34	33	4	7	38	40
Shaker Heights	75	50	30	37	105	87
Solon	21	23	8	12	29	35
South Euclid	103	81	13	24	116	105
Strongsville	66	58	15	24	81	82
University Heights	50	38	21	9	71	47
Warrensville Heights	74	64	21	35	95	99
Westlake	74	33	26	11	100	44

TABLE A, Continued

## Area of Residence, Minors Filed as Delinquents, Unruly

1975 and 1974

AREA OF RESIDENCE	Boy's Cases		Girl's Cases		Total Cases	
	1975	1974	1975	1974	1975	1974
Suburban Villages & Townships						
Bentleyville	-	-	1	-	1	-
Bratenahl	13	1	2	-	15	1
Brooklyn Heights	3	4	-	-	3	4
Chagrin Falls	15	42	6	3	21	45
Cuyahoga Heights	1	6	1	-	2	6
Gates Mills	2	8	4	-	6	8
Glenwillow	1	-	-	-	1	-
Highland Heights	19	28	4	3	23	31
Hunting Valley	-	-	1	1	1	1
Linndale	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mayfield	6	12	3	2	9	14
Moreland Hills	4	13	4	1	8	14
Newburgh Heights	14	16	5	-	19	16
North Randall	2	2	-	2	2	4
Oakwood	10	39	-	10	10	49
Olmsted Falls	9	10	8	5	17	15
Orange Village	9	11	2	7	11	18
Pepper Pike	13	13	3	4	16	17
Valley View	10	7	-	-	10	7
Walton Hills	13	7	3	-	16	7
Westview	16	7	5	4	21	11
Woodmere	1	-	-	-	1	-
Chagrin Falls Township	1	1	-	-	1	1
Olmsted Township	17	15	7	5	24	20
Riveredge Township	2	1	-	1	2	2
Warrensville Township	3	3	-	-	3	3
TOTAL SUBURBS	3,226	3,309	876	905	4,102	4,214
Agency Residents	25	21	24	10	49	31
Out-of-County Residents	115	91	27	26	142	117
Area Designation Unknown	348	265	209	128	557	393
GRAND TOTAL	9,076	8,973	2,811	2,642	11,887	11,615

TABLE B

## Source of Complaints - Delinquency and Unruly Cases, 1975

<u>SOURCE OF COMPLAINT</u>	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
Cleveland Police Department	2,891	353	3,244
Other County Police Departments	2,645	386	3,031
Other Police (State, Private, etc.)	146	28	174
Store Security	485	585	1,070
Other Juvenile Courts	100	41	141
Cleveland Board of Education	242	134	376
Other County School Boards	211	114	325
Social Agencies	39	43	82
Parents, Relatives	567	763	1,330
Citizens	648	254	902
Other Sources	178	26	204
Not Reported	924	84	1,008
TOTAL	<u>9,076</u>	<u>2,811</u>	<u>11,887</u>

TABLE C  
Ages of Delinquent and Unruly Children - 1975

<u>AGE</u>	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
Eight and Under	29	5	34
Nine	67	11	78
Ten	129	15	144
Eleven	188	39	227
Twelve	327	86	413
Thirteen	650	315	965
Fourteen	1,189	517	1,706
Fifteen	1,633	642	2,275
Sixteen	2,119	584	2,703
Seventeen	2,375	512	2,887
Unknown	370	85	455
TOTAL	9,076	2,811	11,887



TABLE 1  
TOTAL COMPLAINTS, 1975 COMPARED WITH 1974

NEW COMPLAINTS	1975	1974
Children's Cases:		
Delinquency: Boys . . . . .	7,763	7,663
Girls . . . . .	1,662	1,527
TOTAL DELINQUENCY . . . . .	9,425	9,190
Unruliness: Boys . . . . .	1,313	1,310
Girls . . . . .	1,149	1,115
TOTAL UNRULINESS . . . . .	2,462	2,425
TOTAL DELINQUENCY and UNRULINESS . . . . .	11,887	11,615
Juvenile Traffic Offenders . . . . .	9,807	9,786
Neglected Children's Cases . . . . .	115	111
Dependent Children's Cases . . . . .	287	251
Application to Determine Custody . . . . .	57	83
Application for Approval of Permanent Surrender . . . . .	25	29
Application for Consent to Marry . . . . .	56	104
Writ of Habeas Corpus . . . . .	13	22
Applications, Photos, Fingerprints . . . . .	16	21
Other Cases . . . . .	2	2
TOTAL CHILDREN'S CASES . . . . .	22,265	22,024
ADULT CASES		
Non-Support of Children . . . . .	282	349
Neglect of Children . . . . .	8	14
Endangering Children . . . . .	12	18
Contributing to Delinquency . . . . .	20	26
Contributing to Unruliness . . . . .	34	37
Paternity Complaints . . . . .	859	723
Certifications and Motions . . . . .	29	30
Contempt of Court . . . . .	41	29
Other Cases . . . . .	26	15
TOTAL ADULT CASES . . . . .	1,311	1,241
TOTAL, NEW COMPLAINTS . . . . .	23,576	23,265
ALIAS COMPLAINTS . . . . .	3,819	3,468
GRAND TOTAL, NEW AND ALIAS COMPLAINTS . . . . .	27,395	26,733

TABLE 2

## DELINQUENCY AND UNRULY COMPLAINTS, 1975 COMPARED WITH 1974

COMPLAINT	Boys		Girls		Total	
	1975	1974	1975	1974	1975	1974
Auto Theft . . . . .	41	22	-	1	41	23
Auto Trespassing . . . . .	683	667	52	47	735	714
Unlawful Entry and Stealing . .	1,382	1,334	65	46	1,447	1,380
Shoplifting . . . . .	621	1,027	648	755	1,269	1,782
Other Theft . . . . .	888	580	126	64	1,014	644
Theft from Person . . . . .	572	521	25	19	597	540
Other Property Offenses . . . . .	178	233	30	23	208	256
Homicide . . . . .	27	26	5	2	32	28
Injury to Person . . . . .	763	676	307	237	1,070	913
Destruction of Property . . . . .	455	435	34	26	489	461
Disorderly Conduct . . . . .	457	368	113	89	570	457
Possession of Weapons . . . . .	230	207	42	5	272	212
Arson . . . . .	53	57	10	1	63	58
Trespassing on Property . . . . .	292	309	38	26	330	335
Glue and Toxic Vapor Sniffing .	59	86	8	16	67	102
Drug and Narcotics Violations .	535	665	82	104	617	769
Liquor Offenses . . . . .	127	221	25	26	152	247
Sex Offenses . . . . .	128	95	13	10	141	105
Incorrigibility . . . . .	669	703	729	816	1,398	1,519
Truancy . . . . .	251	303	181	198	432	501
Running Away . . . . .	85	17	144	33	229	50
Curfew Violation . . . . .	240	182	67	30	307	212
Other Complaint . . . . .	340	239	67	68	407	307
<b>TOTAL . . . . .</b>	<b>9,076</b>	<b>8,973</b>	<b>2,811</b>	<b>2,642</b>	<b>11,887</b>	<b>11,615</b>

TABLE 3

## DISPOSITIONS MADE IN DELINQUENCY AND UNRULY CASES, 1975

OFFICIAL CASES	Boys	Girls	Total
Placed on Probation . . . . .	2,296	709	3,005
Placed in Private Treatment Centers . . . . .	99	35	134
Committed or Returned to Public Institutions			
Ohio Youth Commission . . . . .	562	22	584
Youth Development Center, Cuyahoga County . . . . .	82	18	100
Total Committed or Returned to Institutions . . . . .	644	40	684
Certified to Other Juvenile Courts . . . . .	60	10	70
Transferred to Criminal Division, Common Pleas Court.	92	-	92
Continued Under Supervision of Parole Officer . . . . .	53	3	56
Continued Under Supervision, County Welfare Dept. . . . .	39	32	71
Referred to Court Diversion Project . . . . .	71	64	135
Committed to Parents, Relatives . . . . .	189	44	233
Order Made in Other Cases . . . . .	793	78	871
Other Disposition . . . . .	144	17	161
Dismissed by the Court . . . . .	1,196	245	1,441
Withdrawn by Complainant . . . . .	107	87	194
Continued, or Set for Hearing in 1976 . . . . .	840	277	1,117
TOTAL OFFICIAL DISPOSITIONS: . . . . .	6,623	1,641	8,264
UNOFFICIAL CASES	Boys	Girls	Total
Adjusted by Referee . . . . .	1,615	698	2,313
Referred to Court Diversion Project . . . . .	51	25	76
Probation Officer to Supervise . . . . .	141	84	225
Referred to Community Agency . . . . .	28	28	56
Made Official . . . . .	116	64	180
Other Disposition . . . . .	94	74	168
Dismissed by Referee . . . . .	199	98	297
Withdrawn by Complainant . . . . .	67	23	90
Continued, or Set for Hearing in 1976 . . . . .	142	76	218
TOTAL UNOFFICIAL DISPOSITIONS: . . . . .	2,453	1,170	3,623

TABLE 4  
 CASES UNDER SUPERVISION OF THE PROBATION  
 AND PLACEMENT DEPARTMENTS, 1975

MOVEMENT OF CASES	Probation Dept.		Placement Dept.	Total
	Male Staff	Female Staff		
Brought Forward, January, 1975 . . . . .	1,598	695	420	2,713
Received for Supervision . . . . .	2,319	849	249	3,417
Total Under Supervision . . . . .	3,917	1,544	669	6,130
Removed for Supervision . . . . .	2,175	774	228	3,177
Carried Forward to 1976 . . . . .	1,742	770	441	2,953

TABLE 5  
 CHILDREN UNDER CARE IN DETENTION HOME - 1975

MOVEMENT	Boys	Girls	Total
Under Care, January 1, 1975 . . . . .	47	18	65
Admitted During the Year . . . . .	2,527	1,005	3,532
Total Under Care During Year . . . . .	2,574	1,023	3,597
Released During Year . . . . .	2,541	1,005	3,546
Under Care December 31, 1975 . . . . .	33	18	51
Total Days of Care Furnished . . . . .	23,757	9,620	33,377
Average Daily Population . . . . .	65	26	91
Average Length of Stay in Days . . . . .	9	9	9

TABLE 6  
 DISPOSITION OF CHILDREN IN OFFICIAL  
 NEGLECT AND DEPENDENCY CASES - 1975

DISPOSITION	Neglect	Dependency	Total
Committed to Parents or Relatives . . . . .	9	6	15
Committed to the County Welfare Department:			
Temporary Care and Custody . . . . .	140	346	486
Permanent Care and Custody . . . . .	5	16	21
Committed to Other Agencies . . . . .	2	8	10
Dismissed or Withdrawn . . . . .	18	20	38
Continued, or Set for Hearing in 1976 . . . . .	6	5	11
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHILDREN . . . . .	180	401	581

TABLE 7  
DISPOSITION OF ADULTS IN OFFICIAL NEGLIGENCE,  
NON-SUPPORT, DELINQUENCY AND UNRULY CASES, 1975

DISPOSITION	Neglect Non-Support	Delinquency and Unruly	Total
Committed to Cleveland House of Correction . . . . .	1	2	3
Court Order to Support Minor Children . . . . .	54	—	54
Sentence Suspended:			
On Condition of Proper Behavior . . . . .	—	17	17
Pay Fine and/or Cost . . . . .	—	2	2
Other Order . . . . .	1	—	1
Dismissed or Withdrawn . . . . .	35	20	55
Continued, or Set for Hearing in 1976 . . . . .	36	9	45
<b>TOTAL ADULTS CHARGED . . . . .</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>177</b>

TABLE 8  
REPORT OF THE INTAKE - AFFIDAVIT DEPARTMENT

ACTION TAKEN AT INTAKE	Number of Complaints Received
New Cases Accepted for Court Action . . . . .	13,769 *
Alias Cases Set for Court Hearing . . . . .	3,819
<b>Total Accepted for Court Action . . . . .</b>	<b>17,588</b>
Disposed of Without Court Action:	
Referred to Social Agencies . . . . .	279
Referred to Boards of Education . . . . .	108
Referred to Police Departments . . . . .	199
Referred to Other Courts . . . . .	81
Referred to Court Diversion Project . . . . .	83
Referred to Court Probation Staff . . . . .	348
Referred to Other Services . . . . .	57
Disposed of by Intake Worker . . . . .	547
Disposed of by Correspondence . . . . .	353
<b>TOTAL DISPOSED OF WITHOUT COURT ACTION . . . . .</b>	<b>2,055</b>

\* Excludes 9,807 Juvenile Traffic Offenses which were docketed upon receipt of traffic violation citations.

TABLE 9  
 DIAGNOSES OF PATIENTS EXAMINED  
 BY THE COURT PSYCHIATRISTS - 1975

DIAGNOSIS	Boys	Girls	Adults	Total
Psychosis:				
Schizophrenia, various types . . . . .	3	2	1	6
Other . . . . .	3	-	-	3
Neurosis:				
Depressive Reaction . . . . .	12	3	-	15
Phobic Reaction . . . . .	1	2	-	3
Other . . . . .	1	-	-	1
Personality Disorders:				
Passive-Aggressive Personality . . . . .	50	6	1	57
Inadequate Personality . . . . .	4	1	-	5
Anti-Social Personality . . . . .	14	-	-	14
Hysterical Personality . . . . .	4	14	-	18
Explosive Personality . . . . .	7	3	-	10
Schizoid Personality . . . . .	2	1	-	3
Paranoid Personality . . . . .	1	-	-	1
Other Personality Disorders . . . . .	14	1	-	15
Transient Situational Disturbances:				
Adjustment Reaction of Childhood . . . . .	5	-	-	5
Adjustment Reaction of Adolescence . . . . .	158	55	-	213
Behavior Disorders:				
Withdrawn Reaction . . . . .	1	-	-	1
Overanxious Reaction . . . . .	5	-	-	5
Runaway Reaction . . . . .	-	4	-	4
Unsocialized Aggressive Reaction . . . . .	5	-	-	5
Group Delinquent Reaction . . . . .	10	2	-	12
Other Behavior Disorders . . . . .	1	1	-	2
Other Disorders:				
Mental Retardation . . . . .	9	5	1	15
Drug Dependence . . . . .	13	-	-	13
Sexual Deviation . . . . .	2	-	1	3
Alcoholism . . . . .	3	-	-	3
Other Diagnosis:				
Diagnosis Deferred . . . . .	5	4	-	9
No Diagnosis Made . . . . .	9	5	-	14
TOTAL EXAMINATIONS . . . . .	342	109	4	455



TABLE 10

COLLECTION OF MONEY BY THE COURT AND DISTRIBUTION  
OF MONEY FOR THE SUPPORT OF MINOR CHILDREN

TYPE OF COLLECTION	
For Support of Children . . . . .	\$2,830,005.76
Damages or Restitution . . . . .	22,258.07
Poundage . . . . .	27,799.47
Fines . . . . .	13,367.25
Costs . . . . .	107,084.74
Appearance Bonds . . . . .	27,117.85
Maternity Hospital Collection . . . . .	4,751.22
State of Ohio - Educational Subsidy . . . . .	81,631.15
Miscellaneous General Collections . . . . .	115,655.17
TOTAL AMOUNT COLLECTED . . . . .	\$3,229,670.68
Money for Support of Children Disbursed To:	
Parents and Relatives . . . . .	\$1,284,537.29
Public Agencies:	
Cuyahoga County Welfare Department . . . . .	1,437,778.22
Other Tax - Supported Agencies and Institutions . . . . .	5,169.87
TOTAL PUBLIC AGENCIES . . . . .	\$1,442,948.09
Private Agencies:	
Residential Placements . . . . .	65,785.50
Local Agencies and Institutions . . . . .	36,734.88
TOTAL PRIVATE AGENCIES . . . . .	102,520.38
GRAND TOTAL OF SUPPORT MONEY DISBURSED . . . . .	\$2,830,005.76

# DIRECTORY OF PERSONNEL

## COMMON PLEAS COURT

### JUVENILE COURT DIVISION

2163 East 22nd Street

Telephone: 771-8400

*HON. JOHN J. TONER, Administrative Judge*

*HON. WALTER G. WHITLATCH, Judge*

*HON. ANGELO J. GAGLIARDO, Judge*

*HON. JOHN F. CORRIGAN, Judge*

*ERVIN J. WIERZBINSKI, Administrator*

### LEGAL SERVICES

*JOHN J. SWEENEY, Director*

*WILLIAM KURTZ, Assistant Director*

### REFEREES:

Donna Catliota

Sam Durante

William Fraunfelder

Richard Graham

George McCreedy

Garlandine Mallory

Margaret Mazza

Jeanne Winkler

### CLERK'S OFFICE

*ANDREW PIERCE, Chief Deputy Clerk*

### BAILIFFS:

Sue Fisher

Andrew Ladika

Michael O'Grady

Fred O'Malley

### JUDGES' CLERKS:

Janice French

Ruth Gorman

Madaline Kelly

Bonnie Seiber

### INTAKE OFFICERS:

Rosa Benton

Sharon Berman

Jack Di Cillo

Peter Baumgartner,

Docket Review Officer

Steve Pollok

Wayne Strunk

### SOCIAL SERVICES

### PROBATION DEPARTMENT

*ANDREW J. DeSANTI, Chief Probation Officer*

*VICTOR M. MACHA, JR., Assistant Chief Probation Officer*

### CASE SUPERVISIONS:

Rudiene Brabson

Francis Hogan

Doris Hunt

Millard Jones, Jr.

Edgar MacConnell

Margaret Mueller

Charlotte Perry

Gladys Rubin

PROBATION OFFICERS, MAIN COURT

Eli Abouserhal	Mary Ann Konrad	Donald Perry
Ann Arrington	Darlene Lamb	Mack Pinkney
Nanee Bennett	John Lepo	Pat Raitano
Angela Blount	Steven Leverich	Elizabeth Ramsey
Dan Bosley	John Lowey	Deborah Reaves
Jane Burt	Dan Lyon	William Roche
Timothy Campbell	Sharon Lyon	Carl Sanniti
Victor Cohea	Ronald Malone	Patricia Schraff
Richard Donelan	Melvin McCray	Donald Schwallie
Scott Graham	William McCullough	Cornell Sledge
Herman Hairston	Thomas McGuiness	Dennis Soltis
Christine Hamlin	Rebecca McLeroy	Jack Sonneborn, Jr.
Kenneth Hirz	Mark Mattern	Charles Sprague
David Horton	Mark Melena	Mary Thomas
John Howley	Harold Miller	Michael Violi
Lamont Johnson	Lorenzo Norris	Cynthia Ward
Robert Kahl	Ronald Nowakowski	Jacqueline Warren
Norman Kiner	Kathleen Owens	Ellen Welsh
Robert Koeth	Tom Pearson	Gayle Wiggins
	Russell Perkins	James Young

PLACEMENT UNIT

*DONALD PEAK, Supervisor*

PROBATION OFFICERS:

Jack Cervelli	Patrick O'Donnell	Donald Switzer
Robert Hanna	James Manuel	Cathy Witt
	Earl Matthews	

COMMUNITY COUNSELING CENTERS PROJECT

*ROBERT TWOHEY, Director*

CASEWORK SUPERVISORS:

Marwan Jadeed	Allen Maragliano	Jearlene Rogers
---------------	------------------	-----------------

PROBATION OFFICERS:

Jerrald Arnold	Elizabeth Douglas	Richard Walker
Sylvia Baugham	Rudolph Hoston	Joseph Whalen
Ann Chambers	Robert Jennings	Leonard Young
Helen Curry	Louis Moore	Kevin Zehe
	Johnny Pollard	

YOUTH WORKERS:

Barry Alvis	Larry Gaines	Willa Morgan
Glynn Crawford	John Johnston	Jean Richard
		Jean White

WEST SIDE PROJECT

*JOYCE SMITH, Director*

*FRANK BALISTRERI, Casework Supervisor*

## JUVENILE COURT STAFF MEMBERS

Katherine Adams	Beverly Hamilton	Rudolph Perme
Marie Alexander	Hazel Hannibal	Marcia Perrin
Milton Anderson	Frances Haskovec	Victoria Podolak
Judith Arnold	Frank Haskovec	Bruce Post
Agnes Baldwin	Marian Hickman	Gayle Price
Thelma Barry	Margrett Holliman	Dorothy Pudgush
Eleanor Beckwith	Roberta Ilko	Delores Reid
Ruth Black	Cheryl Johnson	Margaret Repp
Deborah Brady	Connie Kasnik	Linda Resler
Josie Brown	Candace Kauntz	Margaret Rhoades
John Burgess	Mary Keating	Marjorie Rhoades
Gussy Burlin	Margaret Keller	Tessie Robinson
Joyce Byrd	Eleanor Kirby	Marie Rodriguez
Yvonne Canan	Mary Kremzar	Susan Ronges
Linda Carmicle	Mary Kurtz	Lydia Sauer
David Chelminski	Patricia Kus	Linda Schrecengost
Mary Coe	Debbie Kuzel	Linda Scott
Irene Conzaman	Christine Lampe	Mona Shelton
Carrie Cook	Paulette Lapka	Sharon Sinclair
Mary Courtot	Denise Magalotti	Anna Skripnik
Barbara Czachur	Bruce Manuel	Shirley Smik
Eda Deggin	Denise Marczak	Theresa Sommer
Patricia Dimarino	Kathleen Masterson	Linda Spilker
Anna Dudash	Phyllis Matthews	John Standberry
Carlotta Eady	Faith Mazur	Susan Stipek
Wendy Ehle	Anne McFarland	Shirley Storey
Mary Ellis	Danielle McGuirk	Joyce Stucko
Melvyn Ellis	Jeanne Metzger	Barbara Sullivan
Dorothy Englehart	Shirley Moorer	Constance Takach
Jenne Evans	Gloria Moro	Beverly Thomas
Sandra Ewart	Clara Mulgrew	Diane Thornsberry
Frank Finan	Loretta Mulvey	Emma Torok
Kimberly Fitzmartin	Grace Myers	Lynette Tuckosh
Eileen Flower	Barbara Newman	Charles Walker
Katherine Flynn	Joanne Neill	Harold Washington
Beverly Fogle	Robert Neill, Jr.	Gregory Weimer
Lizaweta Foltzer	Mary Newport	Diana White
Thomas Foster	Valerie Orient	Mary White
Kathryn Gillespie	Rosanne Orzechowski	Gregory Williamson
Rita Golembiewski	Michelle Oszterling	Edith Winland
Veronica Golembiewski	Linda Parrott	Patricia Woodard
Debra Gonzales	Pamela Patterson	Natalie Zagor
Vanessa Grier	Joyce Pelliccioni	Melinda Zielinski
Tonja Griffey		

---

NUMBER OF COPIES ORDERED PRINTED: 2,000

APPROXIMATE COST PER COPY: 60 CENTS

## DETENTION HOME STAFF MEMBERS

Jacquelyn Y. Abbott	James Gay, Jr.	Alberta Morrison
Thomas W. Alexander	Chandler V. Garnett	Marie A. Namey
Virginia D. Alexander	Mary F. Gilbert	McCauley R. Odom
Nellie M. Allen	Eddie Greene	Isaac T. Oliver
Terry M. Batts, Jr.	William R. Haake	Lillian M. Orosz
Rowena Beauford	Melvin C. Hall	James M. Perz
Rita D. Bednarski	Robert L. Hampton	Mack Pinkney
Duane Belcher	Victor B. Hardcastle	Kyril Popoff
Velma Black	Joe Harding	Catherine Prevo
Leslie K. Blakemore	Lowell D. Harris	Fannie Price
Gladys Blue	Ruby L. Harris	Raymond Ray
Richard Bohannon	Darryl E. Harrison	Lillie B. Rice
Henry Bradford	Bernard Harvey	Norman Richard
Mary Braeunig	Barbara A. Head	Lawrence Richards
Eugene Branham	David S. Henderson	Jackie V. Robinson
Eleanor Bridge	Joel F. Hicks	John Robinson
John O. Brown	Herine Hill	Lucille Ruff
Ruthie Burnett	Mary A. Hillman	Vernon P. Saunders
Alja Burns	Jeanie P. Hogue	Carl Schmitz
James Burt	Susan M. Holland	Sandra Scott
David E. Butcher	Joseph T. Isom	Burrell A. Shields
Edith E. Casey	Vincent P. James	Katherine Singleton
Helen Cermely	Barbara Jeskey	Claude L. Smith
Lucille Clark	Jerry J. Johnson	Shirley V. Smith
Kenneth C. Cloud	James T. Jones	Charles B. Snell
Mallory D. Coats	Emma S. Jordan	Luvenia Spivey
Lucille Cobb	Perry W. Joyner	Thomas D. Stewart
Fannie Costanzo	John L. Kelly	Eugene Stover
Rosemary Cotos	Lyn S. Kilber	Ann Taraba
Nettie Davis	Dennis C. Kuminiski	Gail A. Taraba
Sarah Dale	Nea H. Lamb	Cordelia D. Tovar
Charles B. Day	Albert Laster	Zelma L. Tucker
Luther E. Demery	Mary L. Leggon	Regina Tycast
Oliver Demery	William E. Little	Paula B. Vasil
Elverna Dillingham	Roosevelt Lockley, Jr.	Thomas Washington
Ruth Easley	Mildred Lowery	Eugene W. Wheeler
Claudia J. Felder	Charlie M. Malone	Vera White
Everett W. Ferguson	Sallie Malone	Georgia L. Whittemore
Genevieve F. Ferguson	George Maranuk	Johnny C. Williams
Thelma Fitch	George R. McJunkins	Leonard Williamson
Louellen Fitts	Fay Ray McLeod	Jeanie M. Woods
Samuel W. Franks	Catherine Midgett	Edward W. Wooten, Jr.
Gerald Frazier	Olethia Miller	Stanley A. Worthy
Morris F. Freeman	Geddes K. Mitchell	Charlie G. Young
Harrison Fulton	Garnett A. Morgan, Jr.	Ronald Young
James Gay, Sr.	Russell Morris, Jr.	Sandra Zummo

## 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.

## ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS

MR. RONALD BROWN, Chairman

Mr. Thomas F. Allen

Mr. Frank Kelker

Mr. James Berick

Mr. Robert Larson

Mrs. John Bernett

Mr. Frank Leonetti

Mr. Crede Calhoun

Mr. John Petten

Mr. Frank Catliota

Mrs. Frank H. Porter

Msgr. Casimir Ciolek

Mr. Albert Ringler

Mrs. Garry B. Curtiss

Mr. J. Kearney Shanahan

Catherine Dickman

Mrs. Paul A. Unger

Mr. Donald Freeman

Dr. Consuelo Sousa

Mrs. Robert Gilkeson

Mr. Michael Stringer

Mrs. Scott B. Hayes

Mrs. Stanley Tolliver

Mr. Harlan Hertz

Dr. Reeves Warm

Mrs. Gilbert Humphrey

Mrs. James H. Wilsman

Mr. Leslie W. Jacobs

Mr. Sidney Zilber

Mr. Frank E. Joseph