
CUYAHOGA COUNTY JUVENILE COURT

*ANNUAL
REPORT
1 • 9 • 8 • 2*



*The Honorable Virgil Brown, Vincent Campanella
Timothy Hagan, Commissioners of Cuyahoga County*

*The Honorable John C. Cuddy
Director, Ohio Department of Public Welfare*

*The Honorable Richard P. Seiter
Director, Ohio Department of
Rehabilitation and Correction*

*The Honorable Pamela S. Hyde
Director, Ohio Department of Mental Health*

*The Honorable James Rogers
Director, Ohio Department of Youth Services*

*The Honorable Minnie F. Johnson
Director, Ohio Department of Mental Retardation
and Developmental Disabilities*

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 1982, showing the
number and kind of cases that
have come before it, the disposi-
tion thereof 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 F. Corrigan

Administrative Judge
Common Pleas Court
Juvenile Division
Cleveland, Ohio
(May, 1983)

JUVENILE COURT SUCCESS STORIES

SUCCESS stories rarely make the news. It is the horrendous crime committed by a youth, the teenage burglary ring, the youngsters charged with neighborhood vandalism, the increase in juvenile crime that attract attention.

Although they draw little public interest, there are many success stories at Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court. They are what keep those who work at the Court going. They are what make it all worthwhile.

Many of the youngsters who appear at Juvenile Court go on to become productive members of the community; some even turn their special insights to work with the next generation of troubled youth and their families.

Juvenile Court is a complex legal and social service agency responsible for cases involving the well-being of youths throughout Cuyahoga County. With a staff of 500 in two downtown locations and 11 branch offices and a budget of \$15.9 million, it balances a dual role of insuring the best interests of youths while protecting the community.

The jurisdiction of Juvenile Court ranges from cases of youthful offenders to cases of

young victims. Unruly and delinquent cases make up the bulk of the caseload, but the Court is also responsible for juvenile traffic offenders; dependent, neglected and abused children's cases; paternity and child support cases; adult contributing cases and marriage consents.

To handle the nearly 30,000 complaints brought to its attention annually, Juvenile Court operates from a core of four major departments with others providing essential supportive services.

Most people's first contact with Juvenile Court is through the Legal Department, where the intake office is responsible for processing complaints filed by police, schools, agencies, parents and citizens. Increasingly, the department's intake staff and diversion staff have become involved in early intervention to stop youths from getting into more trouble and to prevent further involvement in the juvenile justice system.

Intake officers may refer some cases to outside agencies or internal counseling programs where the youths charged with lesser offenses can get the help they need to stay out of trouble. Such efforts benefit not only the youths and their families

but also Juvenile Court because caseloads can be reduced and greater attention can be directed to more serious and repeat offenders.

When a case cannot be resolved unofficially, the Legal Department assigns it for hearing before a judge or referee and notifies those involved about when and where the hearing will take place. It is also responsible for staffing courtrooms, assisting indigent youths in securing attorneys, maintaining legal files and advising staff on legal questions.

If a youth is found delinquent or unruly, the judge or referee must decide how Juvenile Court can best help resolve the problems that led him or her into trouble. To learn more about the youth and his or her functioning at home, in school and in the community, the judge or referee relies on the services of the Social Services Department.

An investigative probation officer from the Social Services Department prepares a social history about the youth for presentation at a dispositional hearing. Also, the psychiatric clinic, which is staffed by psychiatrists and psychologists, may test and evaluate the youth and submit a report for the judge or referee's use.

If the disposition is probation, a supervisory probation officer from the Social Services Department begins to work with the youth. All supervisory probation officers work out of branch offices located throughout the county. From these locations that are easily accessible to clients, the supervisory probation officers can make more frequent contacts with youths and their families and can develop a greater familiarity with community services that may be needed in developing treatment plans to meet clients' needs.

Supervisory probation officers also may refer youths to Juvenile Court's family counseling program and victim aid/restitution program as well as a number of programs funded by the Youth Services Subsidy that is jointly controlled by the Court and the County Commissioners. The probation officer may choose from counseling, tutoring, employment and substance abuse programs, which supplement the probation officer's own services to youths and their families.

If a judge or referee decides that private placement offers the best answer to a youth's problems, the placement unit of the Social Services

Department works to find an appropriate facility and then to monitor the youth's and the family's adaptation to the placement out of the home. A placement officer continues to work with the youth and family after release to ease adjustment back into the home, the school and the community.

When a judge or referee decides to commit a youth to a state or county rehabilitative facility, Juvenile Court staff assist with making a smooth transfer of the youth. Services to youths committed to these facilities and their families are provided by either the Ohio Department of Youth Services or the Cuyahoga County Department of Youth Services.

In some instances, youths who are awaiting hearings, placements and commitments at Juvenile Court cannot remain in the community. The Detention Home serves as a temporary holding facility for those who are considered dangers to themselves or the community, for those who are unlikely to return for court hearings and for those who have no homes where they can return.

The Detention Home provides a full range of services for these youths, including school,

physical education and activities. It is staffed by child care workers, social workers, medical personnel, a chaplain, a dietitian and a variety of others who are responsible for making a youth's stay secure, humane and productive.

The home detention program offers an alternative to the Detention Home for some youths. It matches youths who could remain at home if closer supervision were provided to supplement the parents' supervision with home detention workers who must see them every day until their cases reach resolution in court.

The home detention worker's involvement may include getting youths involved in recreational activities, odd jobs or part-time work to fill their time with alternatives to delinquent activities, referring youths to agencies that offer special services for youths and their families and helping youths and their families to resolve conflicts.

The Juvenile Court's Child Support Department, located at 1515 Euclid Avenue, processes paternity and child support cases and monitors compliance with support orders. Although

these may appear to be adult-centered cases, the well-being of children is at issue. By enforcing the financial responsibility of parents for their children, the department reduces the amount of tax dollars expended for child support.

These large departments function with the help of a budget and purchasing department, a community relations office, a grants management office, information services, a personnel department, a statistics office, a systems analysis office, a training department and a volunteer program.

The interaction necessary for these many functions to help youths and their families is complex, but it is through this network or services that Juvenile Court can make a difference not only in the lives of the young people and their families whose best interests it must serve but also in the community it must protect.

On the following pages are the success stories of a few of the many youngsters in whose lives Juvenile Court has made a difference. They won't make the news, but they tell a more realistic story about the Court and those it serves than those that do make the news.

D I V E R S I O N P R O G R A M

anne came to Juvenile Court's attention because her mother, concerned about her school and home behavior, wanted to file charges against her as an unruly youth. In the last year, the 16-year-old ninth grader had missed over 80 days of school, had run away from home twice and had had an abortion.

Rather than initiate official court proceedings with this case, the intake officer who spoke with Anne's mother recommended their voluntary participation in the Court's Diversion Program.

Diversion serves an alternative to official Court action for first offenders charged with minor legal offenses. It offers three to six months of intensive counseling under the direction of a social worker to youths and their families to help resolve

problems and keep further difficulties from developing. Those who successfully complete the program have no court records. Regularly conducted counseling sessions with the family are designed to eliminate problems that might be affecting home, school and community behavior.

While conducting these sessions with Anne's family, a social worker also helped them take steps to alleviate problems that aggravated Anne's home and school behavior problems.

Noticing that Anne had a vision problem that could create difficulties in school, the worker helped set up an eye examination, which revealed that she needed corrective surgery. He arranged for financial assistance from the local Lions Club for two operations.

The social worker also set up testing through the Child Guidance Center to determine whether Anne might have a learning disability which might contribute to her poor academic and behavioral record at school. When the testing indicated she should enter a special education curriculum, he worked with her school to have her appropriately placed.

Because both Anne and her mother sincerely participated in the counseling sessions, they learned to communicate. This helped them solve many conflicts. They went together to get family planning information for Anne. With improved vision and school classes designed to meet her needs and abilities, Anne's school attitude and behavior has improved. Both mother and daughter now express positive outlooks for the future.

MM

V I C T I M • A I D

IV

ike broke into a suburban home a few blocks from his own home and stole a radio and stereo equipment. The police caught him right away so the property he had taken could be returned to its owner. However, Mike had done \$90.00 worth of damage to a door and window when he had broken into the house.

The probation officer assigned to Mike's case noted the damages and referred the case to the Victim Aid Services Program. A staff member interviewed the victim, who had obtained a written estimate of repair costs for the damages, and prepared a report including the documented information for the judge who would hear Mike's case. As part of the disposition, the judge placed Mike on

S E R V I C E S • P R O G R A M

probation and ordered him to make restitution, repayment, to the victim.

Notified about the restitution order, the victim aid services worker called Mike to discuss how he could earn the money to pay for the damage he had caused. Since Mike did not have a job, the worker arranged for him to get a job as a custodian's assistant at a junior high school in his area. He would work 10 hours a week for the minimum wage. Of that, 75 percent would be deducted to repay the victim and 25 percent would go to Mike.

Initially, the homeowner whom Mike had burglarized did not like the idea of having his damage repaid at such a slow rate, but the more he thought about it, the more he liked it. He realized that a youth who has to work to repay the loss he has created is much more likely to learn a lesson and

less likely to repeat his offense. He appreciated the fact that Mike was responsible for his actions.

In a month, Mike paid back his victim and left the job so that another youth could have a means to repay another victim. He is still on probation and adjusting well.

From its title, the Victim Aid Services Program sounds like a program to help victims of crime. It is, but it is more. It is also a very effective way of helping youthful offenders understand the consequences of their actions.

Juvenile Court has over 400 minimum-wage jobs, mostly in public facilities in Cleveland and throughout Cuyahoga County, where youths involved in property crimes can work off up to \$400.00 worth of damages and losses they have created for individuals and small businesses.

G

HOME DETENTION PROGRAM

Greg, arrested for taking his parent's car without their permission and wrecking it while intoxicated, found himself in the Detention Home operated by Juvenile Court. The Detention Home intake referee who interviewed him and reviewed the police report referred him for admission to the Home Detention Program.

Home Detention is an alternative to the secure confinement of the Detention Home. It allows youths who would otherwise be held while awaiting the outcomes of court proceedings to remain in the community under a home detention worker's supervision.

The home detention workers carry small caseloads, but they must see the youths assigned to them every day. They might refer their clients to community agencies for help, work with families to help resolve conflicts or help youths find part-time or odd jobs and get involved in activities that will occupy their spare time.

While Greg was on Home Detention, his home detention worker spotted a serious problem. He would drink, black out and later find himself in trouble for actions he could not remember. The worker convinced him to attend an Alcoholics Anonymous meeting. With his home

detention worker accompanying him for emotional support, Greg went to an evening session where he realized he had a problem. From that starting point, the home detention worker was able to help get Greg admitted to the in-patient adolescent substance abuse treatment program at Women's General Hospital. Later, he continued recovery treatments at an alcoholism aftercare facility.

The Home Detention Program at Juvenile Court is more than a surveillance program to keep youngsters in their homes and attending school while awaiting the outcomes of court hearings. It offers help to start resolving problems when they are most critical, immediately after an arrest.

social worker assigned by the Welfare Department to her case.

Jane completed high school and went away to college, but she continued to keep in touch, calling and writing occasionally, even after she had been removed from her probation officer's caseload. Finally the correspondence became less frequent and stopped as Jane became fully independent from the probation officer.

Not too long ago, the probation officer ran into Jane again—this time in a dif-

ficer and disturbing the peace.

"He reacted emotionally without thinking," summarized the probation officer to whose supervision Tom was assigned after being found delinquent and placed on probation.

It took many hours of counseling to get Tom to see the dangers of responding so emotionally. At times the probation officer would see him every day.

Tom's rehabilitation did not always run smoothly. While on probation, he was arrested again and charged with at-

area where they can be very familiar with the community services for youths and their families, the problems that youth may face in a community and the schools and school personnel who see their youngsters daily. It also makes it easier for probation officers to make contacts with youths.

Sue was on her way to Juvenile Court for a custody case when she ran away. Her mother, overwhelmed by her own personal problems, had decided to relinquish custody of her daughter to Sue's adult brother.

talked with positive anticipation about graduating in two more years from her regular school.

Sue's probation officer discovered her real interest was in acting and tapped into that to help motivate Sue. She got her involved in Outreach Theater, which presents dramas dealing with the problems that confront youth.

Sue's work with the group led her to investigate further dramatic training, and she obtained a scholarship to study with a professional group.

PROBATION SERVICES SUCCESS STORIES

Jane was 15 years old when her father filed incorrigibility charges against her at Juvenile Court. Among other more general charges, he complained that she did not do the chores that were expected of her and that she refused to obey the curfew he had established for her.

The referee who heard the case placed Jane on probation with a probation officer at one of Juvenile Court's east side branch offices. In working with Jane, the probation officer found that there was much more to her behavior problems at home than had originally been apparent. Though her father presented the image of a stable, conscientious family man with a good job, he was actually a violent, abusive man. He had unrea-

sonably stiff expectations for his family and reacted physically when they failed to meet them.

The probation officer's job became very complicated as she tried to work with Jane, her father, mother and two younger siblings, all of whom needed help to resolve a volatile family situation.

The father's abusiveness intensified though, and the probation officer requested the intervention of the County Welfare Department's Protective Services Division. Jane was more than an unruly child; she was a victim reacting to abuse by refusing to meet her father's rules.

Through the Welfare Department, Jane was placed in a group home where she adjusted well, according to the

ferent capacity. The probation officer was accompanying a youth to a medical clinic and found Jane working there as a medical technologist, happy and functioning independently.

Many times the problems youths pose are the results of problems imposed on them. It is cases such as these where cooperative efforts among a number of agencies charged with providing for the well-being of children come into play, and probation officers must coordinate a number of services for the well-being of youths.

Being the only male in a family of five was difficult for 16-year-old Tom. His relationship with his sisters deteriorated steadily until one day his sister called the police to stop a fight between him and another sister.

When the police arrived, Tom turned his anger on them. The incident resulted in his arrest for assaulting a police of-

tempted auto theft and resisting arrest. When he appeared in court on those charges, he seemed finally ready to get a grip on his actions and resolved to change. He stood up in court and vowed to get his life under control.

Recognizing his resolution, the judge gave Tom one last chance and continued his probation. Tom went on to complete high school, with his probation officer always available to keep him in tune with his resolution, and now attends a technical school from which he expects to graduate in another year. Though he no longer is on probation, he updates his former probation officer on his progress.

All probation officers who supervise youths placed on probation by Juvenile Court work out of branch offices located at 11 sites throughout Cuyahoga County. This decentralized system means that probation officers deal with youngsters in an

Uncertain and frightened about her future, Sue got on a bus and headed for California.

Sue survived on her own, picking pockets and burglarizing wealthy homes, for seven months before she was caught. A computer check revealed she was a runaway and prompted her return home, where a referee placed her on probation on charges of running away and truancy.

Sue's probation officer saw great potential in the energetic, bright 16-year-old and began helping her guide her actions in productive directions. Although she was a habitual truant from a Cleveland high school and hated school, she enrolled in an alternative education program at Cleveland State University that would prepare her for an eventual return to regular classes.

After only a few weeks in the program, Sue was enthused about learning and

Sue is living with her older brother in a different area, still under the supervision of a probation officer. With her talents and initiative, she is making a new life for herself and has a bright future.

Probation officers, like Sue's, often serve as "service brokers" for youths. They provide many direct services to their clients, but they also are familiar with various community programs that can offer services to youths and their families and may make referrals to them. The result is a package of services that meets a number of needs.

The probation officer who worked with Tom points out that he has much more time to work with his caseload because his office is closer to them than when he worked from a downtown office.

STATISTICAL SUMMARY FOR THE YEAR 1982

In 1982, a total of 25,902 complaints were filed in the Juvenile Court. Among them were 19,884 complaints regarding children and 2,896 complaints against adults. Children's complaints included 8,342 delinquency and unruly complaints, as well as 10,202 traffic complaints, 306 neglected children complaints, 304 dependent children complaints and 174 applications to determine custody. Complaints against adults included 2,425 complaints to establish parent-child relations (formerly paternity complaints), 296 cases of non-support, 63 cases of contributing to delinquency and unruliness and 63 cases of violation of the compulsory education law.

In addition to the above complaints filed in the calendar year 1982, an additional 3,122 complaints were filed regarding previously disposed of matters in regard to probation violations, violations of court orders and motions to show cause. An additional 5,639 complaints were reviewed in the Court's intake process but were not accepted for filing. These included 364 cases referred to the Court's Diversion Program, 88 cases referred to the Cuyahoga County Department of Youth Services' Diversion Program and 187 cases referred to public or private agency services. Other non-court dispositions in these matters included referrals to boards of education, police departments, other courts, intake conferences and correspondence. Combining the 5,639 complaints diverted at intake with the 25,902 complaints accepted for court action, the total volume of transaction handled through the court's intake process amounted to 31,541 complaints. (See Table 4 for complaints filed and Table 9 for those cases disposed of without court action.)

Delinquency and unruly complaints declined from 9,652 in 1981 to 8,342 in 1982, continuing a downward trend recorded for the past several years. In 1981, including the 656 children referred to the diversion programs and the 9,652 cases filed on for court action, a total of 10,308 delinquency and unruly matters were referred to intake; in 1982, the 452 diverted cases and the 8,342 cases accepted for court action amounted to 8,794 cases.

Typically, theft charges, including shoplifting, represented the largest single offense for both boys and girls (with the exception of incorrigibility offenses on the

part of girls, 473 cases). There were 1,395 such charges regarding boys and 453 involving girls, accounting for a little more than one-fifth of the total complaints. Unlawful entry and stealing was the next most frequent offense for boys, 1,035 cases, representing 16 percent of boys' cases; and the third most frequent offense regarding boys was injury to person, 908, or 14 percent of all boys' cases. In addition to the 453 theft cases on the part of girls and the 473 incorrigibility cases, the third most frequent offense for girls was that of injury to person, 290 cases, or 15 percent of all girls' cases.

Other more frequent offenses included 836 charges of incorrigibility, 519 truancy cases, 380 theft from person cases and 497 cases of destruction of property, most of which showed declines in proportion to the general decline of 1982 filings over those of 1981. Homicides also declined from 26 in 1981 to 22 in 1982. (See Table 5, Delinquency and Unruly Complaints—1982 compared with 1981, for a complete listing of offenses.)

Probation continued to be the most frequent disposition in delinquency and unruly cases, with 2,367 such orders made regarding cases filed in the calendar year. Including those cases assigned from the latter part of 1981 and those in which a change in status occurred, a total of 2,760 cases were assigned to be supervised by the Probation Department. In addition, 2,288 cases were carried over from 1981, making a grand total of 5,048 children supervised by the department during the year. A total of 211 children were placed in private treatment centers in 1982. Including the 219 children carried over from 1981, placement and post-placement supervision involved 430 children in 1982.

There were 695 commitments to public correctional institutions: 453 boys and 54 girls were committed to the Ohio Department of Youth Services and 127 boys and 61 girls were committed to the Cuyahoga County Department of Youth Services.

Bind-overs to the Criminal Division of the Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas amounted to 25 cases, 23 boys and 2 girls. Transfers of jurisdiction to other counties were made regarding 122 cases. Other dispositions included 960 dismissed cases and 225 cases with-

drawn by the complainants. In another 1,073 cases involving multiple files of delinquency or unruliness, the disposition made regarding the individual child is recorded in only one file, with multiple files cross-referenced to that file.

In addition to the above official delinquency and unruly cases, there were 1,671 unofficial cases which were handled by referees. Fifty-five percent of these cases were adjusted by the referees in informal proceedings, 15 percent were either dismissed or withdrawn, 6 percent were transferred to an official status and 9 percent were referred to community services. (See Table 6 for dispositions made in delinquency and unruly cases.)

Of the 8,342 delinquency and unruly complaints filed during the year, 2,251, or 27 percent were filed by the Cleveland Police Department and 2,699, or 32 percent were filed by all other police departments in the county. Other sources of complaints included: parents or relatives, 915 complaints, or 11 percent; citizens, 650 complaints, or 8 percent; the Cleveland Board of Education, 557 complaints, or 7 percent; other county school systems, 319, or 4 percent; and store security personnel, 495 complaints, or 6 percent of the total. (See Table 2 for all sources of complaints.)

The distribution of delinquency and unruly cases regarding children in the city of Cleveland compared with those from suburban areas of the county has remained rather constant for the past five years. Of the 8,342 cases, 4,878 cases, or 60 percent, involved children living in the city of Cleveland, while 3,298 cases, or 40 percent, involved children living in suburban areas of the county.

While 17 of the 28 social planning areas in the City of Cleveland showed declines in relative proportion to the general decline in overall cases and nine remained at virtually the 1981 level, only two social planning areas showed small increases in 1982 over 1981. They are Glenville, from 566 cases in 1981 to 621 cases in 1982, and Puritas-Bellaire, from 123 cases in 1981 to 143 cases in 1982.

Nearly 56 percent of the city of Cleveland delinquency and unruly complaints involved children living in eight social planning areas as follows: Glenville, 621 cases; Near West Side, 436 cases; Corlett, 384 cases;

Hough, 304 cases; Woodland Hills, 259 cases; Central West, 247 cases; Mt. Pleasant, 241 cases and South Collinwood, 218 cases.

While most suburban areas recorded levels similar to those of 1981, there were some notable declines in cases from the following areas: Cleveland Heights, down from 398 in 1981 to 308 in 1982; Maple Heights, down from 113 in 1981 to 76 in 1982; North Olmsted, down from 189 in 1981 to 104 in 1982, and Parma, down from 283 in 1981 to 232 in 1982.

Six areas out of 59 municipalities, villages and townships recorded 50 percent of all delinquency and unruly cases regarding children living in suburban areas. They were Lakewood, 406 cases; Cleveland Heights, 308 cases; East Cleveland, 303 cases; Parma, 232 cases, and Brook Park and Euclid with 187 cases each. (See Table 1 for delinquency and unruly complaints filed by area of residence for 1982 and 1981.)

In addition to the above delinquency and unruly cases, the Court also dealt with 650 newly filed cases of dependent, neglected and abused children. Commitments to the temporary care and custody of the Cuyahoga County Welfare Department, Division of Social Services, were made regarding 473 children in these kinds of cases, and another 37 were committed to the permanent care and custody of the department. Other dispositions included placement with other agencies and relatives (13 cases), dismissal (48 cases) and withdrawals of the complaints (21 cases).

The Court's Custody Review Unit is responsible for reviewing the placement status of the above-placed children. Including these children and those placed in prior years, the unit conducted, in 1982, 650 initial placement reviews and 3,915 annual reviews of placement status. The five citizens review boards appointed by the Court to assist the unit in this process conducted 1,466 of the 4,565 initial and annual reviews made during the year.

Richard A. Gallitto
Statistician

DELINQUENT & UNRULY COMPLAINTS

FILED BY AREA OF RESIDENCE 1981 and 1982

T A B L E

Area of Residence	Boys' Cases		Girls' Cases		Total Cases	
	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981
City of Cleveland by Social Planning Areas						
Central	63	110	18	43	81	153
Central-East	101	99	19	22	120	121
Central-West	192	236	55	75	247	311
Clark-Fulton	101	120	49	39	150	159
Corlett	308	472	76	115	384	587
Denison	118	132	43	29	161	161
Downtown	9	4	4	8	13	12
Edgewater	39	58	8	15	47	73
Glenville	495	414	126	152	621	566
Goodrich	23	23	8	7	31	30
Hough	244	289	60	82	304	371
Jefferson	114	105	25	29	139	134
Kinsman	94	106	22	24	116	130
Lee-Miles	100	194	25	63	125	257
Mt. Pleasant	195	253	46	57	241	310
Near West Side	339	401	97	145	436	546
North Broadway	80	94	21	14	101	108
North Collinwood	45	77	33	21	78	98
Norwood	121	151	25	50	146	201
Puritas-Belaire	121	96	22	27	143	123
Riverside	80	88	19	29	99	117
South Broadway	103	129	35	43	138	172
South Brooklyn	87	102	31	39	118	141
South Collinwood	166	160	52	48	218	208
Tremont	106	130	31	35	137	165
University	30	28	7	5	37	33
West Side	140	177	48	42	188	219
Woodland Hills	215	230	44	59	259	289
Total, City of Cleveland	3,829	4,478	1,049	1,317	4,878	5,795

Area of Residence	Boys' Cases		Girls' Cases		Total Cases	
	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981
Suburban Cities, Villages & Townships						
Bay Village	36	29	9	11	45	40
Beachwood	6	4	6	9	12	13
Bedford	58	38	13	6	71	44
Bedford Heights	29	57	10	8	39	65
Bentleyville	1	0	0	0	1	0
Berea	58	60	13	18	71	78
Bratenahl	3	1	2	1	5	2
Brecksville	7	6	4	1	11	7
Broadview Heights	20	12	7	7	27	19
Brook Park	134	126	53	51	187	177
Brooklyn	20	17	4	3	24	20
Brooklyn Heights	1	4	1	2	2	6
Chagrin Falls	13	7	0	2	13	9
Chagrin Falls Township	2	0	0	1	2	1
Cleveland Heights	233	295	75	103	308	398
Cuyahoga Heights	0	4	0	0	0	4
East Cleveland	219	210	84	80	303	290

Area of Residence	Boys' Cases		Girls' Cases		Total Cases	
	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981
Suburban Cities, Villages & Townships						
Euclid	134	166	53	58	187	224
Fairview Park	56	52	18	15	74	67
Garfield Heights	84	96	25	23	109	119
Gates Mills	2	3	0	1	2	4
Glenwillow	0	0	0	1	0	1
Highland Heights	12	10	1	7	13	17
Hunting Valley	0	0	0	0	0	0
Independence	20	20	10	3	30	23
Lakewood	309	280	97	94	406	374
Linndale	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lyndhurst	30	33	5	14	35	47
Maple Heights	62	80	14	33	76	113
Mayfield	3	7	0	1	3	8
Mayfield Heights	41	48	5	14	46	62
Middleburg Heights	27	40	6	7	33	47
Moreland Hills	3	4	2	4	5	8
Newburgh Heights	4	9	3	0	7	9
North Olmsted	78	138	26	51	104	189
North Randall	3	1	0	0	3	1
North Royalton	51	41	16	7	67	48
Oakwood	14	35	3	7	17	42
Olmsted Falls	18	24	6	9	24	33
Olmsted Township	11	17	8	4	19	21
Orange	3	4	1	0	4	4
Parma	164	214	68	69	232	283
Parma Heights	35	43	17	14	52	57
Pepper Pike	4	15	2	5	6	20
Richmond Heights	12	11	1	3	13	14
Riveredge Township	1	0	0	3	1	3
Rocky River	26	26	6	10	32	36
Seven Hills	17	11	8	5	25	16
Shaker Heights	75	88	17	9	92	97
Solon	23	21	3	9	26	30
South Euclid	64	68	19	21	83	89
Strongsville	108	74	16	23	124	97
University Heights	30	62	14	17	44	79
Valley View	1	2	0	1	1	3
Walton Hills	6	6	4	3	10	9
Warrensville Heights	78	98	27	20	105	118
Warrensville Township	4	0	5	0	9	0
Westlake	47	64	10	16	57	80
Woodmere	1	4	0	0	1	4
Total, Suburbs	2,501	2,785	797	884	3,298	3,669
Agency Residents	6	9	14	3	20	12
Out-of-County Residents	108	123	35	38	143	161
Area Designations						
Unknown	2	10	1	5	3	15
Grand Total	6,446	7,405	1,896	2,247	8,342	9,652

2

SOURCE OF COMPLAINT • DELINQUENCY AND UNRULY CASES 1982

Police Department	Boys	Girls	Total
Bay Village	38	2	40
Beachwood	10	4	14
Bedford	9	4	13
Bedford Heights	59	2	61
Bentleyville	0	0	0
Berea	42	3	45
Bratenahl	5	0	5
Brecksville	10	0	10
Broadview Heights	9	3	12
Brook Park	102	17	119
Brooklyn	31	0	31
Brooklyn Heights	0	0	0
Chagrin Falls	13	1	14
Chagrin Falls Township	1	0	1
Cleveland	2,002	249	2,251
Cleveland Heights	322	89	411
Cuyahoga Heights	4	0	4
East Cleveland	96	16	112
Euclid	112	13	125
Fairview Park	38	0	38
Garfield Heights	50	7	57
Gates Mills	3	1	4
Highland Heights	9	1	10
Hunting Valley	1	0	1
Independence	22	1	23
Lakewood	270	36	306
Linndale	1	0	1
Lyndhurst	29	2	31
Maple Heights	57	6	63
Mayfield	16	2	18
Mayfield Heights	17	0	17
Middleburg Heights	41	7	48
Moreland Hills	2	0	2
Newburgh Heights	0	0	0
North Olmsted	62	11	73
North Randall	49	26	75
North Royalton	24	3	27
Oakwood	6	1	7
Olmsted Falls	26	2	28
Olmsted Township	3	0	3
Orange	0	0	0
Parma	79	82	161
Parma Heights	97	3	100
Pepper Pike	4	0	4
Richmond Heights	13	0	13
Riveredge	0	0	0
Rocky River	8	2	10
Seven Hills	11	2	13
Shaker Heights	121	3	124
Solon	21	6	27
South Euclid	42	7	49
Strongsville	94	3	97
University Heights	23	4	27
Valley View	5	0	5
Walton Hills	9	6	15
Warrensville Heights	123	27	150
Warrensville Township	0	2	2
Westlake	49	4	53
Woodmere	0	0	0
Citizens	503	147	650
Cleveland Board of Education	394	163	557
Other School Boards	172	147	319
Parents, Relatives, Guardians	423	492	915
Social Agencies	47	42	89
Other Police	143	8	151
Store Security	297	198	495
Other Sources	177	39	216
Total	6,446	1,896	8,342

T A B L E

3

AGES OF DELINQUENT AND UNRULY CHILDREN (in Cuyahoga County 1982)

Ages	Boys	Girls	Total
Eight and Under	15	3	18
Nine	36	9	45
Ten	58	21	79
Eleven	167	21	188
Twelve	310	83	393
Thirteen	507	219	726
Fourteen	858	294	1,152
Fifteen	1,238	431	1,669
Sixteen	1,458	455	1,913
Seventeen	1,799	360	2,159
Total	6,446	1,896	8,342

T A B L E

4

TOTAL COMPLAINTS (1982 compared with 1981)

New Complaints: Children's Cases	1982	1981
Delinquency: Boys	5,778	6,593
Girls	1,130	1,437
Total Delinquency	6,908	8,030
Unruliness: Boys	688	812
Girls	766	810
Total Unruliness	1,454	1,622
Total, Delinquency and Unruliness	8,342	9,652
Children Referred to Diversion Programs*	452	656
Juvenile Traffic Cases	10,202	11,578
Neglected Children's Cases	306	256
Dependent Children's Cases	304	294
Abused Children's Cases	40	41
Application to Determine Custody	174	120
Application for Approval of Permanent Surrender	23	20
Application for Consent to Marry	13	25
Writ of Habeas Corpus	11	19
Other Cases	17	0
Total Children's Cases	19,884	22,661
New Complaints: Adult Cases	1982	1981
Non-Support of Children	296	339
Neglect of Children	2	2
Endangering Children	1	6
Contributing to Delinquency	16	17
Contributing to Unruliness	47	32
Paternity (Complaint to Establish Parent-Child Relation)	2,425	2,329
Certifications and Motions	9	12
Contempt of Court	12	21
Other Cases	88	184
Total Adult Cases	2,896	2,942
Total New Complaints	22,780	25,603
Alias Complaints	3,122	3,986
Grand Total, New and Alias Complaints	25,902	29,589

*In these cases no delinquency or unruly complaints were filed and children were referred to Court and Youth Development Center diversion programs.

T A B L E

Complaint	Boys' Cases		Girls' Cases		Total Cases	
	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981
DELINQUENCY AND UNRULY COMPLAINTS (1982 compared with 1981)						
Homicide	18	20	4	6	22	26
Injury to Person	908	849	290	339	1,198	1,188
Sex Offenses	162	136	13	12	175	148
Arson	45	73	4	6	49	79
Theft from Person	351	379	29	41	380	420
Auto Theft	43	36	1	15	44	51
Unlawful Entry and Stealing	1,035	1,279	77	82	1,112	1,361
Trespassing	277	315	35	40	312	355
Auto Trespass	8	159	0	4	8	163
Destruction of Property	464	490	33	55	497	545
Other Property Offenses	394	332	42	34	436	366
Other Theft (Including Shoplifting)	1,395	1,475	453	548	1,848	2,023
Possession of Weapons	135	268	26	25	161	293
Disorderly Conduct	289	348	75	119	364	467
Drug and Narcotics Violations	105	164	22	30	127	194
Liquor Offenses	55	90	12	17	67	107
Curfew Violation	25	53	15	19	40	72
Truancy	268	305	251	293	519	598
Runaway	12	46	27	66	39	112
Incorrigibility	363	395	473	496	836	891
Other Complaints	94	193	14	0	108	190
Total	6,446	7,405	1,896	2,247	8,342	9,652

T A B L E

Official Cases	Boys		Girls	Total
	1982	1981		
DISPOSITIONS MADE IN DELINQUENCY AND UNRULY CASES 1982				
Placed on Probation	1,690		591	2,281
Placed in Private Treatment Centers:				
On New Filing	79		19	98
On Violation Filing*	77		36	113
Total Placed	156		55	211
Committed to Public Institutions:				
On New Filing	473		66	539
On Violation Filing*	107		49	156
Total Committed	580		115	695
Transferred to Criminal Division,				
Court of Common Pleas	23		2	25
Transferred to Other Juvenile Courts	88		34	122
Order Made in Other Case	965		108	1,073
Referred to Other Agency	116		49	165
Dismissed	779		181	960
Withdrawn by Complainant	133		92	225
Parental Supervision	295		79	374
Other Disposition	23		3	26
Continued, or Set for Hearing in 1983	582		201	783
Total Official Dispositions	5,246		1,425	6,671
Unofficial Cases				
Placed on Probation	54		32	86
Unofficial Supervision	2		1	3
Adjusted by Referee	699		223	922
Order Made in Other Case	10		6	16
Referred to Other Agency	100		44	144
Dismissed	147		67	214
Withdrawn by Complainant	22		8	30
Made Official	100		52	152
Continued, or Set for Hearing in 1983	66		38	104
Total Unofficial Dispositions	1,200		471	1,671

T A B L E

*Violation filings are not included in grand totals.

Movement of Cases	Probation Department		Placement Department	Total
	Male Staff	Female Staff		
CASES UNDER SUPERVISION (of the Probation and Placement Departments 1982)				
Brought Forward, January 1982	1,604	684	219	2,507
Received for Supervision	2,050	710	211	2,971
Total Cases Supervised	3,654	1,394	430	5,478
Removed from Supervision	2,148	767	152	3,067
Carried Forward to 1983	1,506	627	278	2,411

T A B L E

Population Movement	Boys' Cases		Girls' Cases		Total Cases	
	1982	1981	1982	1981	1982	1981
CHILDREN UNDER CARE IN DETENTION HOME (1982 compared with 1981)						
Under Care January 1, 1982	71	72	40	41	111	113
Admitted During Year	1,802	2,084	650	847	2,452	2,931
Total Under Care	1,873	2,156	690	888	2,563	3,044
Released During Year	1,828	2,085	669	848	2,497	2,933
Under Care December 31, 1982	45	71	21	40	66	111
Total Days Care Furnished	22,017	30,055	8,489	12,895	30,506	42,950
Average Daily Population	60	82	23	35	83	117
Average Length of Stay in Days	12.2	14.4	13.1	15.2	12.4	14.7

T A B L E

CASES DISPOSED OF WITHOUT OFFICIAL COURT ACTION	
Referred to Court Diversion Project	364
Referred to Department of Youth Services Diversion Project	88
Referred to Other Public or Private Agency	187
Referred to Boards of Education	24
Referred to Police Departments	40
Referred to Other Courts	29
Referred to Other Services	76
Referred to Court Workers	360
Disposed of at Intake through Correspondence	1,361
Disposed of at Intake through Phone Calls	486
Disposed of at Intake through Conference	514
Disposed of at Intake, Complaint Refused	342
Complaints Held for Consideration	1,768
Total Disposed of Without Official Court Action	5,639

T A B L E

10

T A B L E

Diagnosis	Boys	Girls	Adults	Total
Psychosis				
Schizophrenia, Various	1	1	0	2
Psycho-Neurosis, Mixed	12	3	0	15
Neurosis				
Depressive Reaction	11	9	2	22
Phobic Reaction	2	0	0	2
Other Reactions	0	2	0	0
Personality Disorders				
Passive-Aggressive Personality	0	1	0	1
Passive-Dependent Personality	0	1	3	4
Anti-Social Personality	5	0	1	6
Schizoid Personality	3	0	0	3
Hysterical Personality	0	2	0	2
Identity Disorder	4	9	0	13
Other Personality Disorders	10	4	2	16
Transient Situation Disturbances				
Adjustment Reaction of Childhood	4	1	0	5
Adjustment Reaction of Adolescence	53	23	0	76
Behavior Disorders				
Anxiety Reaction	4	0	1	5
Conduct Disorders	109	42	1	152
Other Behavior Disorders	1	0	1	2
Other Disorders				
Mental Retardation	8	1	2	11
Substance Abuse	8	4	1	13
Anorexia Nervosa	0	1	0	1
Other Diagnosis				
No Diagnosis Made	113	32	24	169
Diagnosis Deferred	4	0	1	5
No Disorder	0	0	1	1
Total	352	136	40	528

11

T A B L E

COLLECTION OF MONIES BY THE COURT AND DISTRIBUTION OF MONIES (for the support of minor children 1982)

Type of Collection:		
Support of Children		\$4,356,811
Damages or Restitution		23,704
Poundage		88,423
Fines		28,315
Costs		143,345
Appearance Bonds		19,611
State of Ohio-Educational Subsidy		126,143
Miscellaneous General Collections		103,811
Total Amount Collected		\$4,890,163
Money for Support of Children Disbursed to:		
Parents and Relatives		\$2,223,733
Public Agencies:		
Cuyahoga County Welfare Department	\$2,052,676	
County Treasurer-Reimbursement for Residential Placements	145,776	
Other Tax-Supported Agencies and Institutions	15,684	
Total Public Agencies		2,214,136
Private Agencies and Institutions		2,864
Grand Total of Support Money Disbursed		\$4,440,733

1982

1982 BUDGET APPROPRIATIONS SUMMARY

Court	
Salaries	\$ 5,061,783
Employee Benefits	1,212,538
Private Placement	2,621,701
Space Maintenance	1,192,161*
Data Processing	285,015*
Equipment and Furniture	232,506
Travel	149,264
Telephone Services	146,590
Judicial Services	102,590
Printing	56,045**
Fast Copier	52,122*
Automotive Expenses	43,185**
Assigned Counsel	40,520
Supplies	39,878**
Postage	27,613**
Equipment Rental, Maintenance and Repair	25,768
Contractual Services	25,545
Publications	13,801
Advertising	1,084
Other Miscellaneous Expenses	12,978
Subtotal	\$11,343,604
Title IV-D/Child Support	
Salaries	\$ 995,131
Employee Benefits	247,731
Space Maintenance	350,390*
Data Processing	57,306*
Postage	32,300*
Telephone Services	21,497*
Printing Services	18,598**
Supplies	11,789**
Professional and Technical Services	10,682
Travel	6,371
Fast Copier	5,548*
Equipment and Furniture	4,105
Judicial Services	4,081
Equipment Rental, Maintenance and Repair	2,558
Publications	2,393
Contractual Services	1,378
Advertising	258
Subtotal	\$1,772,118
Detention Home	
Salaries	\$ 2,017,855
Employee Benefits	454,123
Food Supplies	127,306
Contractual Services	37,863
Professional and Technical Services	34,728
Housekeeping Supplies	29,010
Clothing Supplies	19,579
Equipment and Furniture	14,068
Medical Supplies	5,523
Other Miscellaneous Expenses	19,794
Subtotal	\$ 2,759,757
Grand Total—All Court Departments	\$15,875,481

*Charge-back items—These items are solely controlled by the Board of County Commissioners, not the Court.

**Some charge-back items are included.



Administrative Judge
(elected 1983)
Honorable John F. Corrigan



Judge
Honorable Walter G. Whitlatch
(retired December 1982)



Administrative Judge
(1972-1982)
Honorable John J. Toner



Judge
Honorable Leodis Harris



Judge
Honorable Betty Willis Ruben



Judge
Honorable Kenneth A. Rocco
(took office January 1983)

J U D G E S

The Juvenile Court continued to expand its service delivery to those young people and their families who were referred to the Court, as well as to provide additional service to the community. This was evident in the development of new programs, branch site expansions and additional intake services.

Some of the accomplishments during 1982 were:

- Thirty-four treatment programs were fully implemented to provide additional family counseling, crisis intervention, remedial education, diversion, employment and restitution/victim services. The programs, jointly administered by the Court and the County Com-

missioners, are designed to meet the needs of about 16,000 youth who were involved or who were likely to become involved with the Court.

- Probation services were completely decentralized throughout the county. Two additional branch offices were opened on the east side as a result of the long-time goal of maintaining all followup services in the immediate community of the probationer. It is hoped that they will result in an increased number and quality of supervisory contact.
- Intake services were expanded to make it possible to structure the locations for filing com-

plaints by law enforcement officers, parents, schools and citizens more accessible. Intake workers now handle mediation hearings that provide a mechanism between two parties to resolve conflicts without going to court.

- The development of a Volunteer Program was started by the hiring of a volunteer coordinator. The role of the Volunteer Program is to offer more diverse services to our clients, as well as to supplement the existing programs.
- Detention Home population continued to be controlled by short term group home placement in addition to Home Detention.

On November 10, 1982, the present building, which has housed the Court for 50 years, was rededicated following the completion of a renovation project. The open house and rededication saw a record number of youngsters visit the Court for tours and to observe mock trials, as well as representatives of private and public agencies involved with the Court.

The entire staff of Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court has and will continue to adapt and implement treatment programs to meet current needs of the children and families coming to our attention, and in so doing, continue to contribute to the administration of justice and the resolution of the problems of children and families we are mandated to serve.

John J. Toner
Administrative Judge
(1972-1982)

D I R E C T O R Y O F P E R S O N N E L

COMMON PLEAS COURT JUVENILE COURT DIVISION

MAIN COURT 2163 E. 22nd STREET 443-8400

JUDGES:

Honorable John J. Toner
Honorable Walter G. Whitlatch
(retired 12-31-82)
Honorable John F. Corrigan
Honorable Leodis Harris
Honorable Betty Willis Ruben
Honorable Kenneth A. Rocco
(took office 1-1-83)

COURT ADMINISTRATOR:

Ervin J. Wierzbinski
(resigned 11-15-82)

ACTING COURT ADMINISTRATOR:

Edith Anderson

ADMINISTRATOR'S SECRETARY:

Jane F. Nebesar

BAILIFFS:

Owen McGinty
Arnold Mitchell
R. Hayden Mooney
Jerome Stano
Michael Telep

JUDGES' CLERKS:

Carol Marsalek
Stephanie Radcliff
Margaret Rhoades
Bonnie Seiber
Joyce Stucko

LEGAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

DIRECTOR:

William A. Kurtz

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR:

Richard T. Graham

REFEREES:

Carol Bugg
William Fraunfelder
Garlandine Jones
Margaret Mazza
David M. Novak
Charles Sprague

INTAKE OFFICERS:

SUPERVISOR: Sharon Berman

Shirley Davis
Richard Heil
Shirley Simon
David Schroeder
Wayne Strunk

Sylvia Underwood
Gregory Weimer
Leonard Young

DOCKET REVIEW OFFICER:

John Lepo

CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK:

Andrew Pierce

DIVERSION PROGRAM:

DIRECTOR: Jearlene Rogers

Lynda Kurtz
Thomas Mathew
Carolyn Penn
Paula Selkowitz
Jack Worthington
Kevin Zehe
Secretary: Joann Johansen

SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER:

Andrew J. DeSanti

DEPUTY CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER:

Victor M. Macha

CASEWORK SUPERVISORS:

Rudiene Brabson
Lucy Christopher
Francis Hogan
Millard Jones Jr.
Christina Norris
Jacqueline Warren

CUSTODY REVIEW OFFICE

DIRECTOR: Doris Hunt

SUPERVISOR: Janet Bryant

Jacquelyn Abbott

Bernice Bailey

Gerald Dixon

Joan Gabbard

Secretaries: Sandra Arnett

Linda Carmicle

Marguerite Henry

PLACEMENT OFFICE

SUPERVISOR: Donald Peak

Jack Cervelli

Elizabeth Howse

John Lowey

James Manuel

Earl Matthews

Donald Schwallie

Mary Spearman

Secretaries: Kathleen Masterson

Barbara Smith

COURT CLINIC

DIRECTOR: Dr. Javier Galvez

PSYCHIATRISTS:

Dr. Irving Berger
Dr. Valerie Boulware
Dr. John A. Hadden
Dr. Richard Markey
Dr. Florence K. Matthews
Dr. Kathleen Quinn
Dr. Edwin Roth
Dr. Elena Wolfenson

PSYCHOLOGISTS:

Dr. Thomas Barrett
Dr. Isidore Helfand
James Irwin
Phillip D. Wisneski

FAMILY CASE RECORD ROOM

CHIEF: Ella Eckhoff

FAMILY COUNSELING PROGRAM

SUPERVISOR: Charlotte Perry

John Comley
Chandler Garnett
Joyce Garrett
William Knox
Diane Smith

VICTIM AID SERVICES PROGRAM

SUPERVISOR: Richard Walker

Glynn Crawford

CLASSIFICATION, ASSIGNMENT AND REVIEW

SUPERVISOR: John Puch

PROBATION OFFICERS:

Kim Albert
Nanee Bennett
Leslie Blakemore
Eleanor Bridge
Martha Brown
Lawrence Burnley
Phyllis Burton
Carl Carter
Timothy Dickey
Richard DroSt
Thomas Evans
Sean Gallagher
Christine Godfray
Sandra Hopwood
John Howley
Mary Jane Hudec

Lebron Jackson

Norman Kiner

Patricia Marshall

Thomas McGuiness

Michelle Newson

Alice Palmer

George Pecuch

Donald Perry

Jay Primus

Carole Radey

John Reulbach

Alene Ruple

James Robertson

Robert Staib

Brian Tilow

John Tutt

Michael Violi

Terri Warner

PERSONNEL DIRECTOR:

James Prunty

BUDGET AND PAYROLL DEPARTMENT

DIRECTOR: Brice Manning

CENTRAL STENOGRAPHIC SERVICES

CHIEF: Lethia Shields

TRAINING DEPARTMENT

DIRECTOR: Edith Anderson

ASSISTANT DIRECTORS:

Allen P. Maragliano

George Tsagaris

YOUTH SERVICES SUBSIDY

GRANT MANAGER: Christine Wolf

INFORMATION SYSTEMS

DIRECTOR: Peter Baumgartner

STATISTICS

STATISTICIAN: Richard A. Gallitto

VOLUNTEER PROGRAM COORDINATOR

Mark Mattern

BAIL BONDS, TRANSPORTATION, POLICE LIAISON OFFICE

CHIEF: Thomas Foster

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

DIRECTOR: Lula Holt Robertson

SYSTEMS ANALYSIS

ANALYST: Barbara Noonan Hill

MAIN COURT STAFF DETENTION HOME STAFF

CUYAHOGA COUNTY JUVENILE DETENTION HOME
2209 CENTRAL AVENUE 443-3300

MAIN COURT STAFF

Katherine Adams
Milton Anderson
Cheryl Artis
John Avon
Vickie Barber
Ray Blakeley
Kathleen Bota
Carol Brown
Pamela Brown
Odessa Buchanan
Rebecca Bunner
Christine Burks
Leisha Burns
Cheryl Butler
Linda Cash
Nathan Chait
Pamela Chapek
Carolyn Cleveland
Debra Collins
Linda Columbro
Carrie Cook
Marvita Cook
Vicki Crawford
Bonnie Cuccia
Cathy Darden
Emily Deininger
Odessa Buchanan
Ruth Easley
Rosalind Evans
Frances Ferro
James Ferro
Natalie Fields
Frank Finan
Beverly Fogle
Wanda Glover
Rita Golembiewski
Gwen Grady
Eleanor Gray
Patricia Gunter
Margaret Hairston
Beverly Hamilton
Victoria Hancrik
Tinah Harris
Victoria Hector
Marian Hickman
Margrett Holliman
Cheryl Hruby
Pamela Hunter
Debra Jaenke
Jane Jajola
Cheryl Jay
Sandra Joyce
Veronica Kelly
Eleanor Kirby
Lisa Knisely
Danielle Kovacs
Mary Kremzar
Debbie Kuzel
Regina Lakauskas
Celeste Laster
Marvelyn Lee
Tamela Lett
Cathy Lynch
Benjamin McCants
Barbara McMahan
Michelle Madison
Linda Martin

Phyllis Matthews
Thelma Miller
Linda Minor
Aleida Morales
Matthew Moro
Clara Mulgrew
Evelyn Murdock
Grace Myers
Barbara Newman
Mary Newport
Louis Ockunzzi
Rick Odom
Michelle Oszterling
Tina Patton
Rudolph Perme
Carmela Petway
Gayle Price
Jeanette Price
Denise Richardson
Joy Rimmer
Gladys Roberts
Susan Ronges
Doris Rush
Regina Russell
Shari Seals
Margaret Seese
Robin Shannon
Connie Smith
Jack Sonneborn, Sr.
Jeanette Steele
Barbara Sullivan
Preston Swope
Elvira Taylor
Marian Taylor
Pamela Taylor
Milton Terheggen
Michelle Thomas
Diane Thornsberry
Emma Torok
Elma Tubbs
Helen Ward
Michelle Ward
Joyce Washington
Jean White
Donna Williams
Pamela Wimberly
Waunita Winfield
Stuart Woldman
Donald Woodruff
Linda Wright
Narketah Wright

DETENTION HOME STAFF

Jacqueline Abbott
Donald Adams
Kim Albert
Thomas Alexander
Wyndelle Allen
Lorraine Ameer
Amos Baker
Carl Batts
Eugene Begin
Michael Beynum
Velma Black
Leslie Blakemore
Gladys Blue
John Brown
Samuel Brown
Violet Burley
Alja Burns
Susan Byrd
Lee Campbell
Fred Carque
Michael Carter
Edith Casey
Helen Cermely
Brenda Cheatham
Lamar Clark
Lucille Clark
Kenneth Cloud
Judy Collins
Jocelyn Conwell
Jean Cracium
Helen Curry
Erla Daniel
Harry Davis
Nettie Davis
Tony Davis
Arthur DeBardeleben
Luther Demery
Oliver Demery
Arlene DeSousa
Cleveland Dillard
Elverna Dillingham
Vickie Duncan
Ruth Easley
Stanley Feaster
Claudia Felder
Genevieve Ferguson
Thelma Fitch
Samuel Franks
James Gay, Jr.
James Gay, Sr.

Mary Gilbert
Donald Gill
Michael Gorbett
Lloyd Grandberry
Willie Grayson
Janet Gunn
Thomas Hamilton
Robert Hampton
Joe Harding
James Harris
Darryl Harrison
Bernard Harvey
Felicia Hawkins
Barbara Head
Dorothy Hemphill
David Henderson
Artie Hicks
Herine Hill
John Hollingsworth
Rudolph Hoston
Joseph Isom
Barbara Jeskey
Jerry Johnson
Elaine Jones
James Jones
Emma Jordan
Johnny Kelly
Beverly Kosarko
Lynda Kurtz
Sandra Kusmirek
John Lepo
Mary Ann Lingis
William Little
Gregory Littleton
Roosevelt Lockley
Mildred Lowery
Ruthie McAdoo
Jonathan McKee
Charlie Malone
Kathaleen Martin
Sandra Mayfield
Ronsey Merritt
Catherine Midgett
Virginia Miller
Arnold Mitchell
Rimothy Moore
Willa Morgan
Alberta Morrison
Boris Morrison
Rosa Nalls
Patrick O'Malley

Lilian Orosz
Beulah Payne
LeRoy Payton
Donald Peak
Robin Plater
Madeline Poole
Kyril Popoff
Catherine Prevo
Peggy Ranieri
Jeanine Raynes
Lillie Rice
Lawrence Richards
Alfredo Rivera
John Robinson
Lucille Ruff
Bernice Santiago
Vernon Saunders
Carl Schmitz
Sandra Scott
Brian Sexton
Robert Sharp
Burrell Shields
Marcus Shinaul
Katherine Singleton
Claude Smith
Harriet Smith
Rosalind Smith
Shirley Smith
Thomas Stewart
Eugene Stover
Anna Taraba
Gail Taraba
Daniella Thomas
Queen Thomas
Zelma Tucker
Dennis Verleny
Malik Waliyuddin
Thomas Washington
Vera White
Janie Whitehead
Georgia Whittemore
Carlton Williams
Johnny Williams
Leonard Williamson
Larry Witherspoon
Patricia Woodard
Janie Woods
Edward Wooten
Wardell Wright
Leonard Young

CHILD SUPPORT DEPARTMENT

LOEW'S BUILDING
1515 Euclid Avenue, 443-5800

DIRECTOR: James Papp

LEGAL SERVICES

DIRECTOR: Elaine Chimo

REFEREES:

James Farmer
John Menzies

INTAKE OFFICER:

Jeanne Mattern

ENFORCEMENT

DEPUTY DIRECTOR:

Gregory Williamson

COUNSELORS

SUPERVISOR: John Bokoch

Alice Ahern
Kimberly Biley
Fred Carque
Thomas Edwards
Stanley Feaster
Sharon Hawk
Sharon Hughes
Renee Kereki
Gale Koenig
Roberta Oleksiak
Lisa Reitz

Harry Steele
Lisa Storgard
Daniel Surniak
Richard Taylor
Sandra Watson
Veronica Woods

OPERATIONS

DEPUTY DIRECTOR: Susan Fisher

CASHIER'S OFFICE

CHIEF CASHIER: Howard McGuire

CLERK'S OFFICE

CHIEF, RECORDS PROCESSING:

Yvonne DeRocco

STENOGRAPHIC SERVICES

SUPERVISOR: Mary Pinckney

LOEW'S BUILDING STAFF:

Carolyn Allen
Jeanne Barcy
Jean Beckwith
Donna Bell
Celeste Bozeman
Josie Brown
Barbara Butkiewicz
David Chelminski
Shirley Coles
Barbara Czachur
Victor Dido

Deborah Fair
Lizaweta Foltzer
Vanessa Grier
Janet Griffin
Lois Gutentag
Louise Haggerty
Gwendolyn Jackson
Arlene Johnson
Marian Jones
Angela Kennedy
Monica Kolosky
Patricia Kus
Karen Lynard
Venita Midcaif
Loretta Mulvey
Robert Neill
Linda Owens
Anna Marie Posedly
Sue Rakotci
Delores Reid
Robert Ruthenberg
Cresta Short
Sandra Tier
Kandy Willham
Annie Williams
Karanetta Williams
Lakeetha Williams
Edith Winland
Eugene Zak

WESTSIDE SATELLITE OFFICES

BRANCH OFFICES

NEAR WEST OFFICE

4115 Bridge Avenue
281-1630 (Probation)
281-3102 (Intake)

FAR WEST OFFICE

2121 West 117th Street
631-1211

SOUTHWEST OFFICE

5361 Pearl Road
749-1200

DIRECTOR: Joyce Smith

CASEWORK SUPERVISORS:

Kenneth Hirz
Matthias Novak
Donald Switzer

INTAKE OFFICER:

Gregory Weimer

OFFICE STAFF:

Janice Robinson
Mona Shelton
Theresa Sommer

PROBATION OFFICERS:

Elie Abouserhal
Michele Biliski
Richard Donelan
John Gallagher
Gary Garvin
Kathryn George
Gregory Graham
Steve Leverich
John Miller
Louis Moore
Linda Muscatello
Patrick O'Donnell
Marilyn Roalofs
Dennis Soltis
Jack Sonneborn, Jr.
James Tribble
James Young
Wayne Vlainic

BRANCH INTAKE OFFICES

CLEVELAND HEIGHTS OFFICE

2983 Mayfield Road
321-7380

Intake Referee: Brian Sexton

Clerk: Rosanne O'Brien

EUCLID OFFICE

21331 Wilmore Avenue

289-2779

Intake Referee: Sandra Malevan

LAKESIDE OFFICE

12650 Detroit Avenue

531-0334

Intake Referee: Jack DiCillo

Clerk: Dolores Hildebrand

SHAKER HEIGHTS OFFICE

3355 Lee Road

921-7000

Intake Referee: Sandra Malevan

SOUTHWEST OFFICE

5361 Pearl Road

749-1200

Intake Referee: Mark Minnello

Clerk: Jeanne Metzger

COMMUNITY COUNSELING CENTERS

BRANCH OFFICES

HOUGH OFFICE

1949 East 105th Street
795-3497 (Probation)
795-0759 (Intake)

GLENVILLE-EAST CLEVELAND OFFICE

13308 Euclid Avenue
851-3019

SHAKER OFFICE

11800 Shaker Boulevard
752-8940

MILES OFFICE

9119 Miles Avenue
641-7452 (Probation)
641-0483 (Intake)

DIRECTOR: Robert Twohey

CASEWORK SUPERVISORS:

Marwan Jadeed
Margaret Mueller
Ronald Nowakowski

INTAKE OFFICERS:

Sylvia Underwood
Leonard Young

OFFICE STAFF:

Tonja Blackwell
Lenice Clemons

Geralyn Gebura
Rhonda Pritt

PROBATION OFFICERS:

Jerrald Arnold
Leslie Bass
Ethel Batts
Zelma Brown
Gregory Bufford
Ann Chambers
Jocelyn Conwell
Norma Goodson
Herman Hairston
Gregory Hale
Curtis Halsell
Robert Hampton
Artie Hicks
Rudolph Hoston
Robert Lewis
Doris McGraw
Harold Miller
Leon Pitts
John Pokorny
Johnny Pollard
Cornell Sledge
Dwight Sutherland
Denyse Tilford
Dennis Verleny
Ellen Welsh
Janie Whitehead

DETENTION HOME

CUYAHOGA COUNTY JUVENILE DETENTION HOME

2209 Central Avenue, 443-3300

SUPERINTENDENT: David C. Adams

ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS:

Janet Estadt
Thomas Royer

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

DIRECTOR: Sandra Hargrove

OFFICE MANAGER:

Irene Brodzinski

MEDICAL SERVICES DIRECTOR:

Esther Kofman, M.D.

FOOD SERVICES MANAGER:

Lillian Gunn

CHAPLAIN:

Daniel L. Rossbach

ACTIVITIES DIRECTOR:

Lois Rosasco

HEAD NURSE:

Mary Trayte, R.N.

INTAKE AND RELEASE REFEREES:

Lawrence Alesnik
Robert Horley

SHIFT SUPERVISORS:

Hillman Hanley
Adonis Miles
James Robinson
Floyd Simmons

HOME DETENTION PROGRAM

SUPERVISOR: Carl Sanniti

Forrest Harris
Vivian Irizarry
Robert Lanigan
Akil Ogbonna
Cheryl West

1982

CITIZENS BOARDS

CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

CHAIRMAN:

Mary Louise Hahn

VICE CHAIRMEN:

Robert D. Gries

Albert Ringler

MEMBERS:

Frank Ballistreri

Toni Bernet

Channy Brokaw

Ronald Brown

Walter Burks

Lonnie Burten

Crede Calhoun

Leo H. Clayton

Eugene L. Combs

David N. Cox

Dorothy Curtiss

Anthony DeBaggis

Janet P. Falsgraf

Donald Freeman

Deedee Hayes

Leslie W. Jacobs

Father Walter Jenne

William R. Joseph

Margaret Kennedy

Leslie King

Marjorie Kornhauser

Maxine Levin

David Nachman

John Petten

Dr. Louis R. SanMarco

Dr. Consuelo M. Sousa

Dorothy Tolliver

CUSTODY REVIEW BOARD

Trina Agnlin

Mildred Cannell

George Coghill

James Cox

Kathy Egan

Marjorie K. Evans

Howard Gordon

Janet Hairston

Carrie Johnson

Avonne Jones

Donna Jones

Irene Kay

Florence Landskroner

Jean Livingood

Carolyn Miller

Lucille Morris

Pierre Nappier

Nancy O'Keefe

Rose Pebble Radcliffe

Betty Rath

Janice E. Rench

Mary Robinson

David Sacco

William Shlensky

Jolyn Skodis

Thomas Stuber

Etta Mae Thompson

Joan Tidd

Kay Vine

Peggy Wasserstrom

Frances Watson

Louise Williams

Annie Wooden

James Zika