



429 Michigan

Toledo, Ohio 43624

- *Judge Robert R. Foster*
- *Judge Francis A. Pietrykowski*

# Family Court of Lucas County

## 1969 ANNUAL REPORT



**ROBERT R. FOSTER, JUDGE**  
**Court of Common Pleas**  
**Division of**  
**Domestic Relations**



**FRANCIS A. PIETRYKOWSKI, JUDGE**  
**Court of Common Pleas**  
**Division of**  
**Domestic Relations**

# *Table of Contents*

Letter to the Commissioners . . . . .	3
Judge Foster Reports . . . . .	4
Judge Pietrykowski Reports . . . . .	5
Statistical Highlights of 1969 . . . . .	7
Trends – Ages – Offenses by Month – Source of Referral . . . . .	8
Delinquency Referee Department . . . . .	9
Juvenile Offenses . . . . .	10
Dispositions on Juvenile Offenses – Modifications . . . . .	11
Traffic Report . . . . .	12
Traffic Statistics . . . . .	13-14
Probation Department . . . . .	15-16
Placement Services . . . . .	17
Juveniles Placed in Institutions . . . . .	18
Residence in Area and Schools Attending . . . . .	19-27
1970 Census Tracts – Toledo Urban Area . . . . .	28
Dr. Henry Hartman Reports . . . . .	29-31
Child Study Institute . . . . .	31-32
Child Study Institute Statistics . . . . .	33-34
Custody Department . . . . .	35-36
Child Support Department . . . . .	37
Finance Department . . . . .	38
Domestic Relations . . . . .	39-40
Domestic Relations Statistics . . . . .	41-42
Staff of Family Court – December 1969 . . . . .	43-44

To the Honorable Sol Wittenberg  
William Gernheuser  
James Holzemer

Commissioners of Lucas County

And to the Honorable Martin A. Janis  
Director of Department of Mental Hygiene and Correction

Dear Sirs:

In compliance with Section 2151.18 General Code, I submit herewith the Annual Report of the Court of Common Pleas of Lucas County, Ohio, Division of Domestic Relations, which includes the Juvenile Court, covering the calendar year 1969 showing the number and kinds of cases that have come before it, and other data pertaining to the work of the Court of interest to you and the general public.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT R. FOSTER  
FRANCIS A. PIETRYKOWSKI  
Judges

June, 1970

## ***Judge Foster Reports***

The year of 1969 witnessed several major changes in the laws governing this Court, and also an important change of direction in the policy of the Court pertaining to the handling of juvenile cases. The General Assembly of the State of Ohio, in conformance with recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court, and upon recommendation of the Ohio Juvenile Court Judges Association, passed an act making drastic amendments to the Juvenile Court code. Said act became effective November 19, 1969, and in general added further legal safeguards for juveniles charged with serious crimes, while at the same time not infringing on the Court's inherent power to handle cases on an unofficial or minor offender basis, and to dispose of same short of an adjudication of delinquency. While following all applicable law, it is not this writer's intent to operate a juvenile criminal court.

The Ohio General Assembly also passed legislation permitting Domestic Relations Courts to establish and maintain Conciliation Courts within the framework and jurisdiction of the parent Court. Inasmuch as the Marriage Counseling Department of this Court has for years pursued counseling and conciliation as its prime objective, and as its record of achievement in this field has been of the highest, the establishment of a Conciliation Court has been found to be unnecessary in this County. The funds and space necessary to operate such a service could be used to better advantage by expanding present services.

Late in 1968, an important change in direction was made by this Court in its policy of handling delinquency cases. The principal efforts of our Probation Department were to be devoted to younger delinquents between the ages of 8 to 14 years, while the older repeaters and more sophisticated delinquents were to be faced with the Ohio Youth Commission or the Mansfield Youth Center. The principal objective of the change was to utilize our probation services in an area where our chances of rehabilitation would be greater.

In line with this policy, plans are now being made for the establishment of a group foster home for pre-delinquent or mildly delinquent boys between the ages of 8 and 13 years. The purchase of the home, together with remodeling and furnishing, will be funded with Federal grants through the Toledo Model Cities program. Said funds will also pay the cost of operation and maintenance for the first year, after which title to the property will revert to Lucas County, and the County will bear the cost of operation. Said foster home will be staffed and operated by this Court, and should be ready for occupation by mid-1970. It is hoped that more community-based foster homes for both boys and girls can be established in the near future by this Court. Ways and means of financing same are now under consideration.

In conclusion, it should be stated for the record that all of the dockets of this Court are current and operating well within a minimum pending caseload. My personal thanks to Judge Pietrykowski and the entire Staff of this Court for their efforts in enabling us to maintain such a record in the face of an ever-increasing volume of cases.

## ***Judge Pietrykowski Reports —***

As the years seem to quickly pass on, I am able to pause briefly and note that the end of 1969 marked the mid-point in my first full term of serving in this Court. We all like to reflect on the past, and look toward the future. I know, that with the help of our dedicated staff the next three years will produce more innovation and continued dedication towards our steadfast goal – that of serving the members of our community and with helping their children.

While the Court was to a certain extent, able to receive funds to operate during 1969, the amount received was still far below what was realistically needed in order to fulfill not only our statutory duty but our moral commitment, and that is to make our Family Court the most outstanding facility, not only in the State of Ohio but also one of the finest in the Country. The operation of the Court, like all governmental operations is faced with the various problems of inflation; increased salaries for our personnel to match the increased cost of living, increased placement costs, and as it seems, year after year, an ever increasing caseload.

During 1969 there were 3,366 divorce cases filed, an increase of 9.1% over 1968, and 48.4% increase from 1965. However, even though we have had such large increases, we were still able to keep our pending caseload to an acceptable minimum.

I, personally, want to thank every member of our Family Court Staff and especially my colleague, Judge Robert R. Foster for his support and help during these years. We certainly know that next year and the years ahead will pose additional challenges, however, with a sincere and dedicated commitment, I am sure our Court will fulfill its purpose.

**JUDGE FRANCIS A. PIETRYKOWSKI**

# *Statistical Highlights Of 1969*

Juvenile offenses registered in 1969 totalled 4,864 – a decrease of 225 from 1968. Included in the 1969 registrations were 291 dismissed cases and 168 “Out-of-County” Runaways. In 1968, there were 375 dismissed cases and 272 “Out-of-County” Runaways.

\* \* \*

Of the 4,864 cases registered 3713 involved boys and 1147 involved girls as compared to 3937 boys and 1152 girls in 1968.

\* \* \*

There was a total of 2592 individual boys and 879 girls registered in 1969 compared to 2640 boys and 827 girls in 1968. Boys decreased by 48 and girls increased by 52 – an increase of 4 individual children (excluding “Out-of-County” Runaways.)

\* \* \*

Of the 2592 individual boys 615 or 23.7% repeated in 1969. Of the 879 girls 148 or 16.8% repeated in 1969. However, 1170 or 45.1% of the 2592 individual boys and 223 or 25.4% of the 879 girls had previous Court Appearances before 1969.

1422 boys and 656 girls appeared in Court in 1969 for their first offense. This is a decrease of 52 boys and an increase of 53 girls from 1968.

\* \* \*

193 or 13.6% of the 1422 individual first offender boys and 87 or 13.3% of the first offender girls repeated in 1969.

Since 1964, or in the last 6 years, 11,826 children have been in Court for their first offense.

422 or 36% of the 1170 individual boys who had been in Court before 1969 had more than one offense in 1969. 61 or 27.4% of the 223 girls also repeated more than once in 1969.

\* \* \*

Individual children in Court in 1969 increased by 4 over 1968 while the total offenses registered decreased 225 from 1968. “Out-of-County” Runaways accounted for 104 of the 225 decrease in 1969. In 1969, there were 121 fewer registrations for all other offenses.

## **Significant Increases in Offenses From 1968:**

Shoplifting from 667 to 728; drinking from 196 to 297; disturbance from 160 to 214; malicious destruction of property from 99 to 122; trespassing from 79 to 110; late hours from 172 to 211; arson 11 to 22; and possession/using drugs from 6 to 39.

Shoplifting has increased from 498 in 1967 to 728 in 1969.

## **Significant Decreases From 1968:**

Auto theft 209 to 184; burglary 446 to 408; robbery (armed) from 26 to 11; robbery (unarmed) from 86 to 47; school truancy from 239 to 187; ungovernable 505 to 443; carrying concealed weapons (gun) from 14 to 2; sniffing glue, etc. from 78 to 54.

Delinquency cases registered – 1321 or 27.2% of the total registrations (4864.) Unofficial or Minor Cases 3543 or 72.8%. There were 108 more delinquencies registered in 1969 than in 1968.

\* \* \*

Rate of Juvenile offenses increased from 23.8 in 1968 to 24.2 per 1000 in 1969.

### THE 6-12 AGE GROUP

532 individual boys and girls, ages 6 through 12, were in Court in 1969 – a decrease of 40 children from 1968. 425 of these children were boys and 107 were girls. 123 or 29% of the boys and 13 or 12.1% of the girls were in Court in a previous year.

These 532 children had 700 offenses – 573 for boys and 127 for girls. 47 offenses for boys and 5 for girls were dismissed.

119 or 20.8% of the boys offenses and 14 or 11% of the girls offenses were Official.

Most frequent offenses for these 532 boys and girls were: Shoplifting – 171; burglary – 99; other stealing – 81; ungovernable – 39; malicious destruction of property – 36; school truancy – 33; disturbance and trespassing – 52; runaway – 24; assault and battery – 19; unarmed robbery – 5; and false fire alarm – 11.

91 boys and 4 girls were placed on Probation/Supervision to a Court Counselor; also, 18 boys and 2 girls were placed on supervision to an agency worker.

19 boys and 2 girls violated their probation.

5 boys were Committed to Ohio Youth Commission.

18 boys and 2 girls' cases were pending investigation as of December 31, 1969.

381 individual boys and 85 individual girls (ages 6 through 12) were registered in the Child Study Institute in 1969.

\* \* \*

Excluding Non-Support and Domestic Relations there were 11,337 cases registered in 1969 compared to 11,017 in 1968 and 9130 in 1967.

Break-down of the 11,337 cases registered in 1969 are as follows:

Delinquency . . . . .	4864	Special Service . . . . .	6
Traffic complaints . . . . .	5509	Bastardy . . . . .	290
Dependency . . . . .	182	Affidavit in Neglect . . . . .	69
Custody actions . . . . .	148	Contributing –	
Visitation & companionship . . . . .	73	Delinquency of minor . . . . .	50
Consent to marry . . . . .	37	Dependency & Neglect . . . . .	8
Illegal Placements . . . . .	18	Abuse of child . . . . .	3
Out of town investigations . . . . .	6		

### TRAFFIC COMPLAINTS

Individual children: Boys, 3060. Girls, 611 for a total of 3671. These boys and girls had 5509 Complaints.

First Court appearance	Previous Court appearance
Boys 1802 or 58.9%	Boys 1258 or 41.1%
Girls 514 or 84.1%	Girls 97 or 15.9%

1007 individual boys and 76 girls had more than one traffic complaint in 1969. This means that 32.9% of the boys and 12% of the girls repeated in 1969.

*Bessie Munk  
Gloria Russell*

**TABLE NO. 1  
TREND FOR THE PAST FIVE YEARS**

	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969
Commitments to Ohio Youth					
Commission	155	199	172	216	197
Commitments to Private					
Correctional Schools	50	14	48	28	55
Commitments to other					
Institutions	44	16	30	34	38
Placed in Foster Homes	60	40	68	50	36
Total children removed					
from community	309	269	318	328	326
Number carried on probation	1254	1271	1148	1103	1135

**TABLE NO. 2  
OFFENSES BY THE MONTH (Except Traffic)**

	Boys	Girls	Total
January	286	101	387
February	279	70	349
March	278	91	369
April	312	101	413
May	313	98	411
June	320	105	425
July	347	78	425
August	370	95	465
September	307	81	388
October	288	109	397
November	285	133	418
December	332	85	417
Total	3717	1147	4864

Includes 291 dismissed cases and 168 "Out-of-County Runaways".

**TABLE NO. 3  
AGE RANGE OF ALL CHILDREN**

	Boys	Girls	Total
9 years and under	83	15	98
10	74	11	85
11	110	24	134
12	158	57	215
13	229	131	360
14	383	162	545
15	497	182	679
16	500	169	669
17	528	122	650
18	30	6	36
	2592	879	3471

1969 Median Ages – Boys: 15 yr. 6 mo. Girls: 15 yr. 3 mo.

**TABLE NO. 4  
SOURCE OF REFERRAL – ALL CHILDRENS CASES  
(except out of co. runaways)**

	Boys	Girls	Total
Parents or relatives	101	122	223
Probation Counselor	19	9	28
Law enforcement officer	3402	870	4272
Other court	4	0	4
School Department	71	63	134
Social Agency	5	9	14
Other Source	7	14	21
	3609	1087	4696

# *Delinquency Referee Department*

The nine referees, hearing delinquency cases, had a total of 6394 Official adjudication and disposition hearings and unofficial hearings and rights conferences. This emanated from a registration of 4696 cases.

During the year we had 355 cases in which, initially, a “not guilty” plea was entered, and, therefore, were referred to the prosecutor. Of these, 108 cases went to contested hearings. Of the balance of 247 cases, 140 changed their plea to guilty, and hearings were had on the affidavit. The rest of the matters were heard unofficially, with affidavits “written off docket”, or “dismissed” without hearing, mostly the former.

Concerning the contested hearings, the assistant prosecutors, Mr. Charles Doneghy and Mr. Curtis Posner, assigned to the juvenile cases, aided greatly in establishing, later modifying legal procedures. This was our initial year of having prosecutors involved in contested hearings.

Amended Substitute House Bill 320 made many changes in the Ohio Revised Code relative to juvenile cases. The changes became effective November 19, 1969. These changes were many, and several were of significant import in making findings and dispositions. There were numerous meetings and conferences endeavoring to interpret, weigh the probable significance, and devise methods of implementation. However, in terms of procedure the strictures regarding detention hearings and subsequent preliminary hearings, the former – to be held not more than three days and the latter not more than ten days after the admission of the child to the detention facility, presented the greatest problems. Seemingly, and

hopefully, these problems were resolved by the procedures established. In the matter of the detention hearings the various police agencies were most understanding and cooperative – and greatly appreciated.

There are procedures to be established regarding the handling of hearings on expungement of Juvenile Court records, for which the Code now provides. It is too early to know what problems this may present – the ramifications are quite broad.

During the year there were some changes in personnel. Two new referees, Daniel Sanders and Dennis Ulrich, both attorneys, were added to the staff. But, very shortly after the second joined us we “lost” the first – he became the Traffic Referee (replacing Mr. Louis Fulop, who became Judge Fulop, Maumee Municipal Court).

One must give recognition to the excellent cooperation given by the legal profession, particularly the Legal Aid Society, and their legal staff. This year – as the year just preceding – has been one of transition, of change, of trial, and the understanding and helpful assistance of the legal profession was most welcome and appreciated.

Walter Bouck	– Chief Referee
Catherine Champion	– Assistant Chief Referee
Janice Christofel	William Ruby
Marjorie Gullberg	Daniel Sanders
James Fagerstrom	Frank Sidle
	Dennis Ulrich

## DISPOSITIONS ON JUVENILE OFFENSES

	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>		<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
Placed on Probation/Supervision to:							
Court Counselor .....	571	99	670	Fine Suspended .....	158	1	159
Agency Worker .....	66	20	86	Fine and Restitution .....	11	0	11
Individuals .....	32	17	49	Restitution .....	136	8	144
Continue Probation/Supervision: .....	221	44	265	Adjusted .....	1221	682	1903
Referred to Agency .....	2	19	21	Referred to Other Court .....	6	1	7
Custody to Agency .....	5	1	6	Referred to Parole Officer .....	29	0	29
Committed to Ohio Youth Commission ..	113	18	131	Referred to New Complaint .....	137	37	174
Committed (Temporary) O.Y.C. ....	8	2	10	Other disposition .....	31	20	51
Returned to Ohio Youth Commission ...	36	1	37	Pending disposition .....	<u>103</u>	<u>44</u>	<u>147</u>
Committed to Ohio State Reformatory ..	19	0	19		3366	1039	4405
Committed to Other Institutions,				Dismissed Cases .....	243	48	291
non-correctional .....	1	0	1	Out-of-County Runaways .....	<u>108</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>168</u>
Fined .....	460	25	485	TOTAL CASES REGISTERED .....	3717	1147	4864

## MODIFICATIONS OF PROBATION

	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
Committed to Ohio Youth Commission ..	19	1	20
Placed on Probation/Supervision:			
1968 Disposed of in 1969 .....	74	27	101
Placed in Foster Homes .....	11	25	36
Waived to Adult Court .....	1	0	1
Committed to Ohio State Reformatory ...	2	0	2
Comm. Pri. Tr. School .....	1	0	1
Comm. Columbus State School .....	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
TOTAL .....	109	53	

## *Juvenile Offenses*

	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>				
Robbery-armed . . . . .	11	0	11	Manslaughter . . . . .	1	0	1
Robbery (unarmed) . . . . .	43	4	47	Murder . . . . .	1	0	1
Burglary . . . . .	403	5	408	Cut/stab-intent to wound . . . . .	4	0	4
Auto theft . . . . .	180	4	184	Intentional shooting . . . . .	0	1	1
Shoplifting . . . . .	423	305	728	Shoot, intent to kill or wound . . . . .	3	0	3
Forgery, Fraud, Grand Larceny . . . . .	48	6	54	Other injury to person . . . . .	16	0	16
All other theft . . . . .	295	19	314	Drinking/Drunk & disorderly/ Intoxication . . . . .	268	29	297
Arson . . . . .	19	3	22	Purchasing/Possession of intoxicants . . . . .	17	2	19
Carrying/possession of weapons . . . . .	17	0	17	Sniffing glue, lacquer, freon, etc. . . . .	50	4	54
Disturbance . . . . .	189	26	215	Use/Possession of Drugs . . . . .	35	4	39
Malicious destruction of property . . . . .	117	5	122	Late Hours . . . . .	179	32	211
Trespassing . . . . .	103	7	110	Operating motor vehicle w/o owner's consent . . . . .	69	1	70
All other carelessness/ mischievous . . . . .	203	13	216	All other offenses . . . . .	<u>130</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>161</u>
School Truancy . . . . .	115	72	187	Sub total . . . . .	3366	1039	4405
Runaway . . . . .	89	203	292	Dismissed . . . . .	243	48	291
Ungovernable . . . . .	201	242	443	Out-of-County Runaways . . . . .	<u>108</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>168</u>
Sex offenses . . . . .	40	13	53	<b>TOTAL CASES REGISTERED . . . . .</b>	<u>3717</u>	<u>1147</u>	<u>4864</u>
Assault & battery . . . . .	85	8	93				
Assault, intent to rob . . . . .	12	0	12				

## *Traffic Report 1969*

The increased use of the automobile as a mode of transportation and status among the 16 and 17 age category is reflected by the rise in traffic citations. There were 5509 traffic citations issued to juveniles in the 16 to 17 age grouping in 1969 as compared to 5133 issued in 1968, an increase of 376. While this increase seems small by itself, the total picture is somewhat graver. In 1967, there were 3905 traffic citations issued to juveniles as compared to 1969's total of 5509.

This constant escalation reflects the lack of experience which pervades the entire scope of juvenile driving. Driver inexperience is reflected in the type of offenses committed by our juvenile traffic offenders. Red light violations – 386. Stop sign – 186. Without due regard – 659. Assured clear distances, rear end collisions – 277. Speeding – 964. Starting or backing without care – 111. Changing course without care – 109. These figures indicate driver negligence and also poor driver attitude as regards the automobile. The nature of these offenses are also the prime causes of property damage and personal injury accidents.

The Ohio State Legislature in recognizing this fact has declared that anyone between the ages of 16 to 18 and applying for a probationary driver's license must have attended a qualified driver education class. In following this state and national trend, the Lucas County Juvenile Court doubled its assignment of juveniles to the local Defensive Driving Course

sponsored by the Toledo Lucas County Safety Council. This year's assignment consisted of 1206 boys and 302 girls as compared to 1968's total of 776.

The type of dispositions issued by the Court also indicate inexperience and misuse of the automobile. Besides the usually high court costs and fines, the licenses suspended reached a new high of 1430. This figure includes people who either drove without a license, for example children under age 16, or children who had an extremely bad traffic record.

In an effort to cure driver inexperience, the Court assigned 1508 juveniles to the Defensive Driving Course. These cases usually involved accidents or serious risk or harm to the juvenile and/or other drivers on the highways.

In comparing male and female drivers, the same conclusion is reached as in 1968. In 1968, there were 4445 citations issued to boys and 688 to girls. The 1969 figures indicate a total of 4813 citations issued to boys and 696 to girls.

This year 1970 should prove to be very interesting. This will be the first full year that a qualified drivers education course will be required before the 16 and 17 year old will be allowed a probationary license. Hopefully, with this education and the Defensive Driving Course offered in Lucas County, enough experience will be engendered to lower the rising citation rate among juveniles.

*Daniel J. Sanders*

**COMPARISON OF GIRLS' TRAFFIC COMPLAINTS  
JANUARY – DECEMBER 1968-1969**

	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	+
No operator's license . . . . .	41	51	+ 10
Temp. Permit – no licensed driver . . . . .	4	3	1
Red Light . . . . .	47	60	+ 3
Stop Sign . . . . .	21	23	+ 2
Without due regard on street . . . . .	108	106	2
Without due regard off street . . . . .		0	- 1
Assured clear distance . . . . .	47	58	+ 11
Speeding . . . . .	154	109	45
Unreasonable speed for conditions . . . . .	2	1	1
Driving left of center . . . . .	10	12	+ 2
Wrong way on One Way Street . . . . .	3	4	+ 1
Following too closely . . . . .	3	3	
Prohibited turn . . . . .	10	14	+ 4
Starting or backing without care . . . . .	13	24	+ 11
Changing course without care . . . . .	20	23	+ 3
Yield at intersection . . . . .	18	20	+ 2
Yield turning left . . . . .	25	26	+ 1
Yield at sign . . . . .	34	39	+ 5
Yield emerging – private drive . . . . .	23	28	+ 5
Motorbike – passengers helmet . . . . .	11	0	- 11
Unsafe vehicle . . . . .	12	8	- 5
Headlights improper . . . . .	2	2	

Muffler-excess noise/defective . . . . .	5	3	2
Leaving scene of accident . . . . .	3	10	+ 7
Improper license plates . . . . .	2	4	+ 2
Viol. Ct. Order (Lic. susp., rest.) . . . . .	1	3	+ 2
Other operational violations . . . . .	16	17	+ 1
Other non-operational violations . . . . .	22	11	
	659	662	+ 3
Dismissed . . . . .	29	34	+ 5
TOTAL . . . . .	688	696	+ 8

**COMPARISON OF GIRLS' DISPOSITIONS**

	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	
Pay Court Costs . . . . .	657	658	+ 1
Court Costs Suspended . . . . .	2	4	+ 2
Pay Fine . . . . .	603	581	- 22
Fine Suspended . . . . .	13	5	- 8
License revoked . . . . .	1	0	- 1
License suspended . . . . .	118	159	+ 41
Application/License Suspended . . . . .	26	37	+ 11
License restricted . . . . .	54	57	+ 3
Attend DDC . . . . .	200	302	+ 102
Dismissed . . . . .	29	34	+ 5
Other dispositions . . . . .	7	4	- 3
TOTAL . . . . .	1710	1841	+ 131

**COMPARISON OF BOYS' TRAFFIC COMPLAINTS  
JANUARY – DECEMBER 1968-1969**

	<b>1968</b>	<b>1969</b>	+
No operator's license . . . . .	330	381	+ 51
Temp. Permit – no licensed driver . . . . .	22	34	+ 12
Red Light . . . . .	328	326	- 2
Stop Sign . . . . .	125	163	+ 38
Without due regard on street . . . . .	503	553	+ 50
Without due regard off street . . . . .	22	31	+ 9
Assured clear distance . . . . .	181	219	+ 38
Speeding . . . . .	927	855	72
Unreasonable speed for conditions . . . . .	8	1	7
Driving left of center . . . . .	65	48	17
Wrong way on One-Way Street . . . . .	45	39	- 6
Following too closely . . . . .	11	6	- 5
Prohibited turn . . . . .	94	87	- 7
Starting or backing without care . . . . .	53	87	+ 34
Changing course w/o care . . . . .	71	86	+ 15
Yield at intersection . . . . .	52	57	+ 5
Yield turning left . . . . .	56	66	+ 10
Yield at sign . . . . .	87	99	+ 12
Yield emerging – private drive . . . . .	50	62	+ 12
Motorbike – passengers helmet . . . . .	112	49	- 63
Unsafe vehicle . . . . .	138	100	- 38
Headlights improper . . . . .	37	72	+ 35

Muffler-excess noise/defective . . . . .	199	209	+ 10
Leaving scene of accident . . . . .	31	97	+ 66
Improper license plates . . . . .	98	131	+ 33
Viol. Ct. Order (Lic. susp., rest.) . . . . .	32	66	+ 34
Other operational violations . . . . .	208	375	+ 167
Other non-operational violations . . . . .	<u>299</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>- 49</u>
	4184	4549	+ 365
Dismissed . . . . .	<u>261</u>	<u>264</u>	<u>+ 3</u>
<b>TOTAL . . . . .</b>	<b>4445</b>	<b>4813</b>	<b>+ 368</b>

**COMPARISON OF BOYS' DISPOSITIONS**

	<b>1968</b>	<b>1969</b>	+
Pay Court Costs . . . . .	4147	4461	+ 314
Court Costs Suspended . . . . .	31	60	+ 29
Pay Fine . . . . .	3565	3775	+ 210
Fine Suspended . . . . .	172	37	- 135
License revoked . . . . .	37	19	- 18
License suspended . . . . .	641	975	+ 334
Application/License Suspended . . . . .	205	240	+ 35
License restricted . . . . .	399	341	- 58
Attend DDC . . . . .	576	1206	+ 630
Dismissed . . . . .	259	264	+ 5
Other dispositions . . . . .	<u>65</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>+19</u>
<b>TOTAL . . . . .</b>	<b>10097</b>	<b>11462</b>	<b>+ 1365</b>

# Probation Department

The year 1969 brought about many personnel changes. We started the year with 15 counselors, and had 23 as of December 30, 1969. The numbers alone indicate only 8 new staff members. Actually, there were 12 new counselors during 1969. Of the 15 counselors at the beginning of 1969, some were reassigned to other areas of the Court, began Graduate School at the University of Michigan, or left for other jobs.

These changes caused problems as the caseloads had to be reassigned; and new people required orientation and training. These factors reduced somewhat effective service.

On the positive side, we were able to maintain the Teacher Probation Counselor Program. This year 3 teacher counselors were placed on the Court payroll and 3 remained with the Board of Education. The expectation is that the Court will take over the entire financing of this program. Another positive factor was the expansion of our placements in private schools and foster homes where service had been cut to a bare minimum in the previous year.

In-service training was continued by regular staff meetings with our consulting psychiatrist. Lectures in interviewing techniques and counseling methods were continued by a professor from the University of Toledo. Also, our former chief psychologist (Miss Ruth Williams) conducted a seminar on group therapy techniques for the counselors.

Field training experience was made available to University of Toledo students in the Fall of 1969: 2 from the four-year school; 4 from the two-year Technical College. These students

are provided with Court training and supervision by some of our counselors.

Volunteers continue to play an important part in our Probation Department. From January to June we had the weekly services of Mrs. Joan Foster; September into 1970, Mrs. Margot Clark has been with us; both are from the Junior League of Toledo. Mrs. Phyllis Dean has been assisting the Department since September, mainly with her typing skills. Mr. Edwin T. Burnep, who has been with us for many years, continued his services in 1969. Many thanks go to these good people who have shown an interest in their Juvenile Court.

## CASE LOAD MOVEMENT

	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>
Investigations Pending 1-1-69	118	55
Investigations Assigned	276	149
Social Histories Dictated	264	109
Investigations Pending 12-31-69	66	42
On probation/supervision 1-1-69	564	172
Placed on prob/supervision	552	85
Termination of prob/supervision	355	71
On prob/supervision 12-31-69	761*	186*

\*These figures include 114 (boys agency supervision)  
16 (girls agency supervision)

### **Court – Agency Coordination**

As in the past years, the Court again received much assistance from the various social agencies in our community – Toledo Catholic Charities, Lutheran Social Services, Childrens Services Board. Many cases referred into Juvenile Court are being handled by these agencies. This alleviates some of the caseload burden upon our Court counselors.

The Court – Agency Coordinator is the person with whom all agency counselors work in an effort to keep the Court knowledgeable about case movement. Also, Court services such as psychological testing and psychiatric conferences are arranged through the Agency Coordinator. Six month reports on all probation/supervision cases are requested. When the agency counselor requests a case be closed, a summary is submitted to the Coordinator who then follows through with the mechanics of closing the case.

### **Teacher – Probation Counselor Program**

During the past year, six Teacher Probation Counselors continued to serve the Court carrying a supervision caseload of approximately ten to twelve cases each.

This Program is in its second year. Its basic quality and meaningfulness seems to lie in the fact that the youngsters supervised have at their disposal a counselor who is as it were “on the spot” to give counsel and advice.

*Dan Weber  
Donald McCall  
Robert Schmitz  
Ruth Baumann*

## *Placement Services*

With an assurance of more adequate placement funds, we moved into the year on an encouraging note. We could again place in private residential training schools, juveniles who needed special treatment. We continued expanding our foster home program. Emphasis was placed on the private school placements throughout most of the year. This was due to the greater prevalence in court of youth with more serious personal and social problems.

During the first half of the year, Foster Home Registrar, John J. Neenan, moved on to become Special Projects Coordinator. Later, two experienced counselors joined placement services; Mr. Kenneth Singer, concentrating on boys' private school placements and Miss Alice Bauer on girls. They have been a great asset to our program. Later in the year, Mrs. Margaret Gumble was transferred to placement to specialize in recruiting and evaluating foster homes. She also is an experienced counselor and is selecting quality foster homes in Northwestern Ohio for our boys and girls.

With these staff members giving full time to placement cases, the number of juveniles in private schools rose to 60 and in foster homes to 26. Private schools and treatment centers which we had never before contacted, accepted our juveniles, and this began a new working relationship with them. These schools are Edgemeade of Maryland, Stonegate in Connecticut,

the Brown Schools in Texas, Wernle and United Methodist, both in Indiana, and the recently opened Roweton Boys Ranch at Chillicothe, Ohio. These, plus schools with which we have worked for many years, totaling 20, accepted our children in 1969.

Newer treatment techniques such as intensive group therapy and behavior modification are now being used in the schools. This indicates the innovative philosophy of these schools.

As we look back briefly over 1969, we are proud of improved services in this phase of the court's work. As with all other services, expenses for placement are at a high level. We believe the funds are well spent.

We in placement services want to thank Mr. Edwin T. Burnep, Volunteer Case Aid, who assisted us and other members of the staff during the year. His time and effort was a fine citizen's contribution and a saving of time and money for Lucas County.

*Richard Daley  
John J. Neenan  
Alice Bauer  
Kenneth Singer  
Margaret Gumble*

## 1969 – JUVENILES PLACED IN INSTITUTIONS

### BOYS

Boys Village .....	7
Boys Town, Nebraska .....	3
Buckeye Boys' Ranch .....	3
Edgemeade of Maryland .....	4
Harbor Creek School for Boys .....	1
Mt. Alverno .....	1
Oesterlen Home for Children .....	5
Rhinebeck Country School .....	1
Roweton Boys Ranch .....	2
Starr Commonwealth for Boys .....	3
Stonegate School .....	2
Indiana Methodist Children's Home .....	
Miami Children's Center .....	
Dayton Children's Psychiatric Hospital .....	1
Columbus State School .....	6
Mansfield Youth Center .....	21
Ohio Youth Commission .....	175
Ret. Ohio Youth Commission (Unofficial) .....	<u>1</u>
	238

### GIRLS

Brown School, Texas .....	1
Gilmary School for Girls .....	2
Girls Town of America .....	3
Luella Cummings School .....	4
Our Lady of Charity School .....	2
Rosemont School for Girls .....	9
Stonegate School .....	2
Methodist Children's Home .....	1
Wernle Children's Home, Indiana .....	1
Miami Children's Center .....	6
Ohio Youth Commission .....	20
Ret. to Ohio Youth Commission (Unofficial) .....	1

# *Residence In Area And Schools Attending*

## BIRMINGHAM AREA

<b>Tracts</b>	<b>Children</b>	<b>Schools Attending</b>					
46	38	*Waite	33	Macomber Voc.	5	Luella Cummings	1
47A	34	*Birmingham	20	Whitney Voc.	1	Private Training School	1
47B	<u>34</u>	*Garfield	22	Cardinal Stritch	4	Not Attending	<u>7</u>
	106	*Heffner Spec.	1	Jones	2		106
		*Holy Rosary	2	Parkland	1		
		*St. Stephen	2	Raymer	4		

## EAST TOLEDO AREA

<b>Tracts</b>	<b>Children</b>	<b>Schools Attending</b>					
48	29	*E. Side Central	8	Waite	75	Holy Rosary	1
49	22	*Franklin	9	Cardinal Stritch	4	Jones	1
50	11	*Navarre	13	St. Ursula Acad.	1	Parkland	3
51	45	*Oakdale	23	Macomber Voc.	12	St. Cyril & Methodius	1
52	46	*Raymer	8	Libbey H. S.	1	Not Attending	<u>22</u>
53	<u>38</u>	*St. Thomas	5	Penta County	1		<u>191</u>
	191	*Good Shepherd	2	Birmingham	1		

## CENTRAL BUSINESS AREA

<b>Tracts</b>	<b>Children</b>	<b>Schools Attending</b>	
28	7	Scott H. S.	1
		Robinson Jr.	1
		Warren	2
		Westfield	1
		Not Attending	<u>2</u>
			7

## NORTH END AREA

<b>Tracts</b>	<b>Children</b>	<b>Schools Attending</b>							
12	38	*Chase	3	Woodward	47	Robinson Jr.	1	St. Mary's	2
20	28	*Lagrange	14	Whitney Voc.	2	Washington Jr.	1	Sherman	2
29	28	*Riverside	16	Scott H.S.	1	Arlington	2	Spring	2
30	<u>50</u>	*St. Francis Elem.	3	Start H.S.	1	Hamilton	2	Not Attending:	<u>24</u>
	144	*St. Michaels	3	Macomber Voc.	6	Jones	2		144
		*Stickney	5	Cath. Central	1	Parkland	4		

See map on page 28

\*Schools Located in area.

## RESIDENCE IN AREA AND SCHOOLS ATTENDING (Cont'd.)

### POINT PLACE

Tract	Children	Schools Attending					
55	55	*Edgewater	1	Woodward	27	Washington Jr.	1
		*Point Place	9	Macomber Voc.	5	Hamilton	1
		*St. John's Elem.	2	Cath. Central	3	Riverside	1
				Whitney Voc.	1	Not Attending:	<u>3</u>
				Whitmer	1		55

### FORT INDUSTRY AREA

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending					
5	5	Whitmer	10	Cherry	5		
56	<u>18</u>	Jefferson Jr.	2	St. John's Elem.	1		
	23	Washington Jr.	3	Not Attending:	2		
					23		

### LAGRANGE-STICKNEY AREA

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending					
9	6	*Woodward	84	Cath. Central	2	Mayfair	1
10	12	*Cherry	1	Libbey H. S.	1	Ottawa River	1
11	48	*Parkland	8	Macomber Voc.	8	Riverside	1
17	41	*Hamilton	28	Scott H. S.	1	Stickney	1
18	30	*St. Francis Elem.	1	Whitney Voc.	3	St. Mary's	4
19	<u>80</u>	*St. Adalbert	1	Springfield H. S.	1	Not Attending:	<u>15</u>
	217	*St. Hedwig	3	Robinson Jr.	2		217
		*Sherman	19				
		*Spring	29				
		*St. Vincent DePaul	2				

### MAYFAIR AREA

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending					
4	26	*Northwood	7	Cath. Central	1	Burnham Jr.	1
57	<u>50</u>	*Regina Coeli	1	Macomber Voc.	2	Jefferson Jr.	4
	76	*Whittier	7	Start H. S.	23	Washington Jr.	7
				Sylvania	2	Jackman	1
				Whitmer	9	Hopewell	2
						St. Agnes	1
						Not Attending:	<u>8</u>

See map on page 28

\*Schools Located in area. 20

## RESIDENCE IN AREA AND SCHOOLS ATTENDING (Cont'd.)

### LONGFELLOW AREA

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending					
2	9	*DeVilbiss	17	Start	23	Notre Dame Acad.	1
3	30	*Larchmont	1	Macomber Voc.	4	McKinley	9
6	23	*Longfellow	10	Waite	1	Parkland	2
7	<u>26</u>	*St. Catherine	4	Whitney Voc.	1	Whittier	6
	88			Cath. Central	2	Not Attending:	<u>6</u>
				St. Francis H. S.	1		88

### OLD WEST END AREA

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending					
8	36	*Scott	120	Cardinal Stritch	1	Gunckel	1
15	40	*Cath. Central	11	DeVilbiss	7	Jones	1
16	65	*Macomber Voc.	11	Libbey	2	Lagrange	5
21	67	*Fulton	50	Notre Dame Acad.	1	Lincoln	1
22	112	*Glenwood	33	Start	4	McKinley	3
23	85	*Larc Lane	1	Whitmer	1	Parkland	9
27	<u>23</u>	*Rosary Cathedral	5	Whitney Voc.	1	Riverside	1
	428	*Warren	24	Woodward	4	Ryder	1
		*Florence Crittenton	1	Waite	2	St. Ann's	3
				St. Francis H. S.	1	St. Francis Elem.	1
				St. John's H. S.	3	Sherman	22
				Washington Jr.	1	Washington Elem.	1
				Robinson Jr.	35	Westfield	1
				Birmingham	1	Private Tr. School	1
				Cherry	3	Not Attending:	<u>52</u>
				Deveaux	1		428
				E. Side Central	1		

*\*Schools Located in area.*

## RESIDENCE IN AREA AND SCHOOLS ATTENDING (Cont'd.)

### DORR AREA

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending					
25	162	*Whitney Voc.	3	Bowsher	1	Fulton	3
26	95	*Robinson Jr.	95	DeVilbiss	3	Hale	3
32	40	*Gunckel	65	Libbey	90	Larc Lane	2
33	116	*Lincoln	29	Macomber Voc.	9	Parkland	13
34	75	*Martin L. King	23	Notre Dame Acad.	1	Columbus State Sc.	1
35	33	*Pickett	54	Scott	145	Ohio Medical Sc.	<u>1</u>
36	91	*Stewart	32	St. Francis H. S.	1	Not Attending:	655
37	<u>43</u>	*St. Anthony	2				
	655	*St. Stanislaus	1				
		*St. Teresa	1				
		*Washington Elem.	14				

### SOUTH SIDE AREA

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending					
38	18	*Libbey	65	Bowsher	27	Keyser	1
39	51	*Arlington	5	Cath. Central	4	Lagrange	1
40	41	*Burroughs	6	DeVilbiss	1	Parkland	3
41	40	*Jones	44	McTigue Jr.	1	St. Vincent DePaul	1
42	35	*Marshall	5	Maumee Middle	1	Tracey Special	1
43A	1	*Newbury	5	Macomber Voc.	16	Washington Elem.	1
43B	9	*St. Charles	4	Whitney Voc.	3	Zion Lutheran	1
44	18	*St. Peter & Paul	1	Waite	2	Davis Business College	1
54	43	*Walbridge	25	Woodward	1	Private Tr. School	1
68	<u>13</u>	*Westfield	3	Robinson Jr.	1	Not Attending:	<u>33</u>
	269			Hale	2		269
				Harvard	2		
				Gunckel	1		

See map on page 28

\*Schools Located in area.

## RESIDENCE IN AREA AND SCHOOLS ATTENDING (Cont'd.)

### PARKSIDE AREA

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending					
14	14	*Gesu	1	DeVilbiss	37	McTigue Jr.	2
24	69	*Hale	19	Libbey	1	Robinson Jr.	10
31	17	*St. Francis H. S.	1	Scott	15	Lincoln	9
67	<u>12</u>	*St. Hyacinth	3	Macomber Voc.	2	McKinley	1
	112			Rogers	2	Parkland	1
				St. Ursula Acad.	1	Harvard General	2
				Whitney Voc.	1	Not Attending:	<u>4</u>
							112

### OLD ORCHARD AREA

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending					
13	46	*Hebrew Academy	1	DeVilbiss	25	Start	1
		*McKinley	3	Maumee Valley Day	1	St. John's H.S.	1
		*Old Orchard	7	Notre Dame Acad.	1	Gesu	3
				St. Francis H.S.	2	Not Attending:	<u>0</u>
				St. Ursula Acad.	1		46

### DEVEAUX AREA

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending					
60	12	*Start	25	Cath. Central	1	Jefferson Jr.	2
61	12	*Deveaux	13	DeVilbiss	11	Washington Jr.	4
62	16	*Blessed Sacrament	1	Notre Dame Acad.	1	Wernerts	1
63	12	*Patterson	1	St. Francis H.S.	1	Concordia Lutheran	1
64	17			Whitmer	11	Not Attending:	<u>5</u>
65	<u>10</u>			St. Ursula Acad.	1		79
	79						

*\*Schools Located in area.*

## RESIDENCE IN AREA AND SCHOOLS ATTENDING (Cont'd.)

### HEATHERDOWNS-BEVERLY AREA

<b>Tracts</b>	<b>Children</b>	<b>Schools Attending</b>					
45A	17	*Bowsher	42	Maumee H.S.	7	Garfield	2
45B	28	*Beverly	3	Maumee Middle	4	Newbury	2
69	15	*Glendale	1	Rogers H.S.	13	Riverside Maumee	1
72	40	*Harvard	1	McTigue Jr.	6	Not Attending:	5
	<u>100</u>	*Our Lady Perp. Help	3	St. John's H.S.	9		<u>100</u>
				Concordia Lutheran	1		

### MAUMEE

<b>Tracts</b>	<b>Children</b>	<b>Schools Attending</b>					
70	59	*Maumee H.S.	39	St. John's	1		
71	24	*Maumee Middle	25	Penta County	4		
	<u>83</u>	*Ft. Miami	1	Columbia Military Acad.	1		
		*Union	4	Not Attending:	3		
		*Wayne Trail	2		<u>83</u>		
		*Miami Ch. Center	3				

### SPRINGFIELD TOWNSHIP

<b>Tracts</b>	<b>Children</b>	<b>Schools Attending</b>					
87	16	*Dorr	2	Springfield H.S.	20	Larc Lane	1
91	27			Springfield Jr.	5	Not Attending:	9
	<u>43</u>			Anthony Wayne H.S.	1		<u>43</u>
				Holland Elem.	5		

### SYLVANIA TOWNSHIP

<b>Tracts</b>	<b>Children</b>	<b>Schools Attending</b>					
80	18	*Sylvania H.S.	74	St. John's H.S.	2		
81	26	*Burnham Jr.	28	St. Ursula Acad.	2		
82	36	*Central Ave.	2	Whitmer	1		
83	22	*Highland	2	Not Attending:	17		
84	24	*Hillview	6		<u>145</u>		
92	19	*St. Joseph's	2				
	<u>145</u>	*McCord Jr.	8				
		*Sylvania-Whiteford	1				

See map on page 28

\*Schools Located in area.

## RESIDENCE IN AREA AND SCHOOLS ATTENDING (Cont'd.)

### TRILBY AREA

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending					
58	44	*Whitmer	69	*Jack man	1	Feilbach	1
59	43	*Jefferson Jr.	20	*Hopewell	1	Monac	1
79	<u>57</u>	*Washington Jr.	28	*Horace Mann	1	Toledo Beauty Culture	1
	144	*Hiawatha	2	*Trilby Elem.	1	Not Attending:	<u>7</u>
		*McGregor	3	DeVilbiss	2		144
		*Westwood	4	Sylvania	1		
				Whitney Voc.	1		

### TALMADGE AREA

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending					
76	15	*Ottawa Hills H.S.	13	Whitmer	11	Washington Jr.	4
77	4	*Monac	1	Sylvania	1	McTigue Jr.	1
78	<u>14</u>			St. Francis H.S.	1	Not Attending:	<u>0</u>
	33			Jefferson Jr.	1		33

### REYNOLDS CORNERS AREA

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending					
66	26	*Rogers	40	Bowsher	1	Burnham Jr.	1
74	14	*McTigue Jr.	19	Macomber Voc.	2	Job Corps	1
75	5	*Fall-Meyer	1	St. Francis	1	Not Attending:	<u>9</u>
85	18	*Little Flower	1	St. John's	1		82
86	<u>19</u>	*Mt. Vernon	1				
	82	*Martin	1				
		*Ryder	3				

### AIRPORT HIGHWAY AREA

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending					
73	19	*Springfield H.S.	6	St. Francis H.S.	1	Parkland	1
88	<u>11</u>	*Springfield Jr.	2	Rogers	9	Not Attending:	<u>1</u>
	30	*Holland Elem.	1	McCord Jr.	1		30
		*St. John's	1	McTigue Jr.	7		

\*Schools Located in area.

## RESIDENCE IN AREA AND SCHOOLS ATTENDING (Cont'd.)

### RICHFIELD TOWNSHIP

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending
93	0	None

### SPENCER-HARDING TOWNSHIPS

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending			
94	15	*S. S. Local	10	Penta County	1
		*Irwin Elem.	3	Not Attending:	<u>1</u>
					15

### SWANTON TOWNSHIP

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending	
95	15	Swanton H.S. (Fulton Co.)	1
		Swanton Jr. (Fulton Co.)	10
		Park Elem. (Fulton Co.)	1
		Penta County	1
		Not Attending:	<u>2</u>
			15

### MONCLOVA TOWNSHIP

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending	
90	11	Anthony Wayne H.S.	7
		McAuley H.S.	1
		Fallen Timbers Jr.	1
		Not Attending:	<u>2</u>
			11

### WATERVILLE TOWNSHIP

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending			
89	24	*Anthony Wayne H.S.	16	Swanton H.S. (Fulton Co.)	1
		*Fallen Timbers Jr.	4	Swanton Jr. (Fulton Co.)	1
		*Whitehouse Elementary	1	Not Attending:	<u>1</u>
					24

See map on page 28

\*Schools Located in area. 26

## RESIDENCE IN AREA AND SCHOOLS ATTENDING (Cont'd.)

### PROVIDENCE TOWNSHIP

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending	
96	3	Anthony Wayne	2
		Penta County	<u>1</u>
			3

### JERUSALEM TOWNSHIP

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending	
97	12	Clay H.S.	1
		Eisenhower Jr.	7
		Not Attending:	4
			<u>12</u>

### OREGON AREA

Tracts	Children	Schools Attending					
98	16	*Clay H.S.	28	Scott H.S.	1	Birmingham	1
99	15	*Eisenhower Jr.	10	Start H.S.	1	Holy Rosary	1
100	15	*Fassett Jr.	13	Waite	1	Not Attending:	
101	<u>19</u>	*Coy	2	Penta County	1		<u>6</u>
	65						65


Lucas County: Total Individual Children	3301
Residence – Out of Lucas County	<u>170</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3471</b>

Of the 3301 Individual Children – 315 were not attending school.

*\*Schools Located in area.*

1970  
CENSUS TRACTS  
TOLEDO  
URBAN AREA

TOLEDO-LUCAS COUNTY  
PLAN COMMISSIONERS



## *Dr. Henry Hartman, Consultant-Psychiatrist Reports*

The year 1969 was a busy and at times quite a frustrating one for the consultant psychiatrist. Certain services which he had been rendering had to be discontinued because of the pressures of time, and services in other areas had to be expanded into fields previously handled by the full time psychologist on our staff. Thus a comparison of figures, the number of conferences held, the number of children seen etc. with previous years is rather meaningless although they are appended for what they are worth. Two general services were continued throughout the year, namely the once a month staff meetings with the Department of Domestic Relations. The nature of these conferences with the counselors changed somewhat during the year from a basically lecture format to a case conference format. Those with the Domestic Relations Department continued to be conducted in a case conference manner. The group therapy sessions with the probation counselors which had proved so valuable in the past, both in terms of increasing the individual counselor's effectiveness and in terms of preparing counselors to do group therapy with their own youngsters had to be discontinued as there was simply not enough available time.

After years of being accustomed to three full time psychologists, we have been forced to adjust to having only part time psychological testing service at our disposal. This has led to multiple problems which clustered in two main areas. The first of these areas is concerned with diagnostic and

treatment services rendered to the children themselves. In the past, psychological testing was almost always completed before a specific youngster's case was discussed with the psychiatrist. Now, frequently one of the questions at issue, when a conference is held on a youngster is "should psychological testing be done?" Frequently the exigencies of time make it imperative to the child to be examined by a psychiatrist without benefit of a prior psychological examination. Even when the psychological testing has been done, the psychologist is not available for face to face consultation and we are left with only the bare bones of his report. Since we utilize the services of various psychologists, these reports vary in completeness, interpretations and awareness of our specific needs as a court. Frequently much time has to be spent interpreting the psychologist's report to the counselor involved with the individual child. This also means a psychologist is not available to the counselor for immediate help with specific problems as they arrive and the counselor has had to turn to the psychiatrist, again frequently with a gap in time between the time the need arose and the time the psychiatrist became available.

The second area where the lack of at least one full time psychologist has been strongly felt, has been in the assistance to the C.S.I. Leaders with their problem in handling the youngsters under their care. In the past, there was always a psychologist ready for consultation with them and frequently the psychologist held staff meetings with the leaders, helping

them with general problems of management. As these services became non-existent problems in management became quite acute on the floors. This was particularly true in the boys sections, largely because there was a period of rapid and fairly constant turnover of leaders prior to the arrival of the group which has been functioning through most of this year. With little or almost no in-service training, without the presence of a majority of well experienced leaders to bolster them, without a psychologist to whom one could turn for practical help, a need developed which was so serious that it was threatening morale. As a result the psychiatrist has been forced to divert some of the time which would normally go to case conferences and interviews with children to working with the leaders. This has however proved to be a very interesting and profitable venture and we are now meeting with the day leaders at regular sessions twice a month. It is to be hoped that eventually time will be found to spend some time on a regular basis on the girl's floor as well, but the problems there had not been as acute.

There is one other broad area which I feel should be touched on in this report in which I feel the Psychiatric Department serves a useful function although it is not defined in any statistical way. This is the matter of staff morale. I am talking particularly about counseling staff. Two factors over the past several years have served to buffet staff morale. One is beyond the control of this court or this community, namely the Gault decision of the United States Supreme Court which, while exemplary, in its intent, to insure that the rights of the juvenile offender are preserved, has succeeded in turning what

was basically a social service operation where the needs of the child were paramount into a legal operation where devotion to the letter of the law comes first and the needs of the child are secondary, particularly in-so-far as the insertion of a long and uncertain delay between apprehension and disposition is concerned. Since most of the staff sees themselves as social service rather than as disciplinary people, this tends to be quite frustrating. The second factor adversely effecting morale of course is the budgetary factor, with the tremendous amount of frustration that ensues when a child's needs have been thoroughly studied, definitely pin-pointed, then it is learned that there is no money at hand with which these needs can possibly be met. A devoted probation counselor can be driven to the wall with feelings of helplessness in a situation of this sort. As 1969 drew to a close, a pilot program was being set up to see if we could increase the counselor's effectiveness within the limits of the court budget. Further discussion of this will have to be left until the 1970 report.

## PSYCHIATRIC SERVICES

Conferences with P.C. and Psychologist . . . . .	120
Interviews with clients . . . . .	58
Conferences with Marriage Counselors . . . . .	7
Interviews with clients . . . . .	12
Leadership at Staff Meetings	
(Domestic Relations) . . . . .	8
(Juvenile Court) . . . . .	15
(C.S.I.) . . . . .	11
Conferences with Staff . . . . .	11
Interviews with Applicants . . . . .	2

# *Child Study Institute*

## **PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATIONS**

In the absence of a full-time psychological services, referred to by Dr. Hartman, the court has relied upon the help of psychologists in private practice and graduate interns from the University of Toledo for psychological evaluations. The University interns are supervised by professors.

In 1969, a total of 110 psychological work-ups were completed by these psychologists at the Court's expense. It is to be hoped that in the near future at least one staff psychologist can be retained.

## **MEDICAL SERVICES**

Examinations and Treatments . . . . .	3929
Dental Care Visits . . . . .	90
Eye Refractions . . . . .	5
EEG . . . . .	9
X-Rays . . . . .	18
Special Lab Tests . . . . .	11
Special Clinic Appointments . . . . .	48
Hospital Transfers . . . . .	52
Private Doctors . . . . .	12
Speech and Hearing Center . . . . .	1

The Child Study Institute is a combination detention home and child guidance clinic for diagnostic purposes which is operated by Lucas County Juvenile Court. It serves delinquent children only. Its two main functions are:

1. To provide 1-2 days temporary secure detention for children under the jurisdiction of the court who need this type of control pending court disposition.
2. To conduct extensive social, psychological and psychiatric studies of children in order to help and advise the court regarding the best treatment plan for each child. This second function usually requires from five to seven weeks. The Institute, which has a capacity of 47 boys and 28 girls – total of 75 children, is one of the few detention facilities in the country which has this dual function.

The Institute, in addition to use of the team approach, provides a full range of activities during a child's stay for diagnostic purposes in an attempt to accomplish the following goals:

1. Bring the child to a realization of the need for a change.
2. Create a desire on the part of the child to change.
3. Help and guide the child to think through a program of change.

During 1969 the total number of children referred to C.S.I. from all sources decreased by 103 referrals. There 4,423 total admissions to C.S.I. Of this number 2,735 children were released to their parents or legal guardians pending a court hearing or released without hearing. The remaining 1,688 children were held either pending completion of police investigation or court disposition.

Following a preliminary hearing about 1,400 children were remanded for some type of diagnostic study and evaluation pending a final court disposition.

The highlight of the year did not occur until November, but it was the most significant occurrence in the past four years. The Toledo Board of Education in cooperation with all other Boards of Education in Lucas County will be responsible for providing the entire school program in detention. This means that all of the special programs operated by the school system can now be made available to the individual children who are being detained. Previous to this our school services were curtailed somewhat because of the County's inability to finance as complete a program as is necessary.

This complete program is most urgent especially since almost all of our children will either be returning to the school system, or will be placed in a setting where school achievement is expected. Since the average complete study and evaluation takes six weeks the need for continued schooling becomes apparent. Without it the child can become easily discouraged and lose interest. We are in hopes that as complete a school program as is possible will be in operation by September, 1970.

Another highlight in 1969 was the increased involvement of individual and community groups in the C.S.I. program. The

League of City Mothers provided \$1,500 worth of equipment for the various arts and crafts, ceramics, plastics, woodshop, school, and other special projects. They also sponsored several special events including a Christmas Party for children who could not be released during the holidays. Many other organizations also donated materials to continue the many fine educational and vocational projects.

The Y.M.C.A. "Community Outreach" program also became an integral part of our detention setting. Group workers from this agency presented educational and entertaining programs in an attempt to stimulate and interest children in some of the things that are available to them on the "outside". They were encouraged upon their release to come to one of the centers depending on their interests. A variety of structured and unstructured programs were presented so that a child could choose what was of interest to him, and not be bound by a highly structured program which, needless to say, many steer away from due to feelings of inadequacy.

Also in 1969 Dr. Henry Hartman, our consulting psychiatrist, became very actively involved in staff training for group leaders in addition to his conferences with probation and domestic relations staff. A much better understanding of the relationship between the approach of probation counselor and group leader was realized. Bi-weekly meetings were conducted with the group leaders and once each month the groups met together. In-service training for detention staff continued to be the major critical need in 1969, and will continue to be stressed in the 1970's.

*Lawrence Murphy, Administrator C.S.I.*  
*Charles Hinkelman, Ass't. Administrator C.S.I.*

# *Child Study Institute Annual Report 1969*

## REGISTRATIONS AND TEMPORARY RELEASES

### TOTAL REGISTRATIONS

	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
January	257	95	352
February	278	86	364
March	237	90	327
April	266	106	372
May	288	105	393
June	327	87	414
July	305	87	392
August	319	106	425
September	236	79	315
October	285	117	402
November	243	123	366
December	<u>205</u>	<u>96</u>	<u>301</u>
Total	3246	1177	4423
Less Children Detained	2077	658	2735
Actually Detained	1169	519	1688

## AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION

	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
January	44	31	75
February	51	29	80
March	45	31	76
April	54	38	92
May	54	37	91
June	52	32	84
July	53	29	82
August	53	31	84
September	53	34	87
October	63	34	97
November	60	35	95
December	47	30	77
Average for			
1969	52	33	85
1968	54	28	82

Number of days population exceed capacity in 1969

Boys	352
Girls	365

## AGES OF CHILDREN REGISTERED

	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
8 years and under	16	1	17
9	39	2	41
10	73	4	77
11	99	15	114
12	154	63	217
13	257	129	386
14	387	259	646
15	621	249	870
16	799	242	1041
17	781	209	990
18	<u>20</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>24</u>
Total	3246	1177	4423

Median Age 1969 – Boys 15 yrs. 2 mo.

Median Age 1968 – Boys 15 yrs.

Girls 14 yrs. 6 mo.

Girls 14 yrs. 9 mo.

## PREVIOUSLY IN C.S.I.

	<u>Boys</u>	<u>Girls</u>	<u>Total</u>
January	158	45	203
February	166	36	202
March	157	42	199
April	159	45	204
May	152	46	198
June	184	36	220
July	170	39	209
August	179	44	223
September	148	38	186
October	161	39	200
November	145	49	194
December	<u>125</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>161</u>
Total	1904	495	2399

562 boys and 210 girls, or 772 children, were in C.S.I. from two to eight times in 1969. The largest group were 297 boys and 148 girls in twice. 13 boys and 2 girls were in C.S.I. six different times during the year!

# *Custody Department — 1969*

## **I. SCOPE:**

The custody division of Juvenile Court is concerned primarily with post-divorce matters affecting children. Cases filed in this division seek two major categories of relief:

- (1) A change of custody of children from one divorced parent to another;
- (2) A determination or enforcement of companionship rights of the non-custodial parent.

## **II. VOLUME:**

In the first category (custody cases), 160 custody motions were filed during the year 1969, of which 103 motions were heard, 13 dismissed (including 6 dismissals after custody investigation completed), 8 continued by counsel for future hearing, with the balance awaiting pre-hearing investigation.

In the second category (companionship cases), 110 motions were filed during 1969, of which 76 motions were heard, 5 dismissed, 11 settled without hearing, and 18 continued for future hearing:

In addition thereto, custody and companionship hearings scheduled in 1969 also included disposition of some 42 custody actions and 23 companionship cases which were filed prior to January 1, 1969.

## **III. PROCEDURES:**

Procedures followed in custody contests are dictated largely by Chapter 31 of the **Ohio Revised Code**. A distinction is made, for instance, on the basis of age, with a child over fourteen years of age entitled to appear privately before this Court for the purpose of electing between natural parents for custodial purposes. Although a child's choice is subject to parental challenge and therefore not absolute, such cases are normally accorded prompt hearings and permit disposition solely on the basis of courtroom testimony. The majority of custody contests involve children under age fourteen, however, and are preceded by a thorough investigation of each parental home with findings made by the custody investigator reduced to writing and made available for inspection by counsel prior to the hearing. The investigatory process, as required by Ohio law since October, 1967, has substantial merit in terms of assuring the fullest possible disclosure about parental capacity and circumstances before a custody award is made. The process imposes, however, a sizeable monetary burden upon Ohio courts in terms of staff and, dependent upon size of staff, often necessitates an excessive delay between the filing and hearing of a custody action. Attempts were made in 1969 to minimize such delay by the addition of a full-time custody investigator, with Mrs. Barbara Smith joining our staff on March 3, 1969. During the balance of 1969 some 55 custody cases were assigned to Mrs. Smith; the number of investigation

reports completed by Mrs. Smith during 1969 was 37. Supplementing the efforts of our single staff member, an additional 12 cases were assigned to local or other agencies for custodial study during 1969, with such continued use of agency assistance prompted by fact of prior involvement of a particular agency with the family in question or by reason of the non-residency of one of the parental parties. Similarly, Mrs. Smith conducted 3 local investigations at the request of other courts.

The counselling services of Mrs. Smith and local agencies were also used with increasing frequency during 1969 as a followup measure in visitation and companionship cases where one or more parents demonstrated a particularly adverse attitude to the jeopardy of children. The need for an enlargement of such program is a compelling one but staff limitations continue to be a deterrent.

#### **IV. SUPPLEMENTAL CASELOAD:**

A third category of cases handled by the Custody Department involve adoptive placements certified to Juvenile

Court from Probate Court under authority of **Ohio Revised Code 3107.08** for the purpose of initiating an adoptive study by Children Services Board. Each such certification involves the scheduling of two hearings with appropriate notice to all necessary parties. During the year 1969, 26 such cases were heard, assigned for adoptive study and recertified to Probate Court for final adoption procedures, with a comparable number awaiting disposition at year end.

#### **V. CONCLUSION:**

Consistent with the rapidly increasing divorce rate, the volume of post-divorce litigation likewise continues to expand, not only in numerical size but in terms of special services prescribed by statute or dictated by the conscience of this Court for the benefit of minor children. Responsive to such challenge, staff enlargement remains a major future goal and procedural efficiency an ever present mandate.

*Sue Rauh, Referee*  
*Mrs. Barbara Smith, Custody Counselor*

# *Child Support Department 1969*

The total number of scheduled hearings and hearings actually heard for 1969 by Referee Leon Frankel as compared to 1968.

	<b>Total for 1968</b>	<b>Total for 1969</b>
1 A. <b>Domestic Relations motions scheduled on pending divorces</b> for child support; injunctions; temporary alimony; ejection of parent from home; temporary custody; contempt; etc.	3,503	4,446
1 B. <b>Domestic Relations motions under 1A</b> heard and decision rendered thereon.	761	1,340
2 A. <b>Juvenile Court motions scheduled on prior divorces</b> for child support, injunctions; for contempt; lump sum judgments; to increase or decrease child support or suspend or terminate; set initial support; visitation and companionship; etc.	1,501	894
2 B. <b>Juvenile Court motions under 2 A</b> heard and decision rendered thereon.	783	649
3 A. <b>United States reciprocal Uniform Support of Dependents hearings</b> scheduled for setting initial child support; and motions to punish for contempt thereon; and to suspend or terminate said child support.	276	239
3 B. <b>Reciprocal motions under 3A</b> heard and decision rendered thereon.	142	138
4 A. <b>Bastardy arraignments</b> scheduled in Lucas County.	283	368
4 B. <b>Bastardy arraignments under 4A</b> heard and bastardy pleas of not guilty, bastardy please of guilty, and child support orders set and/or dismissed.	184	305

In all 5,563 motions were scheduled and 1,870 heard in 1968 as against 5,947 motions scheduled and 2,432 heard in 1969 by Referee Leon Frankel.

Child support collections through the Toledo Humane Society rose from a previous high of \$4,097,919.33 in 1968 to a new all time high of \$4,519,681.42 in 1969.

Uniform Reciprocal Dependent Act Child child support collections through Juvenile Court Cashier of Lucas County, Ohio rose from \$144,754.54 in 1968 to a new high of \$156,665.18 in 1969.

# *Finance Department*

Despite the many obstacles faced by the County in its battle against inflation, by astute management and with the cooperation of the several departments, the Commissioners were able to provide adequate funds to cover the Court's limited expenditures for 1969. Although our over-all program still leaves much to be desired, we were able to regain some of the losses taken in prior years.

Adjustments were made in compensation for personal service which gave us a more favorable position in a competitive labor market. Consequently, we were able to hold our key people and replace a number of those previously lost through resignations.

Funds were provided to make a few long-delayed repairs to the building structure and replace some worn out maintenance equipment and office machinery. In addition, we were able to replace some of the old damaged furniture and improve the general appearance of the public sections of the building.

Although some progress was made in the Maintenance Department the building is still badly in need of paint both inside and outside. We are still faced with the problem of flood control and it is imperative that steps be taken to correct the situation promptly.

In May 1969 we accelerated our activity in the collection department by the addition of a Support Officer, and the results were most encouraging.

In the category of reimbursement, by parents, for the support of children, wards of the Court maintained in private treatment centers and foster homes, there were 66 new cases added in 1969. At the end of the year there were 85 children in placement.

While some parents made their payments with a degree of regularity, it was necessary to refer 45 cases to the Support Department in Motions to Show Cause, and to hold 48 conferences with parents who were delinquent in their payments. Our efforts were further rewarded by the collection in full of 29 cases and the reactivation of 38 others.

The exploration of all possible avenues of revenue resulted in the receipt of Social Security benefits for 10 cases.

The total amount paid into the County General Fund for the year was \$32,071.06, an increase of approximately \$7000.00 over 1968.

Restitution paid by children for loss or damage remained approximately the same as 1968. 724 new cases were received by the department, and 613 were collected in full. Through the medium of 253 conferences and an efficient system of follow-up, \$12,096.61 was collected for claimants and \$9,377.76 was paid into the County General Fund for a total collection of \$21,474.37.

Payments collected through the Support Department under the Uniform Reciprocal Support Act reached an all time high and local support payments paid through the Humane Society were up slightly over 10%.

The Traffic Court completed its second full year of operation and showed a considerable gain in the collection of fines and costs in 1969.

In addition to the above, \$594.00 was paid into the County General Fund from state subsidy for foster home care.

## Collections for 1969 –

<b>SUPPORT FOR MINOR CHILDREN:</b> Collected by Toledo Humane Society .....	\$4,519,681.42
SUPPORT OF CHILDREN, Wards of the Court maintained in private residential treatment centers and foster homes (Juvenile Court) . . . .	38,259.84
MONIES COLLECTED UNDER THE UNIFORM RECIPROCAL SUPPORT ACT .....	156,665.18
RESTITUTION PAID BY CHILDREN for damage or loss .....	21,474.37
STATE MILK SUBSIDY AND MISC. ....	4,975.14
STATE SUBSIDY FOR FOSTER HOME CARE ..	594.00
JUVENILE TRAFFIC FINES (Collected by Clerk's Office) .....	37,271.10
COURT COSTS (Collected by Clerk's Office) . . . .	39,928.46
DOMESTIC RELATIONS AND JUVENILE FINES (Clerk's Office) .....	2,455.30
SPECIAL INVESTIGATION FINES (Clerk's Office)	175.00

*Boston A. Bristol, Business Manager*

## *Domestic Relations*

The year 1969 found the legal and legislative communities of Ohio evaluating methods by which present statutory law bearing upon the problems of marriage, divorce, custody of children governs. Sections 3117.01 to 3117.08 Ohio Revised Code, inclusive, were passed by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio on August 6, 1969, approved by the Governor August 20, 1969, to become effective November 19, 1969. These sections provide for a conciliation procedure of marital controversies; determination of the need for such a procedure to be made "by the Judge of the Court of Common Pleas in counties having one such Judge, or by a majority of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas in counties having more than one such Judge". To date a separate conciliation procedure has been set up in very few of the Ohio Jurisdictions. In Lucas County the emphasis and practice in the Domestic Relations court has been on exploring the possibilities of reconciliation, and using counseling services to assist troubled spouses toward that goal. Because the conciliation philosophy has guided this court over the years no new procedures were set up, but the spirit of the new statutes is continuing to be practiced.

There is now pending under Modern Courts Amendments of Ohio Rules of civil procedure Rule 75 with reference to divorce, annulment and alimony causes. This rule will become effective July 1, 1970 unless the General Assembly adopts a concurrent resolution of disapproval before that date. The

major change from present statutory requirement appears to be that it would place the "investigations" which are mandatory under section 3105.08 O.R.C. within the discretion of the court. This rule has been referred to committee by the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Judge.

The significance of these proposals is that they reflect the public concern over the increase in family break-up, and the effects of such break-up on the children involved. Further family dissolution is creating problems in the social, economic, and legal community.

The work of the domestic relations, marriage-counseling division reflects the magnitude of the problem. In 1967 2658 new petitions were filed in the Domestic Relations Court. In 1968, 3086 petitions were filed – an increase of 428 petitions over 1967. In 1969 – 3366 petitions were filed – an increase over 1968 of 280. In two years from 1967 thru 1969 – the increase in petitions filed totals 708. (See table 1 – following).

In 1969, 2085 of the petitions filed fell within the statute which makes it mandatory for an investigation to be made where the action involves children under 14 years of age. These 2085 new cases were assigned to counselors in the domestic-relations – marriage counseling division. The counseling goals were, 1) to evaluate the possibility for reconciliation of the spouses; 2) to help resolve conflicts in planning for the custody of the children involved; 3) to resolve

companionship and visitation with the children for the non-custodial parent.

The 2085 new cases were added to the 2083 cases still pending in the court, and still active in counseling. Total major cases active in counseling and/or for investigation totaled 4168. To these major cases were added 703 cases where minor counseling help was given. (See table 3 – following). This number does not include the many daily phone and personal inquiries made by persons in the community seeking help on family and marital problems. Because of limitation of staff, and because of the practice of inter-agency cooperation the majority of non-litigated problems are referred to other social, legal, or medical agencies.

Table 4 shows the types of cases carried by the counseling staff. The special divorce investigation category – item 2 – and the pre-litigation category – item 3 – show significant change. Much preventive work could be done in these areas if there were sufficient counseling staff.

There is a constant turn-over in staff as trained and experienced counselors leave for more lucrative returns in other courts and in the public and private social agencies.

The following tables suggest the efforts made, and the results achieved in protecting values to children, to families, and to individuals; they imply the close relationship between counselors and attorneys as officers of the court, working with the bench for the best interests of citizens and the community at large.

**TABLE NO. 1**  
**DOMESTIC RELATIONS – LEGAL ACTIONS**  
**(a comparative study for 1967, 1968, 1969)**

	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>
Divorce actions pending before the court Jan. 1	1998	2142	2196
Total new petitions filed . . . . .	2658	3086	3366
Total petitions before the court . . . . .	4656	5228	5562
Petitions heard . . . . .	1669	1722	1820
Total petitions disposed of . . . . .	2520	3032	3054

**TABLE NO. 2**  
**Record of final disposition of Legal Actions**  
**(Comparative figures for 1967, 1968, 1969)**

	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>
Divorce petitions granted . . . . .	1625	1661	1847
Divorce petitions dismissed . . . . .	888	1365	1207
Divorce petitions denied . . . . .	2	2	-
Annulments granted . . . . .	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>-</u>
Total cases disposed of . . . . .	2520	3032	3054

**TABLE NO. 3**

**Cases active in counseling and/or investigation**

Cases active in counseling as of 1/1/69 . . . . .	2083
Total new litigated cases assigned for counseling and/or investigation . . . . .	2085
Total minor cases which received not more than two counseling contacts each during 1969 . . . . .	703
Total cases active in counseling or investigation . . . . .	4871
Total major and minor cases <u>closed</u> in 1969 . . . . .	2575
Total major and minor cases pending 1/1/70 . . . . .	2296

NOTE:

**TABLE NO. 4**

**Classification of cases assigned for investigation and/or counseling in Domestic Relations: —**

— a comparison — 1967 1968 1969

1) Mandatory Divorce Investigations: — litigated cases involving children under 14 years of age. These cases include special counseling effort in re-reconciliation possibilities and special custody studies . . . . .	1638	2009	2044
---	------	------	------

2) Special Divorce Investigations: — no children under 14, but counseling towards reconciliation requested by attorneys, the court, or by litigants themselves. . . . .	6	4	26
3) Major marriage counseling: — pre-litigation effort on cases referred by attorneys. . . . .	0	4	3
4) Total Investigations for other Domestic Relations courts (out-of-town inquiries) . . . . .	4	3	12

**TABLE NO. 5**

**Work assignment by the month during 1969**

	<u>Petitions filed</u> <u>1968</u>	<u>Petitions filed</u> <u>1969</u>	<u>New cases assigned to</u> <u>counseling — 1969</u>
January	247	278	170
February	221	261	163
March	237	254	164
April	244	302	186
May	280	277	167
June	250	310	221
July	309	307	181
August	289	355	211
September	252	295	174
October	323	295	183
November	234	208	124
December	200	224	141
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3086</b>	<b>3366</b>	<b>2085</b>

**TABLE NO. 6**

**Classification of cases referred to counseling or investigation that were closed in 1969 (includes litigated and non-litigated cases and minor service cases).**

1) Mandatory Divorce Investigation Cases closed . . . . .	1835
2) Marriage Counseling cases closed . . . . .	6
3) Investigation of divorce cases being litigated in other courts (O.T.I.) . . . . .	7
4) Miscellaneous cases closed – (post-divorce counseling; stepchildren, etc.) . . . . .	24
5) Minor cases closed . . . . .	703
 Total cases closed – <u>1872</u> major cases <u>703</u> minor cases	 2575

**TABLE NO. 7**

**APPOINTMENTS OF COUNSELING STAFF IN 1969**

1) Total office conferences by counselors with clients, attorneys, family and children of litigants, and other involved persons: . . . . .	4424
2) Total home visits by counseling staff; phone conferences with attorneys, other professional persons; conferences with school personnel, employers, hospitals, other agencies, etc. . . . .	6042
 Total <u>recorded</u> counseling contacts by counseling staff in 1969 . . . . .	 10,466+

*Eve K. Richards,  
Supervisor – Domestic Relations Dept.*

# Staff Of Family Court — December, 1969

Robert R. Foster, **Judge**

\* \* \*

Rita F. O'Grady, **Director**

Lawrence P. Murphy, **Administrator C.S.I.**

Charles Hinkelman, **Ass't. Administrator C.S.I.**

Francis A. Pietrykowski, **Judge**

\* \* \*

Eve. K. Richards, **Supervisor-Domestic Relations**

Boston A. Bristol, **Business Manager**

Mildred M. Baker, **Chief, Typing Department**

## REFEREES

Walter C. A. Bouck, Chief  
Catherine Champion, Ass't. Chief  
Jancie Christofel  
James Fagerstrom  
Leon Frankel  
Louis Fulop  
Marjorie Gullberg  
Sue N. Rauh  
William Ruby  
Daniel Sanders  
Frank Sidle  
Dennis Ulrich

## COURT REPORTERS

Patricia Mack, Chief  
Margaret Jazwiecki

## CASEWORK SUPERVISORS

Dan W. Weber, Chief  
C. Don McColl, Ass't. Chief  
Ruth Baumann  
Robert Schmitz

## PLACEMENT DEPARTMENT

Richard Daley, Supervisor  
Alice Bauer  
Margaret Gumble  
Kenneth Singer

## SUPPORT OFFICER

Frank Landry

## MARSHAL

Norton Cassidy

## PROBATION COUNSELORS

Jeffrey Acocks  
Maryam Berta  
Ruby Cummings  
Ralph Dandona  
Suzanne Deakin  
Carol Himebaugh  
Linda Kinker  
Edward Krauss  
Jerome Levitt  
Thomas McGill  
Viola Nimmons  
Charles Norris\*

Kathleen Patton

Thomas Roth  
Robert Schlein  
Terry Sereno  
William Shepard  
Charles Smith\*  
Douglas Smith  
David Wagner  
Beverly Zawodny

## IN-TAKE COUNSELOR

Pamela Schell

## CUSTODY INVESTIGATOR

Barbara Smith

## SPECIAL PROJECTS COORDINATOR

John J. Neenan

## STATISTICAL DEPARTMENT

Bessie Munk, Supervisor  
Gloria Russell

## MARRIAGE COUNSELORS

Lou Ellen Eyke  
Rebecca Kidd  
Charles Riseley  
J. Anthony Rudge  
Mary Sheffler  
Arlene Zwetsch

## C.S.I. PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Joan Marie Coghlin\*  
Dr. Henry L. Hartman\*  
Rev. Robert L. Hass\*  
Dr. I. H. Kass\*  
Arlene Markwood\*  
Rev. John Meyer\*  
Rosalie Mowka\*

## TEACHERS

Bess Campbell, Principal  
Rochester Gates\*  
Wayne Haefner\*  
Leone Hinelene  
Roy Hodge\*  
Joanne Shapler\*

**BAILIFFS**

Lenard Bauman  
Charles Abood

**C.S.I. LEADERS**

Catherine Shrider,  
Chief Girls' Leader  
Robert Donovan, Supv.  
David Deppen, Supv.  
Daniel Holzemer, Supv.  
Daniel C. Perch, Supv.  
George R. Stamos, Supv.  
Barr, Medford\*  
Rebecca Boudrie  
Eric Buckenmeyer\*  
Patrick Curran  
Pauline Dedes  
James Delucia  
Rosemarie Eteau  
James Farrier  
Timothy Fitzpatrick  
Thomas Galvin  
Minnie Glaspie  
Cornell Grant  
Donald Heldt\*  
Emma Hischka  
Robert Hodge  
James Howell  
John Jackson  
Willie Loper\*  
Leroy Lucius\*  
Margaret Manzey  
William McCoy  
Woodrow McCreary  
Edward Poczekaj

Stanley Rappaport\*  
Ferne Sage  
John Schafer  
Bernetta Shields  
Stella Shields  
Floyd Smith\*  
Dennis Thomas  
James Twiss  
Mary Vaillant  
Lorean Whitaker  
Raymond Wolford  
John Young

**\*Part-time workers****COOKS**

Marie Crawford, Chief  
Modesta Clapp  
Martha Drzewiecki  
Dorothy Hogle

**MAINTENANCE STAFF**

Frank Jurski, Day Foreman  
Edward Wolny, Night Foreman  
Hazel Celestine  
Preston Coleman  
Edward Grice  
Clara Jastrzemski  
Cecelia Kosolka  
Gusta Leiser  
Jean Sohalski  
Milas Wells

**OFFICE STAFF**

James Arnold

Ruth Blair  
Genevieve Blanks  
Brenda Brandes  
Claudette Brashear  
Mary Bruning  
Marie Brunzman  
Mary Compton  
Mildred Connin  
Muriel Dotson  
Elvira Drotar  
Mary Eckholdt\*  
Regina Fleck  
Gertrude Gerbich  
Madelynn Gohring  
Frances Gomolski  
Jean Gould  
Carl Guy  
Pauline Hammonds  
Ella Herbac\*  
Joan Hixson  
Thelma Hogen  
Mary Ivancso  
Mary Klein  
Edna Layman  
Carol Meiring  
Alma Miller  
Kathy Mouch  
Frances Nicholas  
Janet Pilewski\*  
Madelle Pulcrano  
Virginia Semler  
Lillian Silverman  
Elaine Soldingier  
Kathleen Tate  
Harriette Twiss  
Joyce Vargo

Dianne Weller  
Mary Wendt  
Cathy Young  
Bella Yourist

**TEACHER PROBATION COUNSELORS**

Millard Jackson\*  
Andrew Kandik\*  
James Martin\*  
Mattie Milton\*  
Richard Thompson\*  
Marvin Vines\*

**VOLUNTEERS**

Edwin Burnep  
Margot Clark  
Phyllis Dean  
Joan Foster  
Lillian Francois  
Joanne Shapler  
William Shepard

**STUDENTS**

Michael Belcik  
Despina Chakmaki  
Gloria Grant  
Patricia Hououler  
John Malin  
Frances McCaster  
Patricia Moran  
Robert Moreas  
Carlyle Mossman  
Jennifer Peterson  
Lynette Rosen  
Janet Singer

WHO DOETH NOT ANSWER TO THE RUDDER  
SHALL ANSWER TO THE ROCK

