



2011 Annual Report  
Juvenile Division  
of the  
Lucas County Court of Common Pleas



**Judge Denise Navarre Cubbon,  
Administrative Judge**



**Judge Connie Zimmelman**





# Court of Common Pleas

## Juvenile Division

### Lucas County, Ohio

Denise Navarre Cubbon  
Administrative Judge



Connie Zimmelman  
Judge

---

## LUCAS COUNTY CITIZENS:

2011 proved to be a monumental year for new initiatives for the Lucas Juvenile Court. Much of this was accomplished through enhancing community and national partnerships, and collaborating to enhance services for the youth and families in Lucas County.

The Lucas County Juvenile Court Annual Report and Report Card outlines many of the accomplishments that were achieved in 2011. We are most proud of the fact that these undertakings were accomplished during a time of real fiscal challenges and a decrease in staffing levels. Despite this reality, the staff stepped up and rose to the challenge of completing the same amount of work with less people.

The staff at the Lucas County Juvenile Court continues to be our greatest asset in achieving our mission and goals. We continue to strive to achieve a high quality of service for the youth and families in Lucas County, while developing and implementing research-based programming to reduce juvenile crime, rehabilitate youth, repair the harm done to victims, and ensure public safety.

We welcome help and input from you, our community. Please feel free to contact me at [dhodges@co.lucas.oh.us](mailto:dhodges@co.lucas.oh.us) if you have any suggestions, concerns or questions.

Respectfully,

Deborah Hodges  
Court Administrator  
Lucas County Juvenile Court



## Contents

Court Administrator’s Letter .....	i
Report Card .....	1
Description & Jurisdiction .....	3
Mission Statement and Goal .....	4
Clerks Office (Case Flow Services) .....	6
Intake .....	8
Mediation .....	9
CRB/CASA .....	10
JDC and Community Detention .....	13
Drug Court .....	18
Probation .....	20
YTC .....	28
Fiscal .....	30
2011 Statistics .....	31



# LUCAS COUNTY JUVENILE COURT **2011** REPORT CARD

Deborah Hodges, Court Administrator

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The Court continued partnerships with Cherry Street Legacy Project, Harbor Behavioral, Lucas County Board of Developmental Disabilities, Lucas County Children Services, Lucas County Human Sex Trafficking Coalition, Second Chance, Toledo Public Schools and Youth Advocate Program.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	After a year of work with the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ), the Court developed a Re-Entry Treatment Center. The Center provides comprehensive after care for youth stepping down from the Youth Treatment Center.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	In a collaborative with Toledo Grows/Toledo Botanical Garden 44 youth in the Re-Entry Program participated in building a training center and 2 greenhouses on Oneida Street. This was made possible through earmark funds from Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Due to significant reduction in funding fiscal restructuring and identification of new funding sources were priorities to continue court operations and programming in an effective manner.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lucas County Juvenile Court (LCJC) was selected as part of a National Detention Reform Initiative to be an Annie E. Casey Foundation (AECF) Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) site. Kendra Kec, Assistant Administrative Court Administrator, was chosen to be the State Chairman for the reform.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	LCJC received a Behavioral Health Juvenile Justice (BHJJ) Grant to fund Evidence Based Multisystemic Treatment (MST) and Wrap Around Program. This was initiated as a collaborative with the Toledo Mental Health Board to provide comprehensive mental health services to youth and families.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A probation program developed with evidence based practices, Effective Practices in Correctional Settings (EPICS), was implemented. This is a strength based, cognitive behavioral approach which uses role play, skill training and problem solving along with building rapport in one-on-one interactions with the Probation Officer and Youth. The goal is to change offending youth's criminal thought patterns.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2,267 cases were mediated. 1,866 (82.3%) completely settled their cases with the assistance of a neutral mediator.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The Probation Department supervised an average number of 415 youth daily. There were 506 new referrals to Probation; 538 cases were terminated and 282 youth were terminated with no new adjudications while on Probation. The average number of days each case was supervised was 446.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The Domestic Violence/Step Up program had 24 active referrals and 10 youth successfully graduated and 7 youth are still engaged.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A total of 14 families were reunited as a result of completing Family Drug Court and 3 drug free babies were born during the year to program participants.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Youth Advocate Program which mentors our youth, serviced 130 youth and delivered 13,772 volunteer hours.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A total of 587 referrals were terminated from all levels of Community Detention. 81% (474) successfully completed all requirements of Community Detention which is the highest success rate since its inception in 2000.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The Lucas County Youth Treatment Center had 68 placements and 63 terminations (54 Successful- 85%). The average length of stay was 211 days and 54 students increased academic achievement in either math or reading.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	601 Children were served by CASA volunteers with 273 children assigned this year (up 3%) from last year. In addition 261 children were assigned to Atty/GALs (paid). The total number of volunteer hours completed by active CASA volunteers was 13,603, Citizens Review Board 4,786 and Closure Board 214.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Maria Gonzalez was the recipient of the Ohio CASA Association's 'Pro Star of the Year' award for her selfless dedication to the 37 children she has served in the last 10 years.



## **Description and Jurisdiction of the Juvenile Division**

The Lucas County Court of Common Pleas, Juvenile Division was created by statute in 1977 to decide cases involving juveniles. The establishment of a separate, distinct Juvenile Division within the Lucas County Common Pleas judicial system was an acknowledgment of the specialization and greater community emphasis on juvenile justice.

The courts of common pleas, the only trial courts created by the Ohio Constitution, are established by Article IV, Section 1 of the Constitution. The jurisdiction of courts of common pleas is outlined in Article IV, Section 4.

There is a court of common pleas in each of Ohio's 88 counties. Courts of common pleas have original jurisdiction in all felony cases and all civil cases in which the amount in controversy exceeds \$500. Most courts of common pleas have specialized divisions created by statute to decide cases involving juveniles, probate matters, and domestic relations matters. Lucas County is one of 9 courts in Ohio that has only juvenile jurisdiction.

Juvenile divisions hear cases involving persons under 18 years of age, and cases dealing with unruly, delinquent, abused, dependent, and neglected children. They also have jurisdiction in adult cases involving paternity, child abuse, nonsupport, visitation, custody, and contributing to the delinquency of a minor.

The sections in 2151. of the Revised Code, with the exception of those sections providing for the criminal prosecution of adults, shall be liberally interpreted and construed so as to effectuate the following purposes:

- (A) To provide for the care, protection, and mental and physical development of children subject to 2151. of the Revised Code;
- (B) To protect the public interest in removing the consequences of criminal behavior and the taint of criminality from children committing delinquent acts and to substitute therefore a program of supervision, care, and rehabilitation;
- (C) To achieve the foregoing purposes, whenever possible, in a family environment, separating the child from its parents only when necessary for his welfare or in the interests of public safety;
- (D) To provide judicial procedures through which Chapter 2151. of the Revised Code is executed and enforced, and in which the parties are assured a fair hearing, and their constitutional and other legal rights are recognized and enforced.

[Source: Ohio Juvenile Law, by William Kurtz & Paul Giannelli, Banks-Baldwin Law Publishing Co.]

## **Mission Statement of The Juvenile Division**

---

The Court of Common Pleas - Juvenile Division is mandated and governed by law. In fulfilling its mandate the court's mission is to:

Ensure public safety.

Protect the children of the community.

Preserve families by supporting parents and intervening only when it is in the best interest of the child and/or the community.

Work with the community to develop and enforce standards of responsible behavior for adults and children.

Ensure balance between consequences and rehabilitation while holding offenders accountable for their actions.

Efficiently and effectively operate the services of the court. We will, therefore, cooperate with agencies, groups, and individuals who embrace our mission.

## **Goal of The Court**

---

The goal of the Juvenile Division is to effectively, efficiently, and equitably administer justice in all matters brought before it. Due process, responsible administration of the law, humane consideration and social awareness are imperative. The reasonable and responsible balance of society's just demands and the individual's rights are implicit.

Simply put, the goal of the Court is to ensure that the children and people who come before it receive the kind of care, protection, guidance, and treatment that will serve the best interest of the community and the best welfare of the child. The Judges and administrative staff have concern not only for resolving cases in court but also for improving family life, personal relationships, and educational and social services for families within the community. With this in mind, the Juvenile Division proceeds with the confidence to achieve its goals; realizing that it is not within human power to achieve total success, but nonetheless committed to its ideal.

# **Department Narratives 2011**

## Administrator of Case Flow Services, Mediation And Court Intake

**Nicholas Boggioni, Esq., Chief Deputy Clerk/Administrator**

The mission of the Clerk's Office is to effectively and accurately manage the case flow of the Lucas County Juvenile Court from filing to closure, while providing professional and courteous customer service. In 2011, the Clerk's Office continued striving for greater efficiency through internal reorganization, cross-training, better use of technology, and improvements in morale and job satisfaction.

Additionally, in August 2011, the Court-Intake and Mediation Departments were merged into one. Along with reorganizing those departments under a single leadership umbrella, the *Step-Up Domestic Violence Program*, previously housed in the Probation Department, was transferred to the new Intake-Mediation Department, where it assimilated with both the *Family Violence Intervention Program* and the *Court-Intake Assessment Services Program*. Such assimilation not only leads to improved efficiency, but to better service to youth, families, and the community. As the department moves through 2012, these changes will be further analyzed with an eye for continued improvement and a better use of Court resources.

### Case Flow

Per JIS

New Cases 2010			New Cases 2011		
Case Type	Quantity		Case Type	Quantity	% Chg
A - Delinquency	4272		A - Delinquency	4050	-5%
B - Traffic	1633		B - Traffic	1493	-9%
C - Dep/Neg/Abuse	408		C - Dep/Neg/Abuse	392	-4%
D - Unruly	580		D - Unruly	443	-24%
E - Adult/Contrib	574		E - Adult/Contrib	690	17%
F - Perm Custody	83		F - Perm Cust	93	11%
G - Custody/Visit	1909		G - Custody/Visit	1989	4%
H - Support	3051		H - Support	2608	-15%
I - Parentage	1052		I - Parentage	861	-18%
J - URESA	282		J - URESA	242	-14%
K - Other	96		K - Other	116	17%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>13,940</b>		<b>Totals</b>	<b>12,977</b>	<b>-7%</b>

**Case Flow (Continued)**

<b>Open Cases 2010</b>			<b>Open Cases 2011</b>		
<b>Case Type</b>	<b>Quantity</b>		<b>Case Type</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>% Chg</b>
A - Delinquency	357		A - Delinquency	319	-11%
B - Traffic	73		B - Traffic	67	-8%
C - Dep/Neg/Abuse	95		C - Dep/Neg/Abuse	64	-33%
D - Unruly	9		D - Unruly	6	-33%
E - Adult/Contrib	72		E - Adult/Contrib	161	55%
F - Perm Custody	29		F - Perm Custody	32	9%
G - Custody/Visit	492		G - Custody/Visit	607	19%
H - Support	604		H - Support	653	8%
I - Parentage	344		I - Parentage	309	-10%
J - URESA	39		J - URESA	32	-18%
K - Other	32		K - Other	11	-66%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2,146</b>			<b>2,261</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>Closed Cases 2010</b>			<b>Closed Cases 2011</b>		
<b>Case Type</b>	<b>Quantity</b>		<b>Case Type</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>% Chg</b>
A - Delinquency	4417		A - Delinquency	4088	-7%
B - Traffic	1686		B - Traffic	1496	-11%
C - Dep/Neg/Abuse	366		C - Dep/Neg/Abuse	423	13%
D - Unruly	585		D - Unruly	446	-24%
E - Adult/Contrib	614		E - Adult/Contrib	601	-2%
F - Perm Custody	92		F - Perm Custody	90	-2%
G - Custody/Visit	2014		G - Custody/Visit	1874	-7%
H - Support	3290		H - Support	2557	-22%
I - Parentage	1069		I - Parentage	894	-16%
J - URESA	275		J - URESA	249	-9%
K - Other	64		K - Other	137	53%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>14,472</b>			<b>12,855</b>	<b>-11%</b>

## Court Intake

### Fred Whitman, Court Intake-Mediation Director

The role of the Court Intake Department is to ensure that all complaints filed with the court are processed efficiently and assigned with public safety and rehabilitation at the forefront of the decision making process.

Complaints are processed in two basic divisions: official (formal/court hearing set) and the unofficial (informal). Based on a classification matrix that includes a variety of social, psychological, and legal factors, the cases that are deemed to need official judicial action are directed back to the Clerk's office and set for an arraignment hearing. The remaining cases are further analyzed to determine if they are appropriate for an alternative Court program, such as Mediation, Juvenile Drug Court, Community Assessment Services, and/unofficial hearings options.

Additionally, when appropriate, youth are referred to community-based programming. Regardless of where the informal cases were directed, all return to the Intake Department for either closure (successful completion) or reassessment. The reassessed cases come to resolution either through official court action or are redirected into another unofficial program.

Also operating under the Intake Department is the Community Assessment Services Department. The responsibilities center on completing assessments regarding drug, alcohol, behavioral, and mental health issues, and linking youth to service providers in the community. Referrals are received

from the bench, other interdepartmental sources, or from the community at large.

In 2011, the Court Intake Department processed cases efficiently, and maintained and strengthened relationships with community providers. The Department also focused on expanding diversion alternatives by adding a program and offering current services to additional communities.

Intake conducted all contributing mediations and formalized the DAA (Family Violence Intervention) process with the prosecutor's office. Ultimately, the Court Intake Department saved significant staff and docket time by providing services unofficially and diverting and linking youth to appropriate alternatives and services. See statistics on the next page.

#### Statistics

I01	Unofficial Hearing	83
I02	Mediation	816
	• Civil Protection	11
	• Family Conflict	429
	• Contributing	121
I03	Warning Letter	259
I04	Closed Probation	48
I05	Closed Parole	3
I06	Official	3,540
I07	Closed Unofficial (no hearing)	209
I09	Police Probation	154
	• Walk thru	108
I16	T.A.S.C. (Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime)	158
I17	Mental Health Assessment	41
I18	Paraclete Diversion	22
I19	Sylvania Diversion	N/A
I21	Bridging the Gap Diversion	18
	Pre Arraignment screening for Drug Court	42
	Bench referral for assessment	566
	Third Party Custody	347

## Court Mediation

Mediation's role is to bring parties together with a professional mediator in a safe, neutral setting to facilitate an effective resolution of the Court case in an efficient and non-adversarial manner.

The Mediation Department directly assisted 3,606 parents and 5,585 Children in the resolution of their Juvenile Court case through mediation rather than litigation.

### Total Number of Lucas County Juvenile Court Cases Mediated Settlement With Rate

Scheduled	Mediated	Settled	Settlement Rate
<b>3194</b>	<b>2267</b>	<b>1866</b>	<b>82.3%</b>

### The following Case Types Are Mediated:

Unruly/Delinquency	Youth charged as unruly or delinquent
Family Conflict	Youth charged with domestic violence
Civil/Custody	Parents working together to resolve their custody/parenting time conflicts
Child Protection	Dependency, Neglect, and Abuse Cases filed by Lucas County Children Services
Permanent Custody	Cases filed when Lucas County Children Services moves to permanently remove children from the care of their parents
Truancy Prevention	Parents and school personnel mediating issues causing pupil absences.
Contributing	Adults charged with contributing to the delinquency of a minor by failing to send their children to school

### Mediation Programs, Parties Served and Settlement Rate by Case Type

	Unruly/Delinquency	Family Conflict	Civil/Custody	Child Protection	Permanent Custody	Truancy Prevention	Contributing FTS
Scheduled	816	236	1349	140	41	480	121
Mediated	607	235	863	127	31	298	95
Settled	591	221	635	116	12	298	95
Settlement Rate	97.4%	94.0%	73.6%	91.3%	38.7%	100%	100%

## Court Appointed Special Advocate Department, Citizens Review Board Department & Closure Board

**Carol Martin, CASA/CRB Director**

In the year 2011, the Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) department completed its 31<sup>st</sup> year of service, and the Citizen Review Board (CRB) celebrated its 32<sup>nd</sup> year. The CASA program has grown from approximately 40 volunteers serving in 1992 to 217 citizen volunteers with active cases as of 12-31-2011. By law, the Citizen Review Board consists of four separate boards. These two Lucas County Juvenile Court-based departments are overseen by a CASA/CRB staff of 5 full time and 4 part time employees. The departments are exemplary models of what can be accomplished when citizens are invited to collaborate with government for the betterment of the community.

### Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA)

The Lucas County Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA/GAL) Department recruits and trains citizens and attorneys to serve the best interests of abused and neglected children in the juvenile court system. The CASA/GAL Department provides quality volunteer advocacy for children to ensure each child a safe, permanent, nurturing home. CASAs are trained citizen volunteers who serve as Guardians ad Litem(GAL) in the Lucas County Juvenile Court system. They represent the best interests of children involved in the juvenile justice system, primarily in

<b>CASA/GAL Activity</b>			
	<b>2011</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2009</b>
Total D/N/A Children Referred to Court	534	544	554
New Children Assigned to CASA Volunteers	273 (52%)	269 (49%)	267 (48%)
New Children Assigned to Atty/GAL (paid)	261	275	287
Total Children Served by CASA Volunteers	601	629	593
CASA Volunteer Hours	13,603	11,967	10,812
Total Number of Active CASA Volunteers	217	99	209

dependency, neglect, and abuse (D/N/A) cases. The CASA/GAL advocates investigate a child's social and emotional background, make recommendations to the court regarding disposition of the case, and monitor the child's progress toward a permanent home until the child is no longer involved in the court system.

### Citizens Review Board (CRB)

The mission of the Citizens Review Board reviews the status of dispositional orders in the cases of dependent, neglected and/or abused children enmeshed in the juvenile justice system and makes recommendations to the judges pursuant to those reviews. The review includes, but is not limited to, review of the implementation of the agency case plan, the child's

permanency plan, and any other aspects of placement or custody arrangements for the child. CRB's duties and responsibilities are clearly defined by the Ohio Revised Code (2151.417). The Code prescribes that a group of volunteers may review the status of children in the care or custody of a public agency.

Citizens Review Board Activity			
	2011	2010	2009
Total Reviews	2701	2702	2940
CRB Hearings Held	0	8	6
Caseworker Appearances	7	6	17
CRB Volunteer Hours	478	4818	5130

CRB members meet bi-monthly to determine that a plan for a permanent, nurturing environment exists and that the child protection agency is working toward achieving that plan. By statute, Citizen Review Board members must be professionals experienced in working with children (one lay person is permitted per Board). Board members receive training with regard to state statutes governing child welfare, CRB policies and review procedures. Review process structure and specific time frames are outlined in the law.

### Closure Board(CB)

In July 1995, Director Martin established a specialized CRB Closure Board. Its existence ensures that a thorough, final review of each reunification case is held before returning the child to a parent or home from which he or she was removed. Closure Board's review findings are forwarded to the judge or magistrate for review prior to a Termination/Reunification Hearing.

Closure Board Activity		
	2011	2010
Cases Reviewed	107	116
Cases Terminated With Protective Supervision	38	48
Cases Terminated Without Protective Supervision	42	37
Cases Terminating LCCS Protective Supervision	60	67
Motions Received Too Late To Review	13	20
Closure Board Volunteer Hours	214	230

### CASA/CRB Advisory Board

The Advisory Board (a 501 C [3] not for profit entity) meets quarterly. Their focus is to assist CASA and CRB volunteers in their mission of advocating for abused and neglected children in the court system. The 2011 twelve (12) person Advisory Board was comprised of forty-two percent (42%) African American and Latino members; the remaining board members are Caucasian. Board diversity is designed to include community-wide representation.

In 2011, the CASA Department increased the number of new D/N/A children assigned to CASA volunteers by three percent (3%) over 2010. To reach this goal the CASA/GAL Department trained a large GAL class consisting of forty-seven (47) CASA/GAL and seven (7) Attorney/GAL in 2011 for a total class size of 54 GAL trainees. CASA also completed phase one of the digital CASA/GAL reporting forms initiative. This included the design, construction, and posting of 11 CASA/GAL forms accessible via the Lucas County CASA Website: [www.casakids.net](http://www.casakids.net). In addition, the newly created website aims to increase recruitment and community awareness, provide program updates and training

opportunities, and provides a vehicle for receiving 501 C 3 donations and fundraising.

**Ohio CASA Association 'Pro Star Of The Year' Award Winner – Maria Gonzalez**

Each year the Lucas County CASA/GAL department selects one CASA volunteer to be honored with the CASA Power of One Award. In 2011, Maria Gonzalez was chosen for her selfless dedication to the 37 abused and neglected children

she has served in the last decade as a Lucas County CASA volunteer. CASA director, Carol Martin, nominated Maria for Ohio CASA's highest award, the Ohio CASA Pro Star Award. Maria was honored in September, 2011 at the Ohio CASA Conference in Columbus, Ohio and applauded by over 400 CASA volunteers from Ohio. In January, Ms. Martin nominated Ms. Gonzalez for the National CASA G.F. Bettenski Child Advocate of the Year award. The winner will be announced at the National CASA Conference in June, 2012.

## Lucas County Juvenile Detention Center

---

**Kendra Kec, Assistant Court Administrator**  
**Joan Parker, Detention Administrator**  
**Dan Jones, Assistant Court Administrator**  
**Mary Niederhauser, Community Control Manager**

### Juvenile Detention

Lucas County Juvenile Detention Center (JDC) provides temporary detention for delinquent youth. The function of JDC is twofold: 1.) to provide temporary, secure detention for youth who present a danger to themselves or to the community, or who may abscond pending the disposition of cases and 2.) to coordinate social, psychological psychiatric evaluations of children in order to assist and advise the Court regarding the disposition of cases. Policy and procedures within JDC are guided by compliance with federal and state law.

During 2011, JDC had the fewest bookings, nearly a 44% reduction since 2001. A total of 3,295 bookings (youth brought to the facility by law enforcement) and 2,183 admissions (youth detained overnight in the facility). The average daily population was 48 youth and the average length of stay for each youth was 8 days. More information regarding bookings and admissions may be found in the statistical section of this report.

Lucas County Juvenile Detention staff is proud of continued efforts to improve programming within the center. Residents have very structured daily schedules that provide them with various learning opportunities. Services provided are described below.

### Lucas County Selected as part of National Detention Reform Initiative

2011 was an exciting year for Lucas County Juvenile Detention, as the Court was selected to be an Annie E. Casey Foundation (AECF), Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) site. Partners from Toledo Public Schools, Lucas County Children Services, Jobs and Family Services, Mental Health and Recovery Services, Developmental Disabilities, Prosecutor's Office, Public Defender's Office, Sheriff's Department, Toledo Police Department, the East Toledo Family Center, other non-profit agencies, faith based organizations, health care institutions and grass roots organizations have rallied around efforts to insure youth are in the most appropriate, yet least restrictive environment that protects the community while rehabilitating the youth. Data provided by AECF's quarterly reporting system guided the community's roadmap for all reform efforts. More information about the JDAI Initiative may be found at:

<http://www.aecf.org/MajorInitiatives/JuvenileDetentionAlternativesInitiative.aspx>

Lucas County Juvenile Detention staff is proud of continued efforts to improve programming within the center. Residents have very structured daily schedules that provide them with various learning opportunities. Services provided are described below.

### **Rational Behavioral Training**

JDC began using Rational Behavior Training (RBT), a cognitive approach to discipline in 2004. RBT teaches youth that their thoughts lead to their feelings which in turn lead to their behavior.

Youth are engaged in two groups per day which teach RBT fundamentals. Staff guide youth and assist youth in positive decision making via a style of discipline that emphasizes the balanced use of praise, encouragement, logical consequences and disinvolvement.

### **Medical Clinic**

Adolescent and Young Adult Health Services provide healthcare to all youth detained at the Juvenile Detention Center. The mission of the medical clinic at JDC is to provide quality health care that is professional, respectful, courteous, confidential, culturally appropriate, non judgmental, non-punitive, state-of-the-art and education based. Preventative health care and treatment of both chronic and acute conditions is provided on a daily basis by a staff which includes a physician, nurse practitioners, nurses, a medical assistant and a nurse health educator.

### **Rescue Mental Health Services**

Residents who are in crisis or who have a diagnosed mental health disorder may meet with a Rescue Mental Health Services counselor. Rescue provides a licensed, master's level counselor to service JDC residents. Counselors meet with youth referred to them two times

weekly and develop behavioral plans as needed. Counselors also link youth to outpatient services as needed. Medication management appointments are made for residents on medications as prescribed by their psychiatrist.

### **Toledo Public Schools**

While in JDC, residents attend school, operated by Toledo Public Schools. Residents are assessed and assigned to an on-line curriculum based on their individual level of learning and are able to work at their own pace. They work on language, math and science curriculum blocks while in JDC. Certified Special Education teachers lead the classroom blocks with the assistance of paraprofessionals.

### **AIM- Art Integrated Math**

Residents attend AIM three times per week. AIM is designed to enable students to improve upon their math skills and to provide vocational instruction that will allow them to explore the world of work and prepare for future vocational experiences. Art Integrated Math techniques have the advantage of stimulating a renewed interest in academics. Teachers incorporate techniques such as watercolor, acrylics, clay and sculpture to teach both math and language arts concepts.

### **Creative Writing**

Twice weekly, residents attend Creative Writing classes. Contemporary and classical literature (poetry, fiction, biography) that speaks to the concerns of the juvenile population while challenging them with positive messages is used to teach reading and comprehension skills and stimulate their thinking for writing assignments. The class also teaches youth how to use practical reading material such as want

ads, job applications and consumer manuals.

### **Physical Education**

Residents participate in physical education activities once daily in the JDC Gymnasium. Basketball remains one of the resident's favorite activities. Teamwork and sportsmanship is encouraged.

### **Second Chance**

Second Chance has provided a weekly prostitution prevention oriented group for any female detained in JDC. The group ranged in size depending on the census of JDC on any given day but usually included between 3 and 9 participants each week. The subject matter of this group follows a prevention curriculum from the Massachusetts Prevention Project called MY LIFE/MY CHOICE. The program is designed to encourage awareness of trafficking, traffickers and to also encourage development of strong coping skills and self esteem building exercises to encourage young girls to choose different options and choices.

### **Spiritual Enrichment**

Local ministry groups offer spiritual enrichment groups or individual sessions two-three times per week to residents who choose to participate.

### **Library Services**

The Toledo Public Library provides services to the residents in Detention. A small library exists within the facility from which the residents may select. Residents are encouraged to read during their stay at JDC.

## **Community Detention – An Alternative to Secure Detention**

Community Detention was developed in August, 2000 and is based upon Annie E. Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative research. At that time, Lucas County Juvenile Court began managing detention population by transferring low to moderate risk youth to Community Detention.

Youth involved in Level Two of Community Detention (the Detention Reporting Center), reported to the East Toledo Family Center for 4-6 hours of pro-social programming daily (hours varied depending on the youth's school schedule). The East Toledo Family Center also provided classes two nights a week for Level 3 (Home Detention) youth. Community Detention also uses the cognitive based Rational Behavior Training (RBT) as the foundation of its discipline management plan. The Community Detention Team is dedicated to community safety, while empowering youth with knowledge, social skills and tools, to improve decision-making and behavior, as members of our community.

In addition to RBT, Community Detention also partnered with several local agencies to provide programming for youth including the:

- Success Network, job readiness program,
- University of Toledo, art and poetry program,
- House of Bread, financial planning program,
- Toledo Art Museum, tours and various activities,

- Educational field trips to Toledo landmarks and
- College tours

A total of 587 referrals were terminated from all levels of Community Detention during the Calendar Year 2011. Eighty-one percent (81%, 474) of all the youth referred successfully completed all requirements of Community Detention. This is the highest success rate that Community Detention has had since its inception in 2000. In order to successfully complete the program, participants must attend court hearings as scheduled, must not recidivate, or must complete a definable event (i.e. an assessment for counseling or treatment). The remaining nineteen percent (19%, 113) either had a warrant filed for their arrest and/or were placed back into Secure Detention; thus, they were terminated from Community Detention unsuccessfully. Remarkably, of those who completed Community Detention Successfully, 94% did not commit a new felony charge in at 12 month follow up study.

**Bookings By Race and Gender**

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Caucasian</b>	2165 (37%)	1186 (35%)	1779 (32%)	1740 (30%)	1834 (29%)	1705 (27%)	1297 (24%)	1051 (25%)	1001 (26%)	805 (24%)
<b>Minority</b>	3624 (62%)	3519 (65%)	3841 (68%)	4035 (70%)	4582 (71%)	4537 (73%)	4217 (76%)	3159 (73%)	2678 (71%)	2405 (83%)
<b>Unknown</b>	54 (1%)	1 (<1%)	40 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	0	0	1 (<1%)	68 (2%)	83 (2%)	85 (3%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5843</b>	<b>5406</b>	<b>5660</b>	<b>5776</b>	<b>6416</b>	<b>6242</b>	<b>5515</b>	<b>4278</b>	<b>3762</b>	<b>3295</b>
<b>Male</b>	4065 (70%)	3703 (69%)	3895 (69%)	4132 (72%)	4695 (73%)	4493 (72%)	4113 (75%)	3102 (73%)	2617 (70%)	2367 (72%)
<b>Female</b>	1778 (30%)	1703 (31%)	1764 (31%)	1644 (28%)	1721 (27%)	1749 (28%)	1402 (25%)	1176 (27%)	1145 (30%)	928 (28%)
<b>Unknown</b>	0	0	1 (<1%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5843</b>	<b>5406</b>	<b>5660</b>	<b>5776</b>	<b>6416</b>	<b>6242</b>	<b>5515</b>	<b>4278</b>	<b>3762</b>	<b>3295</b>

**Admissions By Race and Gender**

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Caucasian</b>	960 (39%)	1052 (38%)	1184 (37%)	1149 (35%)	1109 (31%)	1029 (30%)	1080 (29%)	919 (26%)	762 (23%)	635 (23%)	622 (26%)	510 (23%)
<b>Minority</b>	1467 (60%)	1613 (58%)	2023 (63%)	2153 (65%)	2493 (69%)	2427 (70%)	2671 (71%)	2603 (74%)	2506 (77%)	2046 (75%)	1702 (72%)	1519 (74%)
<b>Unknown</b>	12 (<1%)	157 (4%)	24 (1%)	1 (<1%)	21 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	0	0	0	52 (2%)	50 (2%)	54 (3%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2439</b>	<b>2822</b>	<b>3231</b>	<b>3303</b>	<b>3623</b>	<b>3457</b>	<b>3751</b>	<b>3522</b>	<b>3268</b>	<b>2733</b>	<b>2374</b>	<b>2183</b>
<b>Male</b>	1815 (74%)	2112 (75%)	2347 (73%)	2381 (72%)	2605 (72%)	2554 (74%)	2809 (75%)	2601 (74%)	2526 (77%)	2075 (76%)	1734 (73%)	
<b>Female</b>	624 (26%)	710 (25%)	884 (27%)	922 (28%)	1018 (28%)	903 (26%)	942 (25%)	921 (26%)	742 (23%)	658 (24%)	640 (27%)	562 (25%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2439</b>	<b>2822</b>	<b>3231</b>	<b>3303</b>	<b>3623</b>	<b>3457</b>	<b>3751</b>	<b>3522</b>	<b>3268</b>	<b>2733</b>	<b>2374</b>	<b>2183</b>

**Admission Rates By Race and Gender**

Year	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Caucasian</b>	55%	63%	63%	59%	59%	54%	59%	60%	62%	63%
<b>Minority</b>	56%	62%	69%	60%	58%	57%	59%	65%	64%	63%
<b>Male</b>	58%	65%	67%	62%	60%	58%	61%	67%	66%	68%
<b>Female</b>	50%	55%	58%	55%	55%	53%	53%	56%	56%	61%

## Lucas County Drug Court

**Judge Connie Zimmelman**  
**Kristen Blake**

2011 marked the eleventh year in operation of the Family Drug Court, as it began in March of 2000. Lucas County Family Drug Court is designed to provide on demand, collaborative services for substance abusing parents who have either lost custody of their children or are at risk of removal of their children. The multi-disciplined services of the program are designed to be timely, holistic, and meet the identified needs of drug court participants. The program goals are maintaining and achieving permanency in a child's sense of time.

A major strength of the Family Drug Court is the collaboration that occurs between all of the systems which provide services. Each week a pre-court staffing is held in which all of the team members are present to provide information on the clients' progress, as well as to develop recommendations for the court regarding the participants in the program.

2000-2011 Family Drug Referrals					
2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
24	25	44	62	53	35
2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
41	48	40	35	36	45
<b>Total</b>	<b>488</b>				

The Family Drug Court team consists of a Judge or Magistrate, the Specialty Dockets Manager, TASC case managers, child protection caseworkers, a child protection attorney, a mental health case manager, treatment providers, housing providers, defense attorneys and guardian ad-litem.

\*Active parents who successfully complete the Family Drug Court Program and are re-unified with their child(ren) at termination.

The following information can be summarized from reviewing Family Drug Court data in 2011:

- Three drug free babies were born to parents in Family Drug Court in 2011 for a total of forty-three drug free babies born since the program began in 2000.

Family Drug Court Referrals By Sex						
	2011			Total since 2000		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Parents referred	10 (22%)	35 (78%)	45	103 (21%)	385 (79%)	488

Family Drug Court Outcomes						
	2011			Total since 2000		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Successful Terminations*	4	10	14 (34%)	37	127	164 (46%)
Unsuccessful Terminations	1	26	27 (66%)	30	162	192 (54%)

- Of the 45 new parents referred to the program in 2011, 49% reported that their drug of choice was heroin or other opiates, 31% reported marijuana, 18% reported crack/cocaine, and 2% reported alcohol as their drug of choice.

This was the third year in a row since the inception of the program that heroin and other opiates was the most reported drug of choice, in that crack/cocaine had consistently been the most reported drug of choice since 2000.

<b>Family Drug Court Children</b>													
	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>New Children Served</b>	61	47	70	110	87	56	63	66	58	71	56	71	816
<b>Children Re-unified w/ Parent</b>	4	31	36	31	48	41	37	19	32	11	11	8	309
<b>Drug Free Babies</b>	3	2	4	9	2	3	4	5	1	6	1	3	43

## Probation Department

### Michael Brennan, Administrator of Probation Services

---

In keeping with the mission of the Lucas County Juvenile Court, the Probation Department is committed to working within the framework of the Balanced and Restorative Justice Model (BARJ), which focuses on the domains of offender accountability, victim reparation, community safety, and competency development. In practice, we hold juvenile offenders accountable for their delinquent activity through a sequence of graduated responses to their respective behaviors, while referring them to resources and services with the intent of reducing their risk to the community and molding them into productive members of the community.

For over 25 years, the probation department has assessed each youth being supervised on probation in terms of the potential for risk to community, as well as developing treatment plans that focus on keeping the community safe and addressing the needs of the youth and family. At the time of the referral, a comprehensive social history is completed on each youth prior to assignment to a Probation Officer. The Intake Probation Officers develop case plans for each offender and connect youth and their family to services in the community. The case is then assigned to an ongoing Probation Officer who works with the youth and family for the duration of the Probationary period.

In 2010, the department transitioned to a risk instrument, the Ohio Youth Assessment System (OYAS), which was developed by the University of Cincinnati that is being utilized by 77 out of the 88 counties in the state of Ohio. In addition to measuring risk, the

OYAS has the treatment plan built into the instrument, which addresses all the domains of the BARJ model. It is important to note that the youth and family play an active role and provide input into their treatment plan. Every six (6) months, the youth is reassessed with the goal of reducing risk to community.

Another positive change has been a shift away from the standard compliance based role of the probation officer into a teaching and coaching role. This has been accomplished by implementing the EPICS (Effective Practices in Community Supervision) Model of probation supervision, which was also developed by the University of Cincinnati. EPICS focuses on addressing the criminal thought behaviors of offenders and provides structured face-to-face interaction for officers to strengthen working relationships with their youth, while at the same time affording them the opportunity to identify high risk thinking and anti-social attitudes.

Once the probation officer and youth have identified a specific problem area, they work on building up their skill levels and appropriate alternative responses through role plays and homework. It is a social learning, cognitive based approach to working with our youth which involves skill streaming and focuses on the criminogenic needs of the youth.

Other services that the probation department has provided include a job readiness program; juvenile sex offender assessments and treatment;

substance abuse screenings and referrals to drug/alcohol treatment; domestic violence assessments and groups; individual and family counseling referrals, as well as several staff dedicated to specialty programming and dockets within the Court such as the Juvenile Treatment Court and Family Drug Court.

The probation department has made great strides in continuing to develop positive and productive relationships with community partners and stakeholders in 2011. Examples of this would include:

- We have had a long standing partnership with Harbor Behavioral Healthcare in providing treatment to our juvenile sexual offenders. Since 2007, therapists from Harbor have teamed up with two (2) probation officers to facilitate juvenile sex offender treatment groups. Harbor also has a designated office in our department.
- We continue to meet on a quarterly basis with the Lucas County Board of Developmental Disabilities to problem solve and treatment plan on cases involving mutual clients. DD also has an office within our probation department.
- Probation is an integral part of our joint Crossover Initiative with Lucas County Children's Services. We are currently piloting joint case management between probation officers and LCCS case managers on cases where our two agencies are mutually involved.
- Probation is actively involved in contracting with the Youth Advocate Program (YAP), a local mentoring program that works

with our at risk probation youth in building positive relationships and introducing them to pro-social activities.

- Probation contracts with the Second Chance Program, an agency that provides case management services, trauma based counseling and mentoring to adolescent females who have been exposed to and/or experienced in sexual trafficking.
- Representatives from Probation, as well as Judge Connie Zimmelman are participating members of the Lucas County Human Trafficking Coalition.
- Representatives from Probation are participants in the Crime Reduction Committee of the Cherry Street Legacy Project, a grass roots neighborhood coalition.
- Probation has two staff who are participating members of the Intersystem Resource Team, an entity comprised of various systems and stakeholders in Lucas County who provide funding for services, programming and, at times, out of home placement for youth with multiple system involvement.
- Probation is currently providing office space to two (2) educational specialists, who are funded by Toledo Public Schools, whose responsibility is to assist youth coming out of our Lucas County Juvenile Detention Center, Lucas County Youth Treatment Center, and the Department of Youth Services, smoothly transition back into an educational setting.

## Classification System

The Classification System (Ohio Youth Assessment System) involves the systematic collection of data on probation referrals and is helpful in indicating the youth's risk to reoffend. This enables the department to sort the Probation population into different categories and provide differential supervision to the youth in each category. This data is used to study the pattern of juvenile offenders in Lucas County and enhances the Probation Department's ability to identify the relative likelihood of recidivism for all probationers. This information is helpful in developing programming directed toward the overall mission of rehabilitation of juvenile offenders and the protection of the community.

In 2011:

- The Intake Department received 506 new referrals to Probation.
- The Probation Department supervised an average number of 415 youth daily.
- There were 58 youth determined to be High risk at the time referred to Probation.
- There were 193 youth determined to be Moderate risk at the time referred to Probation.
- There were 217 youth determined to be Low risk at the time referred to Probation.

## Performance Measures

In 2011, the Probation Department began utilizing the Performance Measures Report consisting of data relative to the youth's accomplishments while on Probation. This report also serves as a grade card for the Department in attempting to improve quality assurance on case management. A total of 538 cases were terminated

- 372 were successful terminations
- 166 were unsuccessful terminations
- 282 youth were terminated with no new adjudications while on Probation

335 youth were ordered to have no contact with the victim

- 326 youth complied with the order to have no contact with the victim

166 youth were ordered to write letters of apology to their victim

- 152 youth completed all of the court ordered letters
- 8 youth completed some of the court ordered letters

161 youth were ordered to complete community service work hours

- 111 youth completed all of the court ordered hours
- 16 youth partially completed the court ordered hours

Average number of days each case was supervised - 446

## Domestic Violence/ Step-Up Program

The mission and/or purpose of the Domestic Violence Step-Up program is to reduce or eliminate the incidents of Domestic Violence; provide families with the tools to improve communication and reduce incidents of abuse or violence; and to provide short-term support to families dealing with abuse or violence.

The DV program experienced many successes this year including these highlights:

- The DV team continued to develop and improve the Step-Up tools and curriculum.
- There were ten successful graduations during a year that showed significant reduction in participants in group.
- During the three months after graduation, none of the ten graduates had a new DV charge.
- Of the active referrals received in 2011, only 4 had new charges while active in the DV program.
- The DV team worked seamlessly with the Family Violence Court in providing consultations, assessments, and programming.
- This year saw an increase in referrals from sources other than the probation department. There were more referrals for DV assessments from magistrates and, even more significantly, from the Family Violence Intervention Program (Family Violence Court).
- There were approximately 99 referrals made; 23 were placed in group and about 26 received some individual work (without being an active referral for the

DV group) from DV counselors. The remaining referrals were found to be not appropriate for services, were receiving services elsewhere, or were unresponsive to services.

- During 2011, there were 24 active referrals. 7 are still engaged in the DV Step-Up Group. There were 10 youth that successfully graduated from the program. There were 2 whom received only individual services with their family. 6 youth were removed from group prior to graduating due to being placed in a hospital setting, moved out of the area, were inappropriate for group, or were placed in the MST program.

## Placement Services

Placement Services provides out-of-home placements for the purpose of treatment to prevent further delinquent behavior. The Court requires that recommendations to remove a youth from home be made only after all efforts to work with the youth/parents within the home setting have been exhausted. When possible the department strives to utilize community-based treatment as opposed to removing youth from their homes, adhering to the philosophy that out of home placement is made as a last resort after community based treatment has not resolved the issues, placing the youth at risk of commitment to the Department of Youth Services.

Once a decision is made to remove a youth from the home, the least restrictive placement is considered. All residential placements are initially screened for approval by the Resource Staffing Level II Committee. Once

placed, all cases are reviewed by the committee every 90 days, with parents and treatment providers present, to assure that treatment goals are met and that reunification of the family is achieved in a timely manner. Out-of-home placements are a temporary episode that ceases once the treatment goals and objectives for the youth and family have been met.

Of the 13 active placement cases during 2011, 7 youth were placed for Sex Offender Treatment, and 6 were placed for aggressive/ assaultive behaviors. All had delinquency behaviors that did not improve with community based treatment and had felony charges that put them at risk of commitment to Ohio Department of Youth Services where little, if any, treatment is available.

**Placement Services**

Youth in Placement on 1/1/11	6
Youth Placed in 2011	7
Cases Terminated in 2011	7
Successful Terminations	4
Unsuccessful Terminations	3
Youth in Placement on 12/31/11	6

\*Total Placement Costs: \$443,764.83  
 \*Total includes the Court’s contribution of \$123,000.00 to Lucas County’s Intersystem Resource Team.

**Lucas County  
 Juvenile Treatment Court**

The Lucas County Juvenile Treatment Court (JTC) completed its seventh year of operation in August 2011. The JTC program was selected in 2008 to be one of ten sites that the University of Cincinnati chose to participate in a study to determine the effectiveness of

juvenile drug (treatment) courts. During 2011, results were received from the study highlighting strengths in collaborations with community partners. JTC has taken suggestions for improvement from that report and has started implementing changes to better the program.

The Juvenile Treatment Court program collaborated with several agencies outside of the court, which include: Treatment Accountability for Safer

**Table 1**

Youth Served During 2011	39
Program Referrals for 2011	17
Number Accepted Into Program - 2011	17
Number of Males Accepted	15
Number of Females Accepted	2

Communities of Northwest Ohio (T.A.S.C.), Unison, the Youth Advocate Program, and numerous other agencies. Youth in the JTC program were also given the opportunity to participate in positive activities coordinated through T.A.S.C. These positive activities included building compost bins, attending hockey games, movies, dinner, and trips to the Y.M.C.A.

The mission of the Juvenile Treatment Court is to increase community safety and reduce delinquency by providing court supervised substance abuse treatment and intensive case management for non-violent substance abusing youth. In order to be eligible for this program, youth must be between the ages of 14 to 17, been assessed as having substance dependent diagnosis, and have a parent/ guardian who is willing to participate in the program and follow the parental requirements.

Number of Youth who Graduated Successfully	Number of Youth who were Terminated Unsuccessfully	Number of Youth who were found to be Inappropriate
2011: 9 (52.9%)	2011: 8 (47.1%)	2011: 0 (0%)
2010: 6 (33%)	2010: 8 (44%)	2010: 4 (22%)
2009: 19 (76%)	2009: 6 (24%)	2009: 0 (0%)
2008: 10 (44%)	2008: 13 (56%)	2008: 0 (0%)
2007: 13 (50%)	2007: 13 (50%)	2007: 0 (0%)
2006: 21 (58.4%)	2006: 12 (33.3%)	2006: 3 (8.3%)
2005: 5 (26%)	2005: 13 (68%)	2005: 1 (5%)

In 2012, we hope to expand the population that we are able to serve by further collaborating with evidence based programs in the community such as the Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST) program through the Zepf Center. We are also updating the program to reflect the changes that have happened in the population being served since implementation in 2004.

Table one on the previous page illustrates the number of youth who were served, referred, and accepted into the program from January 1, 2011 through December 31, 2011.

Table two illustrates the number of youth who were terminated from the program and their status upon termination during this time period as well for years 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010.

### Lucas County Juvenile Sex Offender Treatment Program

The Lucas County Juvenile Court Sex Offender Treatment Program is committed to reducing the incidence of sexual abuse by developing community partnerships which promote community safety, victim restoration and public education along with enhancing healthy relationships, holding youth and parents accountable, and ensuring an effective continuum of care for both

survivors and youth who sexually offend. The Lucas county approach stresses collaboration, community education, valid and reliable assessment, and effective treatment, supervision and management.

The program emphasizes community-based supervision and a cognitive-behavioral treatment model and features: specialized probation officers to provide increased supervision and support; family involvement including parental engagement and accountability; frequent juvenile court review hearings in a specialized juvenile sex offender docket; and enhanced service collaboration among community agencies including law enforcement, schools, mental health, board of Developmental Disabilities, and juvenile court. The program is certified by the Ohio Department of Youth Services to provide assessment, treatment, and transition services to juvenile sex offenders.

Through a dynamic partnership, Harbor Behavioral Healthcare and Lucas County Juvenile Court in Toledo, Ohio have developed a comprehensive JSOT Program that addresses key points of an effective community-based treatment program that is directed at average cognitive functioning adolescent males. Using this model, therapists and probation officers are able to address

and treat special needs populations including females, pre-adolescent offenders & lower functioning offenders by using individual, group and family therapy. This program is designed to meet the client, court and community needs based upon emerging outcomes collected by this evidenced based program.

- 30 Juveniles terminated successfully from treatment program from the inception of the program (81%)
- 7 youth adjudicated on new charges: (Most serious: 3/felony, 4/misd., no sexually oriented offenses)
- Average length of time on probation was 872 days or 29 months

### **Cite Program**

The Community Integration and Training for Employment (CITE) Program provides job readiness training, paid work experience, linkage to employment, community service activities to youth on probation with the Lucas County Juvenile Court. The staff includes a full time Program Manager and Program Officer. Programming includes job training to help participants develop entry level employment skills and job search assistance. In addition, the CITE Program partners with the Toledo Botanical Gardens and other community service agencies to provide a paid work experience and environment to learn job maintenance skills. The CITE Program started new community gardens with the Toledo GROWS Program. These projects supported by funding through Ohio Job and Family Services, employed over 80 youth on probation. These youth received at least one paycheck through the CITE/Toledo GROWS program.

### **Significant Accomplishments**

#### **Reentry Program**

Forty Four youth participated in building a training center and two greenhouses on Oneida Street. This training center will allow CITE to serve a larger number of youth referred by the Youth Treatment Center (YTC) and Ohio Department of Youth Services (ODYS). The greenhouse project will continue to add programming for youth on probation to include:

1. A professional woodworking shop
2. A landscape training program
3. A construction trade's pre-apprentice program
4. A certified bicycle mechanics training program
5. An aquaculture project

#### **Boat Building Project**

Three youth completed an 18 foot cedar strip canoe in 2011 at the Sofia Quintero Center.

#### **The Center for Innovative Food Technology (CIFT) Program**

Four youth participated in learning Basic microbiology, Cross Contamination, Personal hygiene, Sanitation and Kitchen safety. Youth received a Level 1 Food Handler's Training Good Manufacturing Practices Hazard Analyst Critical Control Point (HACCP) Certificate

#### **Youth WORKS Program**

The CITE Program completed its fourth year of the Youth WORKS Project at the Sofia Quintero Arts and Cultural Center. This project works with low level offenders ages 13-16 to provide a work experience that helps prepare them for future jobs. The youth are paid a stipend and work for ten weeks. Their work experience includes gardening, entry level woodworking, art work for cultural events and helping out at the Toledo GROWS Seedswap.

### Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program

The Lucas County Workforce Development Agency (LCWDA) partnered with Lucas County Jobs and Family Services (LCJFS) to develop the TANF program. The CITE Program and Toledo Botanical Gardens/Toledo GROWs placed youth at Grove Patterson, Hawkins Elementary, Glenwood Gardens, and Batavia Gardens. Youth participated in meaningful work by building greenhouses, gardening, landscaping throughout Lucas County during this eight week program.

### Significant changes/ challenges CITE encountered during 2011:

The most significant challenge for the CITE Program in 2011 was integrating the youth training into the construction of the new training center. The goal was for the youth to be able to participate in the construction process as much as they were able. This challenge was met with a strong contingent of dedicated volunteers who shared their skills and knowledge with the trainees. Safety was a required consideration throughout the building process and no injuries occurred requiring more than a band-aid.

### Youth Advocate Program

The Lucas County Juvenile Court has contracted with the Youth Advocate Program (YAP, Inc.) since 2005. YAP is a national organization, based out of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. The program is an evidence based mentoring program which is dedicated to working with highly delinquent, at risk youth in the Lucas County area. Referrals are made to the program through the Probation Department. Each youth referred to YAP is assigned to an advocate/mentor who sees the youth 10

hours per week for a 9 month period of time. 6 hours/week are committed to individual time with the youth, which focuses on building a relationship with the youth, while 4 hours/week are dedicated to group work which entails supervised, structured pro-social activities.

2011 Cite Program Activity	
Total Referrals:	94
Active Referrals*	97
Successful Terminations*	40
Unsuccessful Terminations*	4
Not Appropriate	33
Other	1
*Some referrals / terminations were youth initially referred in 2010	

These activities may involve exposure to recreational activities, such as sporting events, movies, roller skating, picnics, or activities centered around life skill development, such as independent living skills, pursuing employment opportunities, or competency groups. Advocates often times support the youth with Court related activities as well. Goal setting is directly related to the probation treatment plan, and advocates typically make themselves available to attend court proceedings with the youth and family. Advocates also will transport youth to appointments with their probation officer, counseling appointments with mental health providers, and school.

- Number of Youth serviced in 2011- 130
- Number of Youth terminated from YAP in 2011- 72
  - Successful terminations- (78%)
  - Unsuccessful terminations- (22%)
- Number of Hours Youth serviced by Advocates- 13,772 hours
- Total number of you served since 2005- 512

# Youth Treatment Center Re-Entry Treatment Center

**Tara Hobbs, Administrator**

## Youth Treatment Center

The Lucas County Youth Treatment Center (YTC) is a secure 44 bed residential facility for felony offenders who would otherwise be committed to an Ohio Department of Youth Services (ODYS) institution. Cognitive Behavioral treatment planning focuses on:

- Correcting criminal thinking
- Promoting pro-social attitudes, values, and belief
- Addressing family patterns and relationships
- Developing socially appropriate ways to manage emotions and conflicts
- Supporting academic and vocational achievement
- Encouraging healthier life style through sober and drug free living
- Participating in restorative justice activities

A total of 740 youth have been placed at YTC since 1995. Of the 740, 659 were male, and 81 were female. YTC discontinued female programming in 2010 to focus efforts on decreasing male commitments to ODYS. The following is data from **2011**.

For 2011, the average length of stay in months was **7.2** for successful terminations, 4.4 for unsuccessful terminations, with the average length of stay for all terminations equaling **7.0** months.

<b>Total Referrals:</b>	<b>71</b>
Males:	71
African-American:	55 (77%)
Caucasian:	5 (7%)
Hispanic:	4 (5%)
Bi-racial/other:	7 (9%)

<b>Total Placements:</b>	<b>68</b>
Males:	68
African-American:	53 (77%)
Caucasian:	5 (7%)
Hispanic:	3 (4%)
Bi-racial/other:	7 (10%)

<b>Denials:</b>	<b>7</b>
Placement recommended but denied by Judge and sent to DYS:	3 of 71 (4%) of referrals
Placement at other Community Corrections Facility:	2 of 71 (2%) of referrals
Denial recommended and sent to DYS:	2 of 71 (2%) of referrals

<b>2011 Total Terminations: 63</b>	
<b>Successful: 54 (85%)</b>	<b>Unsuccessful: 9 (14%)</b>
Male: 60	Male: 9
African-American: 39 (72%)	African-American: 7 (77%)
Caucasian: 8 (14%)	Caucasian: 0 (0%)
Hispanic: 0 (0%)	Hispanic: 1 (11%)
Bi-racial/other: 7 (12%)	Bi-racial/other: 1 (11%)

<b>Length of Stay Data</b>			
Year	Successful	Unsuccessful	Total
2008	369 days (41 youth)	190 days (5 youth)	350 days (46 youth)
2009	273 days (38 youth)	148 days (15 youth)	237 days (53 youth)
2010	214 days (61 youth)	242 days (11 youth)	218 days (72 youth)
2011	224 days (54 youth)	132 days (9 youth)	211 days (63 youth)

### **Accomplishments:**

- ✓ 100% compliance on Mandatory and Non-Mandatory standards with the American Correctional Association (ACA) reaccreditation
- ✓ 7 Students earned GED
- ✓ 100% of 54 Students increased academic achievement in either math or reading
- ✓ Maintained over 90% occupancy for 2011
- ✓ Maintained seamless Re-entry process focusing on re-entry beginning at placement and supporting a single case plan
- ✓ Established Re-Entry Treatment Center

### **Re-Entry Treatment Center (RTC)**

RTC was developed to support youth's successful transition from YTC to living pro-socially in the community. RTC accepted the initial group of youth in May, 2011 and is designed to be completed within 90 to 120 days. RTC provides evidenced based cognitive behavioral groups focused on advance practice in relapse prevention, problem

solving, skill streaming, an aftercare group, Phase III of Pathways to Self-Discovery and Change, and engagement in pro-social group activities.

Contracting with the Youth Advocate Program (YAP) establishes collaboration within the community and facilitates community support, linkage, and continuity in the Court's seamless re-entry model. RTC is funded through Targeted Reclaim money provided to counties to continue to decrease the number of youth committed to the Ohio Department of Youth Services.

#### **RTC Accomplishments:**

- ✓ Utilizing cognitive behavioral interventions
- ✓ Successfully collaboration with the YAP mentoring model
- ✓ Exhibiting fiscal responsibility utilizing grant funds
- ✓ Total Referrals: 34
- ✓ Total Terminations: 19
- ✓ 63% Successful Terminations (12 out of 19 youth)
- ✓ 100% Successful Terminations did not return to Court within 3 months (12 out of 12 youth)

## **Fiscal Department**

### **Amy Matuzewski, Finance Director**

The purpose of the Lucas County Fiscal Department is to oversee all fiscal transactions for the Juvenile Court, Juvenile Detention Center and the Youth Treatment Center. The Fiscal Department is responsible for the following: the preparation of all division budgets; payroll management; disbursements of all collected fees and court costs; development and maintenance of all financial contracts, reports, and records; coordination of attorney appointments and reimbursement of their fees; fiscal management of all state and federal grants; purchasing and procurement of supplies and equipment; and coordinating with the County Facilities Department to maintain building maintenance and custodial services.

#### **Fiscal – Business Office 2011 Accomplishments**

- Managed over \$21 million in funding for the Juvenile Court, Juvenile Detention and the Youth Treatment Center
  - \$11 million in General Fund and Trust Account funds
  - \$2 million in Youth Subsidy and Reclaim funds
  - \$2 million in CCF (Youth Treatment Center) funds
  - \$4 million in Title IV-E and Title IV-D funds
  - \$2 million in Miscellaneous State and Federal Grants
- Assumed the responsibilities of the disbursement of the fine and court costs from the Clerk's Office
- Along with Administration reviewed and clarified Time Keeping policies. Conducted trainings with Court and YTC Managers to increase accuracy and consistency regarding time keeping across all departments.
- Passed several Audits and Monitoring visits by local and state agencies from which the Juvenile Court receives funding.
- Processed payments to our providers and vendors in a quick and efficient manner.
- Significant reductions in all funding areas presented challenges in continuing the court operations and programs in an effective and efficient manner. Fiscally this forced looking for new revenue streams and juggling expenses across several accounts.
- Loss of personnel made it necessary to consolidate responsibilities and learn new processes in the collection and disbursement of Restitution and Fines and Court Costs.

2011 OFFENSE STATISTICS

Information is collected and entered into the Lucas County Juvenile Information System (JIS). The capability exists to have that data reported in a number of ways. For the purpose of the annual report, data is reported: by offenses and cases disposed during the calendar year. A case may be filed with more than one offense (or count,). For example, if a case is filed with two counts of criminal damage and one count of possession of criminal tools (it is a single case with one case number with three distinct counts 01, 02, and 03). For statistical counting purposes this is counted as one case and three offenses.


**VOLUME OF OFFENSES**

Juvenile offenses disposed during 2011 totaled 6,385, a decrease of 912, or 12%, from 2010. Of these, a total of 4,824, or 76%, of the offenses were disposed by formal court proceedings and 1,561, or 24%, of the offenses were handled informally. This matches the previous year’s breakdown with 75% of the offenses being handled formally during 2010.

**DELINQUENT VS. STATUS OFFENSE**

Of the total offenses, 5,547, or 87%, were delinquency and 838, or 13%, were status offenses. This matches the previous year’s breakdown with 86% of total offenses that were disposed as delinquent during 2010.

**Delinquent v. Status Offenses**



**TABLE D1: SEX OF OFFENDER FOR OFFENSE BY PROCEDURE**

	MALES	FEMALES	UNKNOWN	TOTAL
Formal Proceedings	3604	1220	0	4824
	75%	25%		
Informal Handling	885	664	0	1561
	57%	43%		
<b>Totals</b>	<b>4489</b>	<b>1884</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6,385</b>
	<b>70%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>&lt;1%</b>	

# OFFENSES DISPOSED

## SEX OF OFFENDER FOR OFFENSE

Of the 6,385 offenses 4,489 (or 70%) included males and 1,884 (or 30%) included females, while the sex was undetermined in 12, or less than 1%, of the offenses. This matches the previous year's breakdown with 69% for males and 31% for females during 2010.

	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Delinquency Offenses	4012 72%	1528 28%	7 <1%	5547
Status Offenses	477 57%	356 45%	5 1%	838
<b>Totals</b>	<b>4489</b>	<b>1884</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6,385</b>

## RACE OF OFFENDER FOR OFFENSE

Of the 6,385 offenses, 4,264 (or 67%) were non-white youth and 2,008 (or 31%) were white youth. This compares with 67% for non-white youth and 31% for white youth during 2010.

	<b>AFR/AMER</b>	<b>HISPANIC</b>	<b>WHITE</b>	<b>OTHER</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Delinquency Offenses	3421 62%	200 4%	1749 32%	90 2%	87 2%	5547
Status Offenses	475 57%	40 5%	259 31%	25 3%	39 5%	838
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3896</b> <b>61%</b>	<b>240</b> <b>4%</b>	<b>2008</b> <b>31%</b>	<b>115</b> <b>2%</b>	<b>126</b> <b>2%</b>	<b>6,385</b>


2011 OFFENSE STATISTICS

The following tables categorize individual offenses that were adjudicated during 2011. These categories include Robbery/Theft, Sex, Injury to Person, Weapon, Drug, Alcohol, Property Damage, Status, and Public Nuisance. At the bottom of each table are the sum totals of all Adjudicated offenses and offenses that were dismissed during 2011 and 2010.

**JUVENILE OFFENSES FOR 2011**

<b>TABLE D4: ROBBERY/THEFT OFFENSES DISPOSED FOR 2011</b>				
<b>NUMBER OF OFFENSES</b>	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Breaking and Entering	5	0	0	5
Attempted Breaking and Entering	7	0	0	7
Burglary	75	3	0	78
Aggravated Burglary	6	0	0	6
Attempted Burglary	23	1	0	24
Complicity to Burglary	10	1	0	11
Forgery	0	1	0	1
Grand Theft Auto	2	0	0	2
Complicity to Grand Theft Auto	1	0	0	1
Misuse Credit Card	1	0	0	1
Attempted Misuse Credit Card	1	0	0	1
Pass Bad Checks	1	0	0	1
Petty Theft	72	35	0	107
Attempted Petty Theft	0	1	0	1
Receiving Stolen Property	43	2	0	45
Attempted Receiving Stolen Property	4	0	0	4
Complicity to Receiving Stolen Property	2	0	0	2
Robbery	22	0	0	22
Aggravated Robbery	8	2	0	10
Attempted Robbery	5	4	0	9
Complicity to Robbery	1	0	0	1
Attempted Aggravated Robbery	2	0	0	2
Complicity to Attempted Robbery	1	0	0	1
Complicity to Attempted Aggravated Robbery	1	0	0	1
Theft	37	13	0	50
Attempted Theft	2	0	0	2
Complicity to Theft	3	0	0	3
Theft of Drugs	1	0	0	1
Unlawful Use of Motor Vehicle	19	10	0	29
Unlawful Use of Property	18	9	0	27
Vehicle Trespassing	3	0	0	3
<b>2011 Adjudicated Offense Totals</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>458</b>
2010 Adjudicated Offense Totals	502	119	1	622
<b>2011 Dismissals</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>248</b>
2010 Dismissals	169	68	0	237

During 2011, the total number of robbery/theft offenses disposed (706) decreased 18% from 2010 (859). Adjudicated offenses decreased 26% and dismissals increased 5%.



2011 OFFENSE STATISTICS

<b>NUMBER OF OFFENSES</b>	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Display Materials Harmful to Juveniles	0	2	0	2
Duty to Register	1	0	0	1
Gross Sexual Imposition	6	0	0	6
Attempted Gross Sexual Imposition	1	0	0	1
Gross Sexual Imposition - Force	1	0	0	1
Illegal Use of Minor Nudity	1	0	0	1
Attempted Illegal Use of Minor Nudity	0	1	0	1
Public Indecency	1	0	0	1
Rape	11	0	0	11
Attempted Rape	1	0	0	1
Sexual Imposition	2	1	0	3
<b>2011 Adjudicated Offense Totals</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>29</b>
2010 Adjudicated Offense Totals	26	1	0	27
<b>2011 Dismissals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24</b>
2010 Dismissals	26	8	0	34

During 2011, the total number of sex offenses disposed (53) decreased 13% from 2010 (61). Adjudicated offenses increased 7% and dismissals decreased 29%.

<b>NUMBER OF OFFENSES</b>	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Assault	87	57	0	144
Aggravated Assault	5	0	0	5
Complicity to Aggravated Assault	0	1	0	1
Assault of Police	0	1	0	1
Negligent Assault	0	1	0	1
Domestic Violence	63	26	0	89
Endanger Children	1	1	0	2
Felonious Assault	11	1	0	12
Attempted Felonious Assault	2	1	0	3
Attempted Kidnapping	1	0	0	1
Murder	1	0	0	1
Attempted Murder	4	0	0	4
<b>2011 Adjudicated Offense Totals</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>264</b>
2010 Adjudicated Offense Totals	225	75	0	300
<b>2011 Dismissals</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>585</b>
2010 Dismissals	380	212	0	592

During 2011, the total number of injury to person offenses disposed (849) decreased 5% from 2010 (892). Adjudicated offenses decreased 12% and dismissals decreased 1%.

2011 OFFENSE STATISTICS

**TABLE D7: WEAPON OFFENSES DISPOSED FOR 2011**


<b>NUMBER OF OFFENSES</b>	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Carry Concealed Weapon	40	1	0	41
Firearm in Motor Vehicle	1	0	0	1
Illegal Conveyance	2	0	0	2
Improper Handling of Weapon in Motor Vehicle	1	0	0	1
Possession of Weapon Under Disability	1	0	0	1
Possession of Weapon At School	4	0	0	4
Attempted Possession of Weapon at School	2	0	0	2
<b>2011 Adjudicated Offense Totals</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>52</b>
2010 Adjudicated Offense Totals	47	7	0	54
<b>2011 Dismissals</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>
2010 Dismissals	50	4	0	54

During 2011, the total number of weapon offenses disposed (92) decreased by 15% from 2010 (108). Adjudicated offenses decreased 4% and dismissals decreased 26%.

**TABLE D8: DRUG OFFENSES DISPOSED FOR 2011**

<b>NUMBER OF OFFENSES</b>	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Counterfeit Substance	6	0	0	6
Attempted Counterfeit Substance	1	0	0	1
Drug Abuse	23	0	0	23
Possession of Drug Paraphernalia	25	4	0	29
Possession of a Controlled Substance	1	0	0	1
Possession of Drugs	87	5	0	92
Attempted Possession of Drugs	5	3	0	8
Aggravated Possession of Drugs	1	1	0	2
Attempted Aggravated Possession of Drugs	1	0	0	1
Trafficking Drugs	12	0	0	12
Aggravated Trafficking Drugs	1	1	0	2
Attempted Trafficking Drugs	9	1	0	10
<b>2011 Adjudicated Offense Totals</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>187</b>
2010 Adjudicated Offense Totals	151	20	0	171
<b>2011 Dismissals</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>225</b>
2010 Dismissals	194	37	0	231

During 2011, the total number of drug offenses disposed (412) increased 2% from 2010 (402). Adjudicated offenses increased 9% and dismissals decreased 3%.



## 2011 OFFENSE STATISTICS

**TABLE D9: ALCOHOL OFFENSES DISPOSED FOR 2011**

NUMBER OF OFFENSES	MALES	FEMALES	UNKNOWN	TOTAL
Consume Underage	41	8	0	49
Permit Alcohol	0	1	0	1
Possession of Alcohol by Minor	1	0	0	1
Prohibition of Minors	5	5	0	10
<b>2011 Adjudicated Offense Totals</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>61</b>
2010 Adjudicated Offense Totals	70	20	0	90
<b>2011 Dismissals</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>83</b>
2010 Dismissals	81	47	1	129

During 2011, the total number of alcohol offenses disposed (144) decreased 34% from 2010 (219). Adjudicated offenses decreased 32% and dismissals decreased 36%.

**TABLE D10: PROPERTY DAMAGE OFFENSES DISPOSED FOR 2011**

NUMBER OF OFFENSES	MALES	FEMALES	UNKNOWN	TOTAL
Arson	5	0	0	5
Attempted Arson	1	0	0	1
Complicity to Attempted Arson	1	0	0	1
Criminal Damage	88	11	0	99
Complicity to Criminal Damage	2	0	0	2
Vandalism	6	0	0	6
Vehicular Vandalism	2	0	0	2
<b>2011 Adjudicated Offense Totals</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>116</b>
2010 Adjudicated Offense Totals	62	8	0	70
<b>2011 Dismissals</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>96</b>
2010 Dismissals	117	28	0	145

During 2011, the total number of property damage offenses disposed (212) decreased 1% from 2010 (215). Adjudicated offenses increased 66% and dismissals decreased 34%.

**TABLE D11: STATUS OFFENSES DISPOSED FOR 2011**

NUMBER OF OFFENSES	MALES	FEMALES	UNKNOWN	TOTAL
Unruly	4	4	0	8
Unruly/Curfew	5	0	0	5
Unruly/Runaway	0	1	0	1
Unruly/Truancy	2	0	0	2
<b>2011 Adjudicated Offense Totals</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>
2010 Adjudicated Offense Totals	11	3	0	14
<b>2011 Dismissals</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>289</b>
2010 Dismissals	140	191	0	331


During 2011, the total number of status offenses disposed (305) decreased 12% from 2010 (345). Adjudicated offenses increased 14% and dismissals decreased 13%. Note that 95% of status offenses were dismissed.

## 2011 OFFENSE STATISTICS

**TABLE D12: PUBLIC NUISANCE OFFENSES DISPOSED FOR 2011**

<b>NUMBER OF OFFENSES</b>	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Criminal Mischief	9	10	0	19
Criminal Trespassing	80	0	0	80
Cruelty to Animals	1	6	0	7
Disorderly Conduct	199	0	0	199
Disturb a Public Service	1	2	0	3
Escape	3	0	0	3
Failure to Comply with Police	6	0	0	6
False Alarm	2	0	0	2
Falsification	7	0	0	7
Flee/Elude Officer	4	5	0	9
Furnish False Information	23	6	0	29
Harass/Body Fluids	2	3	0	5
Induce Panic	7	0	0	7
Intimidate Victim/Witness	1	0	0	1
Loitering	9	0	0	9
Menacing	24	0	0	24
Aggravated Menacing	14	15	0	29
Obstruct Justice	2	2	0	4
Obstruct Official Business	85	2	0	87
Park Curfew	1	0	0	1
Possession of Criminal Tools	2	6	0	8
Resist Arrest	22	1	0	23
Attempted Resist Arrest	1	0	0	1
Resist Arrest/Harm	1	70	0	71
Riot	7	0	0	7
Safe School Ordinance	211	1	0	212
Tamper with Evidence	1	0	0	1
Telephone Harassment	6	1	0	7
Violation of Protection Order	4	0	0	4
<b>2011 Adjudicated Offense Totals</b>	<b>735</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>865</b>
2010 Adjudicated Offense Totals	883	278	0	1163
<b>2011 Dismissals</b>	<b>825</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1186</b>
2010 Dismissals	874	301	0	1175

During 2011, the total number of public nuisance offenses disposed (2,051) decreased 12% from 2010 (2,338). Adjudicated offenses decreased 26% and dismissals increased 1%.



2011 OFFENSE STATISTICS

**TABLE D13: 2011 OFFENSE SUMMARY**


**MALES FEMALES UNKNOWN TOTAL**

<b>1.) 2011 Adjudicated Delinquency Offenses</b>	<b>1686</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2032</b>
a.) 2010 Adjudicated Delinquency Offenses	1966	528	3	2497
<b>2.) 2011 Dismissed Delinquent</b>	<b>1749</b>	<b>738</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2487</b>
b.) 2010 Dismissed Delinquent	1891	705	1	2597
<b>3.) 2011 Total Delinquent Offenses (lines 1 &amp; 2)</b>	<b>3435</b>	<b>1084</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4519</b>
c.) 2010 Total Delinquent Offenses (lines a & b)	3857	1233	4	5094
<b>4.) 2011 Adjudicated Status Offenses</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>
d.) 2010 Adjudicated Status Offenses	11	3	0	14
<b>5.) 2011 Dismissed Status Offenses</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>289</b>
e.) 2010 Dismissed Status Offenses	140	191	0	331
<b>6.) 2011 Total Status Offenses (lines 4 &amp; 5)</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>305</b>
f.) 2010 Total Status Offenses (lines d & e)	151	194	0	345
<b>7.) 2011 Total Adjudicated Offenses (lines 1 &amp; 4)</b>	<b>1697</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2048</b>
g.) 2010 Total Adjudicated Offenses (lines a & d)	1977	531	3	2511
<b>8.) 2011 Total Dismissed Offenses (lines 2 &amp; 5)</b>	<b>1907</b>	<b>869</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2776</b>
h.) 2010 Total Dismissed Offenses (lines b & e)	2031	896	1	2928
<b>9.) 2011 Total Official Terminations (lines 7 &amp; 8)</b>	<b>3604</b>	<b>1220</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4824</b>
i.) 2010 Total Official Terminations (lines g & h)	4008	1427	4	5439
<b>10.) 2011 Unofficial Handling - Delinquency</b>	<b>577</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1028</b>
j.) 2010 Unofficial Case Handling - Delinquency	653	541	10	1204
<b>11.) 2011 Unofficial Handling - Status</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>533</b>
k.) 2010 Unofficial Case Handling - Status	374	276	4	654
<b>12.) 2011 Grand Total Disposed Cases (lines 9-11)</b>	<b>4489</b>	<b>1884</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6,385</b>
l.) 2010 Grand Total Disposed Cases (lines i-k)	5035	2244	18	7,297

**TABLE D14: PERCENT OF ANNUAL TOTAL FOR OFFENSE SUMMARY**

	2011	2010
<b>Adjudicated Offenses</b> (Table D13, Line 7)	<b>32%</b> (2048 of 6,385)	<b>34%</b> (2511 of 7,297)
<b>Dismissed Offenses</b> (Table D13, Line 8)	<b>43%</b> (2776 of 6,385)	<b>40%</b> (2928 of 7,297)
<b>Unofficial Case Handling</b> (Table D13, Lines 10&11)	<b>24%</b> (1561 of 6,385)	<b>25%</b> (1858 of 7,297)

**Percent Of Total for Offense Summary**




In summary, the total number of cases disposed during 2011 (6,385) decreased by 12% from 2010 (7,297). During 2011, 32% of all cases disposed were adjudicated (34% in 2010), 43% were dismissed (40% in 2010), and 24% were handled unofficially (25% in 2010).

**TABLE D15: PERCENT OF ANNUAL TOTAL BY OFFENSE CATEGORY (Adjudicated & Dismissed)**

	2011	2010
<b>Robbery/Theft Offenses (706 of 4824)</b>	15%	18%
<b>Sex Offenses (53 of 4824)</b>	1%	1%
<b>Injury to Person Offenses (849 of 4824)</b>	18%	16%
<b>Weapon Offenses (92 of 4824)</b>	2%	2%
<b>Drug Offenses (412 of 4824)</b>	9%	7%
<b>Alcohol Offenses (144 of 4824)</b>	3%	4%
<b>Property Damage Offenses (212 of 4824)</b>	4%	4%
<b>Status Offenses (305 of 4824)</b>	6%	6%
<b>Public Nuisance Offenses (2051 of 4824)</b>	43%	43%

The percentage of offenses by category remained relatively stable from 2010 with a few exceptions. There was a slight increase in Injury to Person offenses and Drug offenses, and a slight decrease in Robbery/Theft offenses and Alcohol offenses compared to those disposed during 2010.


**Percent Of Annual Total by Offense Category**  
(Adjudicated and Dismissed)



**FIVE YEAR TRENDS FOR OFFENSES**

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Number Offenses Disposed</b>	12,058	11,521	8,636	7,297	6,385
<b>Annual Difference</b>	-1.5%	-4.5%	-25%	-16%	-12%


**Offenses Disposed**




	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Males</b>	71%	74%	70%	69%	70%
<b>Females</b>	29%	26%	30%	31%	30%

2011 OFFENSE STATISTICS

**Sex By Percentage**



**Race By Percentage**



**TABLE D18: OFFENSE BY RACE**

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>African-American</b>	61%	63%	61%	61%	61%
<b>Caucasian</b>	33%	30%	32%	32%	31%
<b>Hispanic</b>	4%	4%	5%	5%	4%

**TABLE D19: DELINQUENCY VS. STATUS OFFENSE**

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Delinquency</b>	75%	85%	85%	86%	87%
<b>Status</b>	25%	15%	15%	14%	13%

**TABLE D20: ADJUDICATED OFFENSES**

The following tables chart five year trends for disposed offenses by category.

**TABLE D20-A: ROBBERY/THEFT OFFENSES**

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Number of Offenses</b>	800	853	719	622	458
<b>Percent of All Adjudicated Offenses</b>	20%	23%	27%	25%	22%
<b>Offense Difference from Prior Year</b>	164	53	-134	-97	-164
<b>Percent of Difference from Prior Year</b>	-17%	7%	-16%	-13%	-26%

## 2011 OFFENSE STATISTICS

**TABLE D20-B: SEX OFFENSES**

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Number of Offenses</b>	67	52	27	27	29
<b>Percent of All Adjudicated Offenses</b>	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%
<b>Offense Difference from Prior Year</b>	8	-15	-25	-	2
<b>Percent of Difference from Prior Year</b>	14%	-22%	-48%	-	-7%

**TABLE D20-C: INJURY TO PERSON OFFENSES**

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Number of Offenses</b>	465	431	306	300	264
<b>Percent of All Adjudicated Offenses</b>	12%	12%	12%	12%	13%
<b>Offense Difference from Prior Year</b>	-44	-34	-125	-6	-36
<b>Percent of Difference from Prior Year</b>	9%	-7%	-29%	-2%	-12%

**TABLE D20-D: WEAPON OFFENSES**

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Number of Offenses</b>	83	85	55	54	52
<b>Percent of All Adjudicated Offenses</b>	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%
<b>Offense Difference from Prior Year</b>	-5	2	-30	-1	-2
<b>Percent of Difference from Prior Year</b>	-6%	2%	-35%	-2%	-4%

**TABLE D20-E: DRUG OFFENSES**

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Number of Offenses</b>	316	297	176	171	187
<b>Percent of All Adjudicated Offenses</b>	8%	8%	7%	7%	9%
<b>Offense Difference from Prior Year</b>	-51	-19	-121	-5	16
<b>Percent of Difference from Prior Year</b>	-14%	-6%	-41%	-3%	9%

**TABLE D20-F: ALCOHOL OFFENSES**

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Number of Offenses</b>	145	119	81	90	61
<b>Percent of All Adjudicated Offenses</b>	4%	3%	3%	4%	3%
<b>Offense Difference from Prior Year</b>	35	-26	-38	9	-29
<b>Percent of Difference from Prior Year</b>	32%	-18%	-32%	11%	-32%

2011 OFFENSE STATISTICS

**TABLE D20-G: PROPERTY DAMAGE OFFENSES**

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Number of Offenses</b>	191	143	77	70	116
<b>Percent of All Adjudicated Offenses</b>	5%	4%	3%	3%	6%
<b>Offense Difference from Prior Year</b>	-31	-48	-66	-7	46
<b>Percent of Difference from Prior Year</b>	-14%	-25%	-46%	-9%	-66%

**TABLE D20-H: STATUS OFFENSES**

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Number of Offenses</b>	27	42	33	14	16
<b>Percent of All Adjudicated Offenses</b>	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
<b>Offense Difference from Prior Year</b>	-11	15	-9	-19	2
<b>Percent of Difference from Prior Year</b>	-29%	56%	-21%	58%	14%


**TABLE D20-I: PUBLIC NUISANCE OFFENSES**

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Number of Offenses</b>	1928	1709	1155	1163	865
<b>Percent of All Adjudicated Offenses</b>	48%	46%	44%	46%	42%
<b>Offense Difference from Prior Year</b>	451	-219	-554	8	-298
<b>Percent of Difference from Prior Year</b>	31%	-11%	-32%	1%	-26%

**TABLE D21: ADJUDICATED OFFENSE TOTAL**

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Adjudicated Offense Total</b>	4022	3731	2629	2511	2048
<b>Annual Offense Difference</b>	-42	-291	-1102	-118	-463
	-1%	-7%	-30%	-4%	-18%

**Adjudicated Offenses**



## ADJUDICATED VIOLENT CRIME INDEX OFFENSES

The following tables report Adjudicated Violent Offenses for a five year period. The violent offenses reported are consistent with the Federal Bureau of Investigation reporting standards.

<b>TABLE D22: VIOLENT CRIME INDEX ADJUDICATED MALES OFFENSES</b>					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Aggravated Robbery & Robbery	54	49	36	29	30
Homicide Offenses	2	1	2	1	1
Felonious & Aggravated Assault	18	23	24	11	16
Rape & Felonious Sexual Penetration	14	14	5	5	11
<b>Totals</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>Annual Difference</b>	<b>-2%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>-23%</b>	<b>-31%</b>	<b>26%</b>

<b>TABLE D23: ADJUDICATED VIOLENT CRIMES COMPARED TO ALL MALES</b>					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Total Adjudicated Violent Crimes-Males</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>Total Adjudicated Offenses-Males</b>	<b>3152</b>	<b>3027</b>	<b>2116</b>	<b>1977</b>	<b>1697</b>
<b>Percent Of Violent</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>2.9%</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>3.4%</b>


<b>TABLE D24: VIOLENT CRIME INDEX ADJUDICATED FEMALES OFFENSES</b>					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Aggravated Robbery & Robbery	4	3	2	6	2
Homicide Offenses	2	0	0	0	0
Felonious & Aggravated Assault	4	4	3	4	1
Rape & Felonious Sexual Penetration	1	0	0	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Annual Difference</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-36%</b>	<b>-29%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>-70%</b>

<b>TABLE D25: ADJUDICATED VIOLENT CRIMES COMPARED TO ALL FEMALES</b>					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>Total Adjudicated Violent Crimes-Females</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Total Adjudicated Offenses-Females</b>	<b>870</b>	<b>704</b>	<b>513</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>351</b>
<b>Percent Of Violent</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>0.9%</b>

**TABLE D26: VIOLENT CRIME INDEX ADJUDICATED OFFENSES TOTALS  
(Males & Females)**


	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Aggravated Robbery & Robbery	58	52	38	35	32
Homicide Offenses	4	1	2	1	1
Felonious & Aggravated Assault	22	27	27	15	17
Rape & Felonious Sexual Penetration	15	14	5	5	11
<b>Totals</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>Trends</b>	<b>-2%</b>	<b>-5%</b>	<b>-23%</b>	<b>-22%</b>	<b>9%</b>

**Adjudicated Violent Offenses**



**TABLE D27: ADJUDICATED VIOLENT CRIMES COMPARED TO ALL ADJUDICATIONS**

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Total Adjudicated Violent Crimes-Males & Females	99	94	72	56	61
<b>Total Adjudicated Offenses-Males &amp; Females</b>	<b>4022</b>	<b>3731</b>	<b>2629</b>	<b>2511</b>	<b>2048</b>
<b>Percentage Violent of All Adjudicated Offenses</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>3.0%</b>



## 2011 OFFENSE STATISTICS

**TABLE D28: FIVE YEAR TREND OF FELONIES AND MISDEMEANORS FOR OFFENSES DISPOSED**

	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011	
First Degree Felony	112		108		76		63		75	
Second Degree Felony	303		335		280		209		167	
Third Degree Felony	203		157		104		107		108	
Fourth Degree Felony	357		282		228		179		172	
Fifth Degree Felony	528		461		340		275		250	
<b>Total Felonies</b>	1503	12%	1343	12%	1028	12%	833	11%	772	12%
First Degree Misdemeanor	5177		4877		3853		3333		2788	
Second Degree Misdemeanor	1199		1094		794		727		685	
Third Degree Misdemeanor	129		105		88		80		61	
Fourth Degree Misdemeanor	1549		1472		1012		833		789	
Fifth Degree Misdemeanor	0		1		0		0		0	
Minor Misdemeanor	913		930		594		488		461	
<b>Total Misdemeanors</b>	8967	74%	8479	74%	6341	73%	5461	75%	4784	75%
<b>Total Status Offenses</b>	1558	13%	1677	15%	1249	14%	993	14%	817	13%
<b>Total Unknown Degree</b>	30	<1%	22	<1%	18	<1%	10	<1%	12	<1%
<b>Total Annual Offenses</b>	12,058		11,521		8,636		7,297		6,385	

**TABLE D29: SEX OF OFFENDERS BY OFFENSE DEGREE FOR OFFENSES DISPOSED**


	MALES	FEMALES	UNKNOWN	TOTAL
First Degree Felony	69 (92%)	6 (8%)	0	75
Second Degree Felony	152 (88%)	15 (9%)	0	167
Third Degree Felony	95 (88%)	13 (12%)	0	108
Fourth Degree Felony	152 (88%)	20 (12%)	0	172
Fifth Degree Felony	211 (84%)	39 (16%)	0	250
<b>Total Felonies</b>	<b>679 (88%)</b>	<b>93 (12%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>772</b>
First Degree Misdemeanor	1744 (63%)	1040 (37%)	4 (<1%)	2788
Second Degree Misdemeanor	536 (78%)	149 (22%)	0	685
Third Degree Misdemeanor	46 (75%)	15 (25%)	0	61
Fourth Degree Misdemeanor	632 (80%)	154 (20%)	3 (<1%)	789
Fifth Degree Misdemeanor	0	0	0	0
Minor Misdemeanor	375 (81%)	86 (19%)	0	461
<b>Misdemeanors</b>	<b>3333 (70%)</b>	<b>1444 (30%)</b>	<b>7 (&lt;1%)</b>	<b>4784</b>
Total Status Offenses	467 (57%)	345 (42%)	5 (1%)	817
Total Unknown Degree	10 (83%)	2 (17%)	0	12
<b>Total Offenses for 2011</b>	<b>4489</b>	<b>1884</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6,385</b>
	<b>70%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>&lt;1%</b>	

2011 OFFENSE STATISTICS

**TABLE D30: RACE OF OFFENDER BY OFFENSE DEGREE FOR NEW OFFENSES FILED**

	<b>HIS-</b>					
	<b>AFR/AMER</b>	<b>PANIC</b>	<b>WHITE</b>	<b>OTHER</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
First Degree Felony	48 (75%)	4 (1%)	23 (24%)	0	0	75
Second Degree Felony	130 (69%)	5 (6%)	32 (21%)	0	0	167
Third Degree Felony	77 (74%)	3 (4%)	28 (21%)	0	0	108
Fourth Degree Felony	111 (72%)	3 (4%)	57 (21%)	1 (1%)	0	172
Fifth Degree Felony	154 (67%)	10 (5%)	83 (26%)	2 (1%)	1	250
<b>Total Felonies</b>	<b>520 (70%)</b>	<b>25 (5%)</b>	<b>223 (23%)</b>	<b>3 (1%)</b>	<b>1 (1%)</b>	<b>772</b>
First Degree Misdemeanor	1704 (60%)	105 (4%)	888 (34%)	51 (1%)	40 (1%)	2788
Second Degree Misdemeanor	471 (66%)	25 (5%)	164 (28%)	14 (1%)	11 (1%)	685
Third Degree Misdemeanor	28 (30%)	3 (16%)	28 (44%)	1 (1%)	1 (9%)	61
Fourth Degree Misdemeanor	433 (59%)	30 (4%)	295 (36%)	17 (<1%)	14 (1%)	789
Fifth Degree Misdemeanor	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Misdemeanor	273 (64%)	13 (6%)	149 (28%)	6 (<1%)	20 (1%)	461
<b>Total Misdemeanors</b>	<b>2909 (60%)</b>	<b>176 (5%)</b>	<b>1524 (33%)</b>	<b>89 (1%)</b>	<b>86 (1%)</b>	<b>4784</b>
Total Status Offenses	467 (58%)	38 (5%)	251 (32%)	23 (2%)	38 (3%)	817
Total Unknown Degree	0 (50%)	1 (6%)	10 (44%)	0	1	12
<b>Total Offenses for 2011</b>	<b>3896</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>6,385</b>
	<b>61%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>	

Lucas County Juvenile Court 2011 Offense Statistics gathered and processed by Sarah Nopper (snoppe@co.lucas.oh.us) and reflect information gathered on May 7th, 2011.



Information is collected and entered into the Lucas County Juvenile Information System (JIS). The capability exists to have that data reported in a number of ways. For the purpose of the annual report, data is reported: by offenses and cases disposed during the calendar year. A case may be filed with more than one offense (or count). For example, if a case is filed with two counts of criminal damage and one count of possession of criminal tools (it is a single case with one case number with three distinct counts 01, 02, and 03). For statistical counting purposes this is counted as one case and three offenses.


# CASES DISPOSED

## Delinquent Vs. Status - Cases Disposed

### VOLUME OF CASES

A total of 5,294 cases were disposed during 2011, a decrease of 578, or 10%, from 2010. Of these, a total of 3,865, or 73%, of the cases were disposed by formal court action and 1,429, or 27%, were handled unofficially.

This compares to 70% of the cases being disposed by formal court action during 2010.



### DELINQUENT vs. STATUS OFFENSES


Of the 3,865 cases disposed by formal court action, 3,610, or 93%, were delinquency and 255, or 7%, were status.

This compares to 93% of the formal offenses being delinquent during 2010.

## Juvenile Cases by Sex

### JUVENILE CASES BY SEX

Of the 5,294 cases, 3,648, or 69%, were males and 1,638, or 31%, were females, while the sex was undetermined in 8, or less than 1%, of the cases. This compares to 68% males and 32% females during 2010.



**TABLE D31: SEX OF OFFENDER FOR CASES**

	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Delinquency Cases	2717 75%	893 25%	0	3610
Status Cases	138 54%	117 46%	0	255
Unofficial Cases	793 55%	628 44%	8 1%	1429
<b>Total Cases</b>	<b>3648</b> <b>69%</b>	<b>1638</b> <b>31%</b>	<b>8</b> <b>&lt;1%</b>	<b>5294</b>


**RACE OF OFFENDER FOR CASES DISPOSED**

Of the 5,298 cases, 66% were non-white youth and 32% were white youth. This compares to 66% non-white youth and 32% white youth during 2010.

**TABLE D32: RACE OF OFFENDER FOR CASES**

	<b>AFR/AMER</b>	<b>HISPANIC</b>	<b>WHITE</b>	<b>OTHER</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Delinquency Offenses	2293 64%	153 4%	1081 30%	58 2%	25 1%	3610
Status Offenses	155 61%	17 7%	69 27%	13 5%	1 <1%	255
Unofficial	760 53%	46 3%	532 37%	27 2%	64 4%	1429
<b>Totals</b>	<b>3208</b> <b>61%</b>	<b>216</b> <b>4%</b>	<b>1682</b> <b>32%</b>	<b>98</b> <b>2%</b>	<b>90</b> <b>2%</b>	<b>5294</b>

**Race of Offender for Cases Disposed**



2011 CASES DISPOSED

AGE	MALES			FEMALES			UNKNOWN			TOTAL		
	DEL	STATUS	UNOFF	DEL	STATUS	UNOFF	DEL	STATUS	UNOFF	DEL	STATUS	UNOFF
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
8	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	2
9	2	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	8
10	11	0	15	3	0	7	0	0	0	14	0	22
11	30	0	29	22	1	10	0	0	1	52	1	40
12	89	0	44	22	4	22	0	0	0	111	4	66
13	197	15	87	90	10	68	0	0	0	287	25	155
14	381	21	104	161	12	104	0	0	1	542	33	209
15	466	27	163	185	33	148	0	0	2	651	60	313
16	691	47	169	198	31	130	0	0	0	889	78	299
17	797	26	167	205	25	127	0	0	2	1002	51	296
18	42	0	4	5	1	9	0	0	0	47	1	13
19+	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0
Unknown	5	2	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	6	2	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>2717</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>793</b>	<b>893</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>628</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3610</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>1429</b>

**FIRST TIME OFFENDERS VS. REPEAT OFFENDERS BY SEX**

A total of 81% of the males' cases received were repeat offenders. This compares to 75% in 2010. A total of 70% of the females' cases received were repeat offenders. This compares to 62% in 2010.

	First Time Offenders	Repeat Offenders
<b>Males</b>	19% (478 of 2569)	81% (2089 of 2569)
<b>Females</b>	30% (289 of 968)	70% (679 of 968)
<b>Unknown</b>	100% (3 of 3)	(0 of 3)
<b>Total</b>	22% (770 of 3538)	78% (2768 of 3538)

**FIRST TIME OFFENDERS VS. REPEAT OFFENDERS BY RACE**

A total of 66% of White youth were repeat offenders, compared to 85% for African American youth and 79% for Hispanic youth. Percentages for 2010 were 58% repeat offenders in White youth, 79% repeat offenders in African American Youth, and 71% repeat offenders for Hispanic youth.

	First Time Offenders	Repeat Offenders
Caucasian	34%	66%
African/American	15%	85%
Hispanic	21%	79%
Other	24%	76%
<b>Total</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>78%</b>

## 2011 CASES DISPOSED

**TABLE D36: ZIP CODE OF OFFENDER BY CASE TYPE**

CITY	MALES			FEMALES			UNKNOWN			TOTAL		
	DEL	STATUS	UNOFF	DEL	STATUS	UNOFF	DEL	STATUS	UNOFF	DEL	STATUS	UNOFF
43601	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1
43602	7	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	7	0	3
43603	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
43604	133	1	38	35	6	29	1	0	0	169	7	67
43605	295	17	84	91	11	58	0	0	5	386	28	147
43606	121	6	27	35	7	24	0	0	1	156	13	52
43607	270	20	74	63	15	76	0	0	1	333	35	151
43608	248	8	63	85	11	87	0	0	4	333	19	154
43609	234	18	144	52	14	64	1	0	0	287	32	208
43610	111	1	22	45	7	17	0	0	0	156	8	39
43611	102	7	42	29	9	44	2	0	2	133	16	88
43612	234	12	76	83	9	62	1	0	5	318	21	143
43613	141	6	62	51	8	51	0	0	2	192	14	115
43614	73	0	36	21	7	30	0	0	1	94	7	67
43615	197	16	44	78	12	42	2	0	1	277	28	87
43616	114	1	21	16	0	6	0	0	1	130	1	28
43617	17	0	5	9	0	5	0	0	1	26	0	11
43618	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
43619	10	0	2	4	0	2	1	0	0	15	0	4
43620	35	8	10	13	2	10	0	0	1	48	10	22
43623	35	1	21	12	2	21	0	0	1	47	3	39
43624	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	2
43635	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>2384</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>773</b>	<b>724</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>629</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>3116</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>1428</b>

COUNTY	MALES			FEMALES			UNKNOWN			TOTAL		
	DEL	STATUS	UNOFF	DEL	STATUS	UNOFF	DEL	STATUS	UNOFF	DEL	STATUS	UNOFF
43412	4	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	3
43504	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
43512	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
43522	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
43528	47	7	25	25	0	8	0	0	1	72	7	34
43537	79	1	44	16	1	16	0	0	1	95	2	61
43542	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	2
43547	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
43558	31	0	3	2	3	7	0	0	0	33	3	10
43560	69	4	19	22	0	5	1	0	0	92	4	24
43566	15	0	1	8	0	1	0	0	0	23	0	2
43571	7	0	2	3	0	2	0	0	0	10	0	4
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>337</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>142</b>
Wood Co.	13	0	4	1	1	6	0	0	0	14	1	10
So. Mich.	11	1	8	6	0	12	0	0	0	17	1	20
Not Lucas Co.	20	0	7	11	2	10	1	0	0	32	2	17
Unknown	5	1	6	1	0	4	1	0	1	7	1	11
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2693</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>895</b>	<b>821</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>704</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>3525</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>1628</b>

Lucas County Juvenile Court 2011 Case Statistics gathered and processed by Sarah Nopper  
(snoppe@co.lucas.oh.us) and reflect information gathered on March 16th, 2012.

Information is collected and entered into the Lucas County Juvenile Information System (JIS). The capability exists to have that data reported in a number of ways. For the purpose of the annual report, data is reported: by offenses and cases disposed during the calendar year. A case may be filed with more than one offense (or count). For example, if a case is filed with two counts of criminal damage and one count of possession of criminal tools (it is a single case with one case number with three distinct counts 01, 02, and 03). For statistical counting purposes this is counted as one case and three offenses.

# FILING STATISTICS

## VOLUME OF NEW OFFENSES FILED

A total of 6,474 new offenses were filed during 2011, a decrease of 418 offenses, or 6%, from 2010.

Of these 6,474 new offense filings, a total of 4,803, or 74%, were designated to be handled by formal court proceedings and 1,671, or 26%, were designated to be diverted for informal handling. This compares to 72% of the cases being disposed by formal court action during 2010.

**TABLE F1: SEX OF OFFENDERS FOR NEW OFFENSES FILED BY PROCEDURE**

	MALES	FEMALES	UNKNOWN	TOTAL
Formal Proceedings	3572	1230	1	4803
	74%	26%	<1%	
Informal Handling	927	732	12	1671
	55%	44%	1%	
<b>Total Offenses</b>	<b>4499</b>	<b>1962</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6,474</b>
	<b>69%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>&lt;1%</b>	


## SEX OF OFFENDERS FOR NEW OFFENSES FILED

Of the 6,474 new offenses filed - 4,499, or 69%, involved males - 1,962, or 30%, involved females - and 13, or less than 1%, were offenses for which the juvenile's sex was not recorded. This compares to 68% involving males and 32% females during 2010.


**TABLE F2: SEX OF OFFENDERS FOR NEW OFFENSES FILED BY CASE CODE**

	MALES	FEMALES	UNKNOWN	TOTAL
Delinquency	4015	1583	10	5608
	72%	28%	<1%	
Status	484	379	3	866
	56%	44%	1%	
<b>Total Offenses</b>	<b>4499</b>	<b>1962</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6,474</b>

**Sex of Offenders for New Offenses Filed**



**Race of Offenders for New Offenses Filed**



**RACE OF OFFENDER FOR NEW OFFENSES FILED**

During 2011, 66% of the new offenses filed involved minority youth. This remained the same as the 66% of minority filings during 2010.

**TABLE F3: RACE OF OFFENDER FOR NEW OFFENSES FILED**


	AFR/AMER	HISPANIC	WHITE	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL
Delinquency	3387	211	1800	99	91	5862
	58%	4%	31%	2%	2%	
Status	491	37	283	26	49	886
	55%	4%	32%	3%	6%	
<b>Total Offenses</b>	<b>3878</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>2083</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>6,474</b>
	<b>60%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>	

**TABLE F4: FIVE YEAR TREND OF OFFENSES FILED BY PROCEDURE**


	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Formal Proceedings	8785	7744	6118	4970	4803
Informal Handling	2943	3032	2283	1922	1671
<b>Total</b>	<b>11,728</b>	<b>10,776</b>	<b>8,401</b>	<b>6,892</b>	<b>6,474</b>

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Delinquency	10,314	9214	7193	5862	5608
Status	1414	1562	1208	1030	866
<b>Total</b>	<b>11,728</b>	<b>10,776</b>	<b>8,401</b>	<b>6,892</b>	<b>6,474</b>

**Five Year Trend By Procedure**



**Five Year Trend By Case Code**



**TABLE F6: FIVE YEAR TREND OF FELONIES AND MISDEMEANORS FILED\***

	2007		2008		2009		2010		2011	
First Degree Felony	113		100		80		57		77	
Second Degree Felony	298		342		264		185		167	
Third Degree Felony	155		144		115		108		98	
Fourth Degree Felony	314		266		231		150		174	
Fifth Degree Felony	507		411		344		235		250	
<b>Total Felonies</b>	<b>1387</b>	12%	<b>1263</b>	12%	<b>1034</b>	12%	<b>735</b>	11%	<b>766</b>	12%
First Degree Misdemeanor	5011		4614		3682		3106		2777	
Second Degree Misdemeanor	1180		974		801		690		695	
Third Degree Misdemeanor	115		102		103		56		56	
Fourth Degree Misdemeanor	1559		1301		1001		799		804	
Fifth Degree Misdemeanor	1		0		0		0		0	
Minor Misdemeanor	969		864		559		469		496	
<b>Total Misdemeanors</b>	<b>8835</b>	75%	<b>7855</b>	73%	<b>6146</b>	73%	<b>5120</b>	74%	<b>4828</b>	74%
<b>Total Status Offenses</b>	<b>1494</b>	13%	<b>1643</b>	15%	<b>1207</b>	14%	<b>1025</b>	15%	<b>866</b>	13%
<b>Total Unknown Degree</b>	<b>12</b>	<1%	<b>15</b>	<1%	<b>14</b>	<1%	<b>12</b>	<1%	<b>14</b>	<1%
<b>Total Annual Offenses</b>	<b>11,728</b>		<b>10,776</b>		<b>8,401</b>		<b>6,892</b>		<b>6,474</b>	

## 2011 FILING STATISTICS

**TABLE F7: SEX OF OFFENDERS BY DEGREE FOR NEW OFFENSES FILED**

	MALES	FEMALES	UNKNOWN	TOTAL
First Degree Felony	71 (92%)	6 (8%)	0	77
Second Degree Felony	152 (91%)	15 (9%)	0	167
Third Degree Felony	88 (90%)	10 (10%)	0	98
Fourth Degree Felony	151 (87%)	22 (13%)	1 (<1%)	174
Fifth Degree Felony	207 (83%)	43 (17%)	0	250
<b>Felonies</b>	<b>669 (87%)</b>	<b>96 (13%)</b>	<b>1 (&lt;1%)</b>	<b>766</b>
First Degree Misdemeanor	1711 (62%)	1061 (38%)	5 (<1%)	2777
Second Degree Misdemeanor	532 (77%)	163 (23%)	0	695
Third Degree Misdemeanor	41 (73%)	15 (27%)	0	56
Fourth Degree Misdemeanor	649 (81%)	152 (19%)	3 (<1%)	804
Fifth Degree Misdemeanor	0	0	0	0
Minor Misdemeanor	400 (81%)	95 (19%)	1 (<1%)	496
<b>Misdemeanors</b>	<b>3333 (69%)</b>	<b>1486 (31%)</b>	<b>9 (&lt;1%)</b>	<b>4828</b>
Status Offenses	484 (56%)	379 (44%)	3 (<1%)	866
Unknown Degree	13 (93%)	1 (7%)	0	14
<b>Total Offenses for 2011</b>	<b>4499</b>	<b>1962</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6,474</b>

**TABLE F8: RACE OF OFFENDER BY OFFENSE DEGREE FOR NEW OFFENSES FILED**

	AFR/AMER	HISPANIC	WHITE	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL
First Degree Felony	51 (66%)	3 (4%)	23 (30%)	0	0	77
Second Degree Felony	127 (76%)	3 (2%)	37 (22%)	0	0	167
Third Degree Felony	69 (70%)	4 (4%)	25 (26%)	0	0	98
Fourth Degree Felony	114 (66%)	3 (2%)	55 (32%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	174
Fifth Degree Felony	158 (63%)	12 (5%)	77 (31%)	2 (1%)	1 (<1%)	250
<b>Felonies</b>	<b>519 (68%)</b>	<b>25 (3%)</b>	<b>217 (28%)</b>	<b>3 (&lt;1%)</b>	<b>2 (&lt;1%)</b>	<b>766</b>
First Degree Misdemeanor	1631 (59%)	109 (4%)	933 (34%)	53 (2%)	51 (2%)	2777
Second Degree Misdemeanor	479 (69%)	25 (4%)	164 (24%)	16 (2%)	11 (2%)	695
Third Degree Misdemeanor	26 (46%)	4 (7%)	24 (43%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	56
Fourth Degree Misdemeanor	438 (54%)	29 (4%)	299 (37%)	17 (2%)	21 (3%)	804
Fifth Degree Misdemeanor	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Misdemeanor	297 (60%)	18 (4%)	166 (33%)	9 (2%)	6 (1%)	496
<b>Misdemeanors</b>	<b>2871 (59%)</b>	<b>185 (4%)</b>	<b>1586 (33%)</b>	<b>96 (2%)</b>	<b>90 (2%)</b>	<b>4828</b>
Status Offenses	482 (56%)	37 (4%)	273 (32%)	26 (3%)	48 (6%)	866
Unknown Degree	6 (43%)	1 (7%)	7 (50%)	0	0	14
<b>Total Offenses for 2011</b>	<b>3878</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>2083</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>6,474</b>
	<b>60%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>	

2011 FILING STATISTICS

The following tables represent the offenses most commonly referred to the Court. A total of 16 offenses represent 77% of all offense filings.

	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Assault	266	165	1	432
Burglary	128	7	0	135
Consume Underage	96	33	1	130
Criminal Damage	158	43	0	201
Criminal Trespassing	241	45	2	288
Disorderly Conduct	234	78	2	314
Domestic Violence	332	183	0	515
Drug Paraphernalia	101	23	0	124
Obstruction Of Official Business	278	75	0	353
Petty Theft	190	304	1	495
Possession Of Drugs	211	26	0	237
Resist Arrest	74	33	0	107
Safe School Ordinance	548	297	0	845
Unruly	230	169	0	399
Unruly/Curfew	124	70	0	194
Unruly/Runaway	92	109	0	201
<b>a) Totals</b>	<b>3303</b>	<b>1660</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4970</b>
<b>b) Total 2011 Filings</b>	<b>4499</b>	<b>1962</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6474</b>
<b>c) 'a' divided by 'b'</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>77%</b>

The most commonly referred offense was Safe School Ordinance, as was the case during 2011.

	<b>Number of Offenses in 2011</b>	<b>% of Total Findings</b>
Safe School Ordinance	845	13%
Domestic Violence	515	8%
Petty Theft	495	8%
Assault	432	7%
Unruly	399	6%
Obstructing Official Business	353	5%
<b>% of Total Filings</b>		<b>47%</b>

2011 FILING STATISTICS

The most commonly referred males offense is Safe School Ordinance, as was the case during 2010.

	<b>Number of Offenses in 2011</b>	<b>% of Total Filings</b>
Safe School Ordinance	548	12%
Domestic Violence	332	7%
Obstruction of Official Business	278	6%
Assault	266	6%
Criminal Trespassing	241	5%
Disorderly Conduct	234	5%
<b>% of Total Filings</b>		<b>41%</b>

Petty Theft was the most commonly referred female offense in 2011 while Safe School Ordinance was the most commonly referred female offense during 2010.

	<b>Number of Offenses in 2011</b>	<b>% of Total Findings</b>
Petty Theft	304	15%
Safe School Ordinance	297	15%
Domestic Violence	183	9%
Unruly	169	9%
Assault	165	8%
Unruly/Runaway	109	6%
<b>% of Total Filings</b>		<b>62%</b>

A total of 148 violent offense filings occurred during 2011, compared to 127 during 2010.

	<b>Males</b>	<b>Females</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	<b>Total</b>
Aggravated & Felonious Assault	31	5	0	36
Aggravated Robbery & Robbery	80	7	0	87
Homicide Offenses	1	0	0	1
Rape	22	2	0	24
<b>Total</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>148</b>
<b>% of Total Filings</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>1%</b>		<b>2%</b>

Lucas County Juvenile Court 2011 Filing Statistics gathered and processed by Sarah Nopper (snoppe@co.lucas.oh.us) and reflect information gathered on March 20th, 2012.

2011 COMMITMENTS AND CERTIFICATIONS

There are five categories for commitments to the Ohio Department of Youth Services. Youth who are serving their first term are COMMITTED; youth who are on parole for a prior commitment to the department and are committed for a new felony offense are RECOMMITTED; youth who have a prior commitment and are not on parole or probation and are committed on a new felony are PRIOR COMMITMENT; youth on parole and returned to our institution for a technical violation are PAROLE REVOCATIONS; and, youth who have been given an early release and placed on probation and are returned to the institution for a technical violation are JUDICIAL RELEASE VIOLATIONS.

# COMMITMENTS AND CERTIFICATIONS

## COMMITMENTS

A total of 34 youth were committed to the Ohio Department of Youth Services during 2011, compared to 28 during 2010 (an increase of 6 or 21%). The breakdown was 31 commitments during 2011 compared to 22 during 2010 (an increase of 9 or 41%) and 3 parole revocations compared to 6 during 2010 (a decrease of 3 or 50%).

	<b>Males</b>	<b>Females</b>	<b>Total</b>
New Commitments	22	1	23
Re-Commitments	7	0	7
Prior Commitments	1	0	1
<b>Total Commitments</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>31</b>
Parole Revocations	3	0	3
Judicial Release Violations	0	0	0
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>34</b>

A total of 50% of the commitments were for Felony 1 and Felony 2 offenses, compared to 40% during 2010.

	<b>Commitments</b>	<b>Revocations/Rel. Violations</b>	<b>Total</b>
Murder	0	0	0
Felony 1	5 or 16%	0	5 or 15%
Felony 2	10 or 32%	2 or 67%	12 or 35%
Felony 3	5 or 16%	0	5 or 15%
Felony 4	8 or 26%	1 or 33%	9 or 26%
Felony 5	3 or 10%	0	3 or 9%
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>34</b>


African-American	24 or 77%	3 or 100%	27 or 79%
Caucasian	5 or 16%	0	5 or 15%
Hispanic	2 or 6%	0	2 or 6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>34</b>

**FIVE YEAR TRENDS FOR COMMITMENTS**  
to the Ohio Department of Youth Services (Excludes Revocations)

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>New Commitments</b>	69	41	42	19	23
<b>Recommitments</b>	5	8	3	2	7
<b>Prior Commitments</b>	2	2	1	1	1
<b>Total Commitments</b>	76	51	46	22	31
<b>Parole Revocations</b>	27	16	12	6	3
<b>Grand Total</b>	103	67	58	28	34

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>African American</b>	75 (73%)	49 (73%)	52 (90%)	23 (82%)	27 (79%)
<b>Caucasian</b>	25 (24%)	16 (24%)	6 (10%)	4 (14%)	5 (15%)
<b>Hispanic</b>	3 (3%)	2 (3%)	0	1 (4%)	2 (6%)
<b>Males</b>	95 (92%)	64 (96%)	53 (91%)	28 (100%)	33 (97%)
<b>Grand Total</b>	103	67	58	28	34

**Commitments & Revocations**




## CERTIFICATIONS

During 2011, a total of 15 youth were certified to the General Trial Division to stand trial as an adult compared to 12 youth certified during 2010 (an increase of 3, or 25%). The prosecutor filed 30 petitions to certify during the year, compared to 31 in 2010 (a decrease of 1 or 3%).

<b>Certification Offenses</b>		
Murder		1
Attempted Murder		4
Aggravated Robbery		2
Felonious Assault		2
Aggravated Burglary		4
Burglary		4
Carry Concealed Weapon		1
Weapon Under Disability		1
<b>Sex</b>		
Male		15
Female		0
<b>Race</b>		
Caucasian		2
African American		11
Latino		2
<b>Age</b>		
	16	2
	17	10
	18	3

### Certifications - 5 Year Trend



Lucas County Juvenile Court 2011 Commitment and Certification Statistics gathered and processed by Sarah Sagaser (Data Analyst) and reflect information collected on April 19th, 2012.

# TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS


---

**TABLE T1: TRAFFIC OFFENSES BY SEX & RACE FOR OFFENSES DISPOSED**

	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
African/American	412	136	0	548
Hispanic	32	15	0	47
Caucasian	693	452	0	1145
Other	11	3	0	14
Unknown	15	8	0	23
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1163</b>	<b>614</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1777</b>

**TABLE T2: FIVE YEAR TREND FOR TRAFFIC OFFENSES DISPOSED**

	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
Males	2497	1953	1733	1468	1163
Females	1157	1076	801	655	614
<b>Total</b>	<b>3655</b>	<b>3029</b>	<b>2534</b>	<b>2123</b>	<b>1777</b>




**BOOKING:** A youth who is brought to JDC by a law enforcement officer. The youth may be booked and released to a parent or guardian shortly thereafter if the youth scores as low risk on the JDC Risk Assessment Instrument. If a youth was booked twice within the year, he/she may be counted twice in the numbers represented below.

# DETENTION STATISTICS

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Caucasian	1705 (27%)	1297 (24%)	1051 (25%)	1001 (27%)	805 (24%)
Minority	4537 (73%)	4217 (76%)	3227 (75%)	2761 (73%)	2489 (76%)
Unknown	0	1 (<1%)	0	0	1 (<1%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6242</b>	<b>5515</b>	<b>4278</b>	<b>3762</b>	<b>3295</b>
Male	4493 (72%)	4113 (75%)	3102 (73%)	2617 (70%)	2367 (72%)
Female	1749 (28%)	1402 (25%)	1176 (27%)	1145 (30%)	928 (28%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6242</b>	<b>5515</b>	<b>4278</b>	<b>3762</b>	<b>3295</b>

**Total Bookings**



**ADMISSION:** A youth who is admitted into Secure Detention and not eligible for release without a Detention Hearing and Judicial Authorization (medium-high risk on the JDC Risk Assessment Instrument). If a youth was admitted twice within the year, he/she may be counted twice.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Caucasian	919 (26%)	762 (23%)	635 (23%)	618 (26%)	509 (23%)
Minority	2603 (74%)	2506 (77%)	2098 (77%)	1748 (74%)	1672 (77%)
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3522</b>	<b>3268</b>	<b>2733</b>	<b>2366</b>	<b>2181</b>
Male	2601 (74%)	2526 (77%)	2075 (76%)	1729 (73%)	1620 (74%)
Female	921 (26%)	742 (23%)	658 (24%)	637 (27%)	561 (26%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3522</b>	<b>3268</b>	<b>2733</b>	<b>2366</b>	<b>2181</b>

2011 DETENTION STATISTICS


**ADMISSION RATE:** The number of youth admitted divided by the number of youth booked.

<b>TABLE JDC3: ADMISSION RATE BY RACE AND GENDER</b>					
	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>
Caucasian	54%	59%	60%	62%	63%
Minority	57%	59%	65%	63%	67%
Male	58%	61%	67%	66%	68%
Female	53%	53%	56%	56%	60%

<b>TABLE JDC4: AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION</b>					
Calendar Year	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009*</b>	<b>2010*</b>	<b>2011*</b>
	69	67	67.3	51.6	48.3

\***Note:** After the implementation of the Annie E. Casey Foundation’s Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) principles, the calculation for Average Daily Population and Average Length of Stay were improved to reflect a more accurate portrayal of the events and timing in the Lucas County Juvenile Detention Center.

<b>TABLE JDC5: AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY</b>					
Calendar Year	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009*</b>	<b>2010*</b>	<b>2011*</b>
Days	7.90	8.40	9.0	8.1	8.1



The following information, mandated by section ORC 2151.18, reflects the number of complaints filed within the court, that allege that a child is a delinquent child, in relation to which the court determines under ORC2151.27(D) that the victim of the alleged delinquent act was sixty-five years of age or older or permanently and totally disabled at the time of the alleged commission of the act.

# VICTIM STATISTICS

**TABLE V1: VICTIM STATISTICS FOR CASES FILED**

	<b>Property</b>	<b>Theft</b>	<b>Violent</b>
Delinquent Complaints Filed	10	32	2
Adjudications	1	17	0
Adjudication & Restitution	0	4	0
Committed to an Institution	0	4	0
Transferred for Criminal Prosecution	0	0	0