


# 2008 Annual Report



JUVENILE DIVISION of the  
Lucas County Court of Common Pleas




The time is always right to do what is right.

*Martin Luther King, Jr.*



Judge Denise Navarre Cubbon,  
Administrative Judge

Judge Connie F. Zimmelman



# **Court of Common Pleas**

## **Juvenile Division**

### **Lucas County, Ohio**

---

**Denise Navarre Cubbon**  
**Administrative Judge**

**Connie Zimmelman**  
**Judge**

To the citizens of Lucas County:

Greetings! The 2008 Annual Report once again reflects the dedication and hard work of the Administration and Staff of Lucas County Juvenile Court, Lucas County Juvenile Detention Center and Lucas County Youth Treatment Center as well as the quality services rendered professionally to those who find themselves within the jurisdiction of Juvenile Court in whatever capacity.

Early in the year Lucas County Administrator Michael Beazley and the Office of Management and Budget staff met with the Juvenile Court Administration to inform the Court that the monies coming into the county's general fund to support operation of county services were low and to be prepared for significant county-wide budget reductions. This information caused the Administration to begin the process of developing a multi-year plan to engage in budget analysis and creation of an action plan to maintain effective service delivery to the families and children who come within the jurisdiction of the Court.

Ohio Supreme Court Chief Justice Thomas J. Moyer and Governor Ted Strickland invited Ohio's Juvenile Court Judges Connie F. Zimmelman and Denise Navarre Cubbon to attend the first Ohio Summit on Children in Columbus. The objective of the Summit was to exchange information and build inter-agency relationships to address safety, permanency, and well-being issues for Ohio's children and families. In May 2008, a team from Lucas County including the Lucas County Juvenile Court Judges, Lucas County Children Services Executive Director Dean Sparks, Mental Health and Recovery Services Board of Lucas County Executive Director Jacqueline Martin, and Toledo Public Schools Superintendent John Foley attended the two day event with teams from approximately 80 Ohio counties. The Lucas County team agreed as a team to examine mental health needs and service delivery of Lucas County children who are system-involved; and to create opportunities for children placed out of home to address the Court directly in an age appropriate manner regarding their needs, goals and dreams.

In August 2008, the Lucas County Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) Workgroup issued the Juvenile Justice System Assessment Report. Results indicated that Lucas County has overrepresentation of minority youth in the community's arrest rate and in the institutional confinement rate. Using the data derived from the study, the local DMC Workgroup worked with Toledo Public Schools and the House of Emmanuel to develop an on-site program (Intensive School Retention Program) to divert from Juvenile Court those Leverage Junior High School students charged with violations of the safe school act. Reduction in court filings by the schools appeared almost immediately in large part due to the cooperation of Toledo Public Schools. The Lucas County Juvenile Court Model Court team adopted as a 2008 goal to join efforts in examining DMC in the area of child protection matters by following the juvenile justice assessment study model.

Lucas County Juvenile Court continued its efforts to work with the Prostitution Roundtable and the local Task Force addressing teen prostitution in Lucas County. Efforts to meet the needs of these children and

eliminate teen prostitution recruitment are ongoing due to commitment of those affiliated with the Innocence Lost Project, local and federal law enforcement agencies, and community entities such as the Second Chance Program.

Challenges associated with Lucas County's alarmingly high teen pregnancy rate continue. Connecting Point, the Toledo mental health agency for youth, facing drastic funding reduction was forced to close its 24 hour Assistance Center in October 2008.


Lucas County Juvenile Court continues its efforts to respond to the particular needs of the families and children we serve by providing quality services. Collaboration with agencies and stake holders is imperative and this Court's commitment to this practice continues. Insistence on quality programming based upon best practice for this special population is very important. An emerging interest in the number of children who have involvement in the child protection system as well as delinquency matters has caught the attention of stakeholders nationally and locally. This Court initiated discussion with Lucas County Children Services, Lucas County Board of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, Mental Health and Recovery Services Board of Lucas County, and the Ohio Department of Youth Services concerning these dual classified/crossover children.

On behalf of the Administration and the Staff of Lucas County Juvenile Court, the Lucas County Juvenile Detention Center, and the Youth Treatment Center, Judge Connie Zimmelman and I thank the citizens of Lucas County for the privilege to do this significant and important work. The professionalism and outstanding work of the administration and staff greatly enhances our ability to effectively manage the significant caseload. The personal satisfaction and fulfillment derived from working with our community's children and families who find themselves within the jurisdiction of Lucas County Juvenile Court is indescribable.

Respectfully submitted,

Denise Navarre Cubbon, Administrative Judge

Connie F. Zimmelman, Judge



# CONTENTS

---

Report Card to the Citizens of Lucas County .....	i	Information Systems .....	29
Description and Jurisdiction .....	ii	Fiscal & Business .....	30
Goal of the Court/Mission Statement ....	iii	<b>2008 Statistics .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>2008 Department Narratives .....</b>	<b>1</b>	Section 1: Offenses Disposed .....	34
Court Administration .....	1	Section 2: Cases Disposed .....	51
Case Flow Services .....	4	Section 3: Filings .....	55
Legal .....	5	Section 4: Commitments & Certifications .....	61
Mediation .....	7	Section 5: Serious Youthful Offenders ..	64
Family Drug Court .....	10	Section 6: Traffic .....	66
Community Control .....	12	Section 7: Detention .....	67
CASA/CRB/Closure Board .....	13	Section 8: Community Control .....	69
Probation .....	15	Section 9: Victims .....	70
Juvenile Detention Center .....	22	<b>Administration and Supervisory Staff .....</b>	<b>71</b>
Youth Treatment Center .....	25	<b>Credits .....</b>	<b>71</b>
Staff Development & Training .....	27		
Human Resources .....	28		

# A REPORT CARD TO THE CITIZENS OF LUCAS COUNTY FROM YOUR JUVENILE COURT

We are proud to announce some of the accomplishments of the staff of the Lucas County Juvenile Court during the year 2008.

- 3,035 cases were scheduled for Mediation; 2,247 (74%) completely settled their cases with the assistance of a neutral mediator



- The Court partnered with Lucas County Job and Family Services and Toledo Public Schools to attack the pervasive problem of truancy in our community through the Truancy Prevention through Mediation Program; the elementary schools of the Woodward learning community are currently involved in the program while Catholic Charities' School Attendance Initiative Program served as an important referral service in this program

- A total of 14 families were reunited as a result of completing Family Drug Court and 1 drug free baby was born during the year to a program participant

- Volunteer Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) volunteered 12,390 hours of service representing the best interest of children involved in the court system - primarily in cases involving dependency, neglect or abuse; The Citizens Review Board (CRB) volunteered 5,416 hours of service reviewing the status of children in the care and custody of the Children Services Board; The Closure Board, which ensures a thorough review of each case where a child is being returned home volunteered 254 hours of service



- A total of 728 intake assessments were conducted by the Probation Department and 613 youth were placed on formal court probation

- 856 youth were assigned to community control as an alternative to detention with 638 (74%) successfully completing with no negative impact on community safety

- Delinquent youth worked over 19,000 hours at various community sites to meet their financial obligation to repay their victim - in total \$188,686 was returned to victims of juvenile crime



- The CITE Program started four new community gardens and a large greenhouse with the Toledo GROWS Program; in North Toledo a 22,000 square foot garden was built (including the greenhouse), supported by funds from The NorthRiver Weed and Seed Program

- The Juvenile Detention Center had 5,514 bookings (youth brought to the facility by law enforcement) and 3,268 admissions (youth detained overnight in the facility)

- Court staff received 9,366 hours of formal training

- A total of 25 youth were committed to the legal custody of the Ohio Department of Youth Services, and 9 youth were bound over to the General Trial Division to stand trial as an adult

## 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.

## 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 education 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.



**2008**  
**DEPARTMENT**  
**NARRATIVES**

# Court Administration

---

**Dan Pompa**, Court Administrator  
**Kendra Kec**, Assistant Court Administrator

## **DISPROPORTIONATE MINORITY CONTACT (DMC) STUDY RELEASED**

In August, the Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) in the Lucas County Juvenile Justice System Phase 1 Assessment Report was issued. Overrepresentation exists when the percentage of minority youth who come into contact with the juvenile justice system is higher than their percentage in the total youth population. A significant body of research demonstrates that, throughout the United States, a disproportionate percentage of racial minorities come in contact with all stages of the juvenile and criminal justice systems.

In July 2006, Lucas County joined efforts already underway in Franklin County to develop strategies that can be used statewide to reduce minority overrepresentation in Ohio's Juvenile Justice System. Following the focus at the federal level, the Ohio Department of Youth Services has identified 14 counties that represent 85% of Ohio's minority population, and the respective juvenile courts have joined forces to address the large numbers of minority youth entering Ohio's juvenile justice system. In addition to Lucas County, juvenile court representatives from Allen, Butler, Clark, Cuyahoga, Franklin, Hamilton, Lorain, Mahoning, Montgomery, Richland, St. Clair, Summit and Trumbull Counties have committed to this initiative.

A small workgroup met regularly to report findings to the

community through the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC) and the Lucas County Family and Children First Council, our collaborating partner. The workgroup included representatives from Lucas County Juvenile Court, Toledo Police Department, Lucas County Mental Health and Recovery Services and a research consultant from University of Cincinnati. CJCC provides staff services to the workgroup.

The local data gathered since 2004 suggests that the point of contact with the highest disproportionality among minorities as a whole is arrest. Additionally, the Court has been proactive in combating detention overcrowding and detention reform. Based on these factors, we began our DMC initiative by focusing on the arrest point of contact. It is hoped that by addressing this point of contact with the highest disproportionality first, the disproportionality at other points of contact will also be affected.

Based on the data reviewed, the local DMC workgroup decided to use selected data sets to further understand the types of crimes being committed. Below is a summary of the selected data sets.

- Safe School Ordinance (SSO) violations have been the most referred filings over the past four years, averaging 13% of offenses filed with Juvenile Court.
- The number of SSO filings are nearly double the next leading referred offense filings of assault and petty theft with an average of 7% of all filings.
- Since SSO violations are nearly double the next leading referred offense, the workgroup decided to analyze the schools that referred the most SSO violations to juvenile court.
- Woodward and Leverette accounted for 32.3% of all SSO violations. The Woodward feeder system was selected for additional analysis and implementation of DMC reduction activities.

Additionally, it was discovered that SSO violations were not only the leading referred offense to juvenile court, but over half of the youth committed to ODYS had at least one SSO violation in their history. More significantly, 67% of African-American youth committed to ODYS had at least one SSO violation in their history.

While focusing on the Woodward feeder pattern, it is important to consider the factors contributing to juvenile delinquent behavior. The greatest influences on a child's life, aside from individuals within his/her family structure, are the people that the child first comes into contact withing the school system. Involvement and attachment to school are two factors that impact juvenile delinquent behavior. Poor academic achievement and lack of involvement in school increases the chance that a child will drop out of school, lack of involvement in school increases the chance that a child will drop out of school, lack employment skills and exhibit delinquent or deviant behaviors. The Court contracted with the House of Emmanuel (HOE) to provide on site diversion services in a new program - Intensive School Retention Program to assist Leverette Junior High students who are vulnerable to violate Toledo Public School's safe school ordinance (SSO) policy.

Between April 1, 2008 and the end of the 2007-2008 school year, HOE staff were available on site to screen youth referred by Leverette school administration and provide intervention and support services. As part of the pilot startup phase, HOE agreed to serve all youth referred by Leverette administration and received 40 youth referrals. These youth will remain in the program during the summer months and into the beginning of classes in September. HOE program staff is also collecting baseline data on the referred youth. Baseline information is being collected on school attendance and tardiness, number and type or disciplinary absences, law enforcement contact, behavior and academic performance.

## **OTHER HIGHLIGHTS FOR THE YEAR**

Windows in the Detention Center had to be reinforced with a special coating and Plexiglass was installed after three youth broke a third floor common area window and two of the youth jumped into a tree and escaped. The two escapees were eventually found and rearrested. It was the second such incident involving window breakage and the fix should permanently address the issue.

Lucas County regained the distinction of having one of the highest teen pregnancy rates in Ohio. According to figures released by the Ohio Department of Health, Lucascounty was second in the state with a rate per thousand of 45.2 during 2006. The top five counties, with the exception of Lucas, were all small counties. The 2006 figures were the highest it had been since 1998.

It is a known fact that children rescued from sex trafficking are not safe. It is well known fact that Toledo has been identified as a major hub for child sex trafficking/prostitution in the United States. It was announced in December that Second Chance, a program of Toledo Area Ministries, was moving ahead with opening a safe house in Toledo for children prostituting or at risk of prostituting. There are few such facilities in the nation and none in Ohio.

Connecting Point, a Toledo mental health agency, that served over 2,000 children in 2008 was facing a total shutdown in 2009. The agency, which served as a runaway and 24 hour hotline service when it started in 1974, provided mental health therapy, substance abuse services, and other youth focused services. Funding for the \$8 million agency was the reason for closing a 24 hour assistance center in October.

For the second straight year, the number of delinquency filings (offenses) were down. Offense filings decreased 8% in 2008 and 11% from 2006. Safe School Ordinance filings continued to be the most frequently referred offense.


# Case Flow Services

Pat Balderas, Administrator of Case Flow Services

2008 NEW CASE FILINGS LUCAS COUNTY JUVENILE COURT		
	2008	2007
Delinquency	5,485	5,981
Traffic	2,091	2,539
Dependency/Neglect/ Abuse	279	466
Unruly	361	394
Adult (Contributing)	292	389
Motion Permanent Custody	23	32
Custody	1,084	1,268
Support Enforcement	1,736	1,767
Parentage	826	915
U.I.F.S.A.	207	144
Others	13	22
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12,397</b>	<b>13,917</b>

\*As reported to the Ohio Supreme Court

A significant increases in new case filings occurred in the U.I.F.S.A. case type (44%). Significant decreases in new case filings occurred in Traffic (18%), Dependency/Neglect/Abuse (40%), Adult/Contributing (25%), and Permanent Custody (28%). Overall new case filings were down by 1520 or 11%.



The Magistrates are appointed by the Administrative Judge to preside over the daily case management in the Juvenile Court. The powers of a Magistrate are similar to those of a Judge, however, their decisions and orders are subject to review and approval by the assigned Juvenile Court Judge. In Lucas County, there are 11 Magistrates who hear a large volume of cases in various jurisdictional areas. They determine delinquency, dependency, custody, paternity and child support matters in Juvenile Court.

Three Magistrates are assigned to preside over cases involving allegations of dependency, neglect and abuse of children. They are responsible for deciding the temporary and permanent placement of children. The primary goal of the dependency process is to protect the best interest of the child. The Magistrates provide judicial oversight of services offered to parents to address the casual issues of the neglect or abuse and judicial oversight of the efforts made by parents to comply with those services.

Four Magistrates preside over delinquency and traffic matters. Hearings involve whether or not to detain a youth, arraignments, adjudications of delinquency, disposition and post-dispositional matters.

The Juvenile Court has jurisdiction over paternity, custody and child support when a child is born out of wedlock, or child support issues when married parents have not filed for divorce. The Magistrates oversee proceedings to establish the proper parent/child relationship. In addition to establishing paternity, the Magistrates also set child support orders. A Magistrate has the authority to hold a parent in contempt of court and place them before the assigned Judge for imposition of a jail term for failure to pay child support. The Magistrates also decide custody and visitation matters in Juvenile Court. Custody and visitation decisions determine who shall be the residential parent or custodian of a child and provide for the visitation shedule of a child. There are three Magistrates primarily



## Legal Department

**Donna Mitchell, Chief Magistrate**

assigned to this docket.

In addition to their regular dockets, the Magistrates preside over the Lucas County Juvenile Court specialty courts, either as the primary hearing officer or as backup to the Judge. The specialty courts include:

**Family Drug Court** - The Magistrate oversees the intensive supervision of parents who are seeking reunification with children who have been removed from their custody due to issues that include substance abuse. Parents are provided with an array of services to address the issues that cause the removal of the child from the home.

**Juvenile Treatment Court** - The Magistrate oversees the intensive supervision of youth who have been found to be delinquent and have substance abuse issues.

**Re-entry Court** - The Magistrate provides judicial oversight of youth who have been released on parole back to our community after having been committed to the Ohio Department of Youth Services by the Juvenile Court. The youth's progress in complying with services and with conditions of parole is measured.

**Sex Offender Treatment Court** - The Magistrate oversees compliance with specialized treatment plans and services for youth found delinquent of sexual crimes.

LEGAL DEPARTMENT

Traffic Diversion - The Magistrates provides a judicial determination of whether a youthful traffic offender would best be addressed in a diversion program (CARTEEN) rather than in the standard delinquency process.

Community Control Review - The Magistrate hears matters of violations of the rules of community detention of youth charged with a delinquent act but not yet adjudicated, and

considers whether the youth should be placed in secure detention for their protection or the protection of the community.

The Magistrates have performed in leadership roles by serving on and/or chairing committees withing the court. The Magistrates performed in teaching roles for staff, local attorneys and for judicial officers and attorneys statewide.

In 2008, the Lucas County Juvenile Court Mediation Department developed and expanded in a number of important ways in order to accommodate the increasing demand for alternative dispute resolution across all Juvenile Court case types. (See table below.)

More cases were scheduled for mediation, in 2008, than ever before. As shown in the table below, more than 3000 cases were scheduled for mediation in 2008. This data indicates a 17% overall increase in cases scheduled for mediation in 2008 as compared to 2007. Significantly, the most dramatic increases in case types scheduled for mediation were in the areas of delinquency, truancy and child custody/visitation cases.

In 2008, the number of child protection cases scheduled for mediation, including permanent custody cases, declined by 26%, and family conflict cases scheduled for mediation declined by 26%, as well. These decreases are primarily a direct reflection of reduced filings in each of those case types.

Primarily in the areas of delinquency, truancy and custody/visitation cases, the overall number of actual mediations



# Mediation Department

**Linda Sorah, Director of Mediation Services**

that occurred in 2008 increased by 20% when compared to 2007.

Most importantly, partial case settlements resulting from mediation increased by 36% when compared with partial settlement rates in 2007, while the complete resolution of Juvenile Court cases through mediation increased by 16% overall in 2008.

These statistics clearly indicate that the Lucas County Mediation Department has been working harder and more effectively in resolving Juvenile Court cases through mediation than ever before in the department's history.

LUCAS COUNTY JUVENILE COURT MEDIATION BY CASE TYPE (No. of Cases)							
	<u>Unruly/ Delinquency</u>	<u>Family Conflict</u>	<u>Civil/ Custody</u>	<u>Child Protection</u>	<u>Permanent Custody</u>	<u>Truancy Prevention</u>	<u>All Cases</u>
Cases Scheduled in Mediation							
<b>2008</b>	<b>1232</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>1263</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>3035</b>
2007	937	310	1006	211	66	N/A	2530
Cases Mediated							
<b>2008</b>	<b>886</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>920</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>2247</b>
2007	678	232	643	184	53	N/A	1790
Cases Resolved w/ Partial Settlement							
<b>2008</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>167</b>
2007	0	23	61	22	7	N/A	113
Cases Resolved w/ Complete Settlement							
<b>2008</b>	<b>849</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>1688</b>
2007	650	181	423	136	19	N/A	1409

MEDIATION DEPARTMENT

<b>CASES RESULTING IN PARTIAL/COMPLETE SETTLEMENT BY CASE TYPE IN 2007</b>							
<b><u>Case Type</u></b>	<b><u>Unruly/ Delinquency</u></b>	<b><u>Family Conflict</u></b>	<b><u>Civil/ Custody</u></b>	<b><u>Child Protection</u></b>	<b><u>Permanent Custody</u></b>	<b><u>Truancy Prevention</u></b>	<b><u>All Cases</u></b>
Cases Mediated	886	199	920	147	31	64	2247
Cases Resolved w/ Complete Settlement	849	159	503	105	8	64	1688
Average Time Spent In Mediation (hours)	0.8h	0.9h	1.5h	1.7h	1.4h	0.6h	1.1h

An examination of the table above demonstrates one important measure of the efficacy and efficiency of the use of mediation services in Juvenile Court. More than 75% of the Juvenile Court cases mediated resulted in a complete resolution of the case in 2008. Overall, the average time spent in mediation is 1 hour and 6 minutes.

Clearly, mediation is a cost effective and time efficient method of assisting families to resolve their conflict without ever having to appear before a Judge or Magistrate for an actual hearing or trial in their court case.

<b>ANNUAL COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF SETTLEMENT RATES RESULTING FROM THE MEDIATION OF ALL CASES REFERRED TO MEDIATION</b>					
	<b><u>All Cases Scheduled for Mediation</u></b>	<b><u>Cases Mediated</u></b>	<b><u>Partial Settlement</u></b>	<b><u>Complete Settlement</u></b>	<b><u>Settlement Rate (Partial &amp; Complete)</u></b>
<b>2006</b>	2889	1841	139	1419	85%
<b>2007</b>	2530	1790	113	1409	85%
<b>2008</b>	<b>3035</b>	<b>2247</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>1679</b>	<b>83%</b>

The table above demonstrates that, although the number of cases mediated in Juvenile Court increased by 21% from 2007 to 2008, the overall settlement rate remained relatively consistent at 83%. This impressive fact is a reflection of the training and experience of the Juvenile Court mediators and the commitment of the entire department staff in response to this Court’s judicial support of the consistent use of mediation across all case types.

In 2008, the Juvenile Court Mediation Department was also involved in several other activities and events in furtherance and support of the Juvenile Court’s vision and mission:

- At the 2008 Ohio Summit on Children, an event sponsored by the Office of the Governor and the Ohio Supreme Court, the Lucas County Juvenile Court Mediation Department was spotlighted in a film presentation as one of the promising and proven approaches in achieving timely permanency for dependent, neglected or abused children in Ohio.
- For the first time ever, Lucas County Juvenile Court partnered with Lucas County Job and Family Services and Toledo Public Schools to attack the pervasive problem of truancy in our community through the Truancy Prevention through Mediation Program. The elementary

## MEDIATION DEPARTMENT

schools of the Woodward learning community are currently involved in the program. Of the families served by truancy mediation, 100% developed an agreement or plan with teachers to resolve issues related to school attendance. All truancy mediation participants indicated that the program also improved the relationships between the parents and teachers of the children involved. Catholic Charities' School Attendance Initiative Program serves as an important referral service in this program.

- The National CASA Judge's Page Newsletter featured an article discussing the success of this court's mediation program in child protection cases. Written by Linda Sorah, the Juvenile Court Mediation Coordinator, The Consistent Use of Child Protection Mediation: A Key to Timely Permanency in Neglect, Abuse and Permanent Custody Cases was featured in the October 2008 newsletter publication.

- The Juvenile Court Mediation Department continues to support the community in the development of skilled mediators by offering several annual training events.

- Basic Mediation Training is offered to members of the community and students of the University of Toledo, College of Law twice each year.

- The Domestic Abuse Issues in Mediation Training event is offered annually at the Juvenile Court through co-sponsorship with the Ohio Supreme Court.

- Brought to us by the Ohio Supreme Court and the Ohio Commission on Dispute Resolution, the Truancy Prevention through Mediation Training event occurred this year at Juvenile Court and trained several staff and local mediators in the special skills of truancy mediation.

- The department also offered an annual court-wide, in-service training event. The "Free for All" In-Service Training event spot-lighted several community agencies offering free or low-cost services for families in the Toledo area.

- Jennifer Fulton Styblo, the Assistant Mediation Coordinator, participated as a speaker and panel member at the Ohio Fatherhood Initiative Policy Forum in Toledo, and presented on this Juvenile Court's efforts to facilitate safe and healthy relationships between never married parents and their children.

- In order to meet the increasing demand for the use of mediation as a cost-effective alternative to litigation in Juvenile Court, two local practicing attorneys were added to the Mediation Department staff early this year. Shelby Cully and Debbie Lipson-Kaplan are experienced part-time mediators.

- The Juvenile Court Mediation Department continues to partner with various educational institutions in the development of local student interns. This year, the Mediation Department supported interns from the University of Toledo paralegal program, the College of Law and Davis College. With the support of the Juvenile Court Administration, the Mediation Department staff assisted more than 20 interns in the development of either mediation skills or paralegal/administrative skills by working directly with experienced mediation staff members this year.

Looking to the future, Lucas County Juvenile Court has implemented a new mediation referral system this year that will allow us the opportunity for improved statistical oversight and quality control of mediation services at Juvenile Court.

We look forward to the use of this new level of statistical scrutiny so that we may best serve the Juvenile Court and our Lucas County community with excellence and cost effectiveness through mediation services for many years to come.

# Family Drug Court

## Kristen Blake, Drug Court Coordinator

The year 2008 marked Family Drug Court’s ninth year in operation. The Lucas County Family Drug Court 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 shall be timely, holistic, and meet the identified needs of Drug Court participants. The goals are maintainig and achieving permanency in a child’s sense of time.

Family Drug Court participants enter voluntarily and are required to commit to the program for a minimum of one year. They may enter Family Drug Court at several points in their Neglect/Abuse case, including Shelter Care, Mediation, adjudication/disposition or at a Motion to Show Cause hearing. Participants who are found in contempt of court at a Motion to Show Cause hearing have 30 days incarceration as an additional possible sanction. The program has three phases; during these phases, the client receives judicial supervision through weekly, bi-weekly or monthly attendance in Court.

A major strength of the Family Drug Court is the collaboration among all systems that 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 recommendations. The Family Drug Court team consists of a Judge and Magistrate, the Drug Court Coordinator, TASC case managers, child protection

caseworkers, a child protection attorney, a mental health case manager, treatment providers, housing providers, defense attorneys and guardians ad-litem.

## SUMMARY

The following information can be summarized from reviewing Family Drug Court data in 2008:

- A total of thirty-four drug-free babies have been born to parents in the Family Drug Court Program since the program began in 2000.
- Of the 40 new parents referred to the program in 2008, 42% reported that their drug of choice was marijuana, 25% reported crack/cocaine, 18% reported heroin or other opiates, and 6% reported alcohol as their drug of choice. This was the first year since the inception of the program that marijuana was the most reported drug of choice. Previously, crack/cocaine was consistently the most reported drug of choice since 2000. Also, heroin and other opiates showed an increase as drug of choice, as compared to 2007 referrals.

Lucas County Family Drug Court continues to serve as a host site for the Supreme Court of Ohio's Specialized Dockets. As a host site, the Lucas County Family Drug Court arranges numerous visits from courts across Ohio who are in the process of planning a dependency treatment court.

### 2000-2006 FAMILY DRUG COURT REFERRALS

Year	Parents Referred
2000	24
2001	25
2002	44
2003	62
2004	53
2005	35
2006	41
2007	48
2008	40
<b>Total</b>	<b>372</b>

FAMILY DRUG COURT

FAMILY DRUG COURT REFERRALS						
	2008			TOTAL SINCE 2000		
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Parents referred	5 (13%)	35 (87%)	40	82 (22%)	290 (78%)	372
Active Parents*	5 (14%)	32 (86%)	37	63 (20%)	251 (80%)	314
Total Active Parents in 2008**	18 (22%)	65 (78%)	83			

\*Parents engaged in services within first month of referral. Those who did not engage in services received a neutral termination from the program.

\*\*Includes carryover of parents already engaged from previous year(s).

FAMILY DRUG COURT OUTCOMES						
	2008			TOTAL SINCE 2000		
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Successful Terminations*	6	8	14 (37%)	30	105	135 (50%)
Unsuccessful Terminations	7	17	24 (63%)	27	110	137 (50%)

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

2000-2008 FAMILY DRUG COURT CHILDREN										
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	Total
New Children Served	61	47	70	110	87	56	63	65	55	614
Children Re-unified										
With a Parent	4	31	36	31	48	41	37	19	32	279
Drug Free Babies Born	3	2	4	9	2	4	4	5	1	34

# Community Control

**Kendra Kec**, Assistant Court Administrator  
**Mary Niederhauser**, Community Control Team Manager

## MISSION

The Community Control Team is dedicated to community safety and holding youth accountable, while empowering youth with knowledge, social skills and tools used to improve decision making & behavior.

Community Control was developed in August 2000 and is based upon Annie E. Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative research (JDAI). At that time, Lucas County Juvenile Court began managing the detention population by transferring youth to Community Control. The primary purpose of Community Control is to provide a safe alternative to Secure Detention for moderate to low risk youth who are awaiting trial.

Youth involved in Level Two of Community Control (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 Control continued to use cognitive based Rational Behavior Training (RBT) as the foundation of its discipline management plan. To supplement RBT, Community Control staff also continued teaching the *Thinking for a Change* and the *Journey Through Life*

curriculum and youth attended Toledo Police Department educational classes.

A total of 856 referrals were terminated from all levels of Community Control during Calendar Year 2008. Seventy-four percent (74%, 638) of all referrals successfully completed all requirements of Community Control. In order to successfully complete the program, participants attended Court hearings as scheduled, did not recidivate and were not placed back into Secure Detention while active in Community Control. The remaining twenty-six percent (26%, 218) either had a warrant filed for their arrest and/or were placed back into Secure Detention; thus, they were terminated from Community Control unsuccessfully.

The chart on page 69 of this report provides details on the success rates of the different levels of Community Control from January 1, 2008 through December 31, 2008.

Lucas County's judicial officials remain comfortable with placing non-violent youth in Community Control Level 2 (the Direct Reporting Center) and Level 3 (Home Supervision), realizing that some youth are better served by the programming offered through Community Control. As an alternative to Secure Detention, Community Control operations helped make Secure Detention population manageable.

# Court Appointed Special Advocates, Citizens Review Board, and Closure Board

Carol Martin, Director

In the year 2008, the Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) department completed its 28<sup>th</sup> year of service and the Citizen Review Board (CRB) celebrated its 30<sup>th</sup> year. The CASA program has grown from approximately 35 volunteers serving in 1992 to 178 citizen volunteers with active cases in 2008. These two Lucas County Juvenile Court based 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 ADVOCATES (CASA)** 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 dependency, neglect, and abuse 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. The goal of the CASA/GAL advocate is to ensure that a child's right to a safe, permanent home is acted on in a sensitive and expedient manner.

plan for a permanent, nurturing environment exists and that the child service agency is working toward achieving that plan. By statute, Citizen Review Board members are 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. Each Board meets twice monthly. CRB reviewed 86 more case plans in 2008 than in 2007. Two non-CRB volunteers donated a total of 650 hours in office help to help the CRB Department manage the additional caseload in 2008.

## 2008 CASA/GAL ACTIVITY

Total Dependency/Neglect/Abuse Children  
Referred to Court - **462** (down 286 from 2007)  
New Children Assigned to CASA/GAL  
Volunteers - **219** (48%, up 11% from 2007)  
New Children Assigned to Attorney/GAL - **243**  
(down 226 from 2007)  
Total Children Served by  
CASA Volunteers - **555** (down 147 from 2007)  
CASA Volunteer Hours - **12,390** (down 2016 from 2007)

## 2008 CITIZENS REVIEW BOARD ACTIVITY

Total Reviews - **3301** (-86 from 2007)  
Hearings Held - **10**  
Caseworker Appearances - **9**  
CRB Volunteer Hours - **5412** (+396 from 2007)

**CITIZENS REVIEW BOARD (CRB)** is a group of volunteers who review the status of children in the care or custody of a public agency. Volunteers determine that a

**CLOSURE BOARD (CB)** In July 1995, Director Martin established a specialized 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 Termination Hearing.

**2008 CLOSURE BOARD ACTIVITY**

Cases Reviewed - **128**

Cases Terminated With  
Protective Supervision - **82**

Cases Terminated Without  
Protective Supervision - **43**

Cases Terminating LCCS  
Protective Supervision - **58**

Motions Received Too Late  
To Review - **19** (*down 14% from 2007*)

Drug Court Cases (not subject  
to CB termination review) - **23**

Closure Board Volunteer Hours - **254**

**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. Three new Board members were voted onto the Board for 2008 to complete a 13 person Board. The 2008 Advisory Board was comprised of twenty-three percent (23%) African American members; the remaining board members are Caucasian. Board diversity was designed to include community-wide representation.

In keeping with the mission of the Lucas County Juvenile Court, the Probation Department remains committed to the restorative justice and balanced approach framework which emphasizes a response to juvenile delinquency that focuses on accountability, public safety, competency development and victim reparation. The department strives to hold juvenile offenders accountable for delinquent activity, while providing referral to resources that reduce criminal behavior, and increase the ability of youth to live productively and responsibly in the community. The department recognizes that accountability for the offender means accepting responsibility and acting to repair the harm done to people and communities. The department embraces the importance the role the family plays in each youth's response to supervision, and requires parents and/or guardians to participate in the youth's treatment plan, as well as other programs to which the youth and family are referred. Assessment, referral to treatment and interventions are provided based on each offender's needs. Many of these interventions focus on teaching life skills and coping skills to youth through referral to diverse programming that includes, but is not limited to: individual and family therapy, mentoring services, domestic violence prevention programming, sex offender treatment, job readiness training and assessment and linkage to treatment for youth with substance abuse issues. To meet the goals set forth in the department's mission, we strive to develop positive and collaborative relationships with other systems and service providers in the community to ensure the greater likelihood of successful family outcomes.

In 2008, the Probation Department received 732 new referrals to Probation. At time of referral, a comprehensive social history was completed on each youth prior to assignment to a Probation Officer. Referred youth and families received case management services, in addition to a wide array of programming. Services range from interventions geared for low risk offenders to supervision for high risk felony offenders. In 2008, there were a total



# Probation Department

**Deborah Hodges, Administrator**

of 613 cases assigned. High risk offenders represented 220 (36%); Regular risk offenders represented 322 (52%); and low risk offenders represented 71 (12%) of the total youth placed on Probation. Probation Officers develop treatment plans for each offender and link youth and families to services in the community. This treatment plan is updated every 90 days, as is the risk and need score for each youth. Should community protection become an issue, probation staff may recommend secure detention, community control, surveillance, electronic monitoring and drug testing of youth to ensure compliance to court orders and reduce the risk to the community.

## **CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM**

The Classification System involves the systematic collection of data on probation referrals and provides management reports and caseload data.

The system enables the department to sort the probation population into different categories based on assessment of risk and need, to provide differential supervision to youth in each category. The caseload data, which is traced through the management information system, has provided a valuable resource to study the pattern of juvenile offenders in the county, and enhances Probation's ability to identify the relative likelihood of recidivism for all probationers. This information is beneficial to the development of both internal and external programming directed toward the overall mission of rehabilitation of the juvenile offenders and the protection of the community.

PROBATION DEPARTMENT

<b>-2008 PROBATION INTAKE UNIT ACTIVITY-</b>	
Assessment Reports	497
Social History Investigations	206
Certification Reports	29
Out-of-Town Investigations (O.T.I.)	0
<b>Total 2008 Reports</b>	<b>728</b>
Total 2007 Reports	827
<b>-2008 PROBATION CASE ASSIGNMENTS-</b>	
High Risk	220 (36%)
Regular Risk	322 (52%)
Low Risk	71 (12%)
Divert	0
<b>Total 2008 Assigned</b>	<b>613</b>
Total 2007 Assigned	695
<b>-2008 PROBATION CASES TERMINATED-</b>	
Successfully Terminated	508 (63%)
Unsuccessfully Terminated	306 (37%)
Terminated with no New Charges	355 (43%)
Average Number of Days on Supervision	511
<b>Total 2008 Prob. Cases Terminated</b>	<b>814</b>
Total 2007 Prob. Cases Terminated	478

**JUVENILE RESTITUTION PROGRAM J.R.P.**

Since the development of the Juvenile Restitution Program in 1977, the Court has placed a high priority on holding offenders accountable for their actions. Restitution holds youth financially responsible for the loss and/or damage they have caused. The restitution owed by each youth is determined through a loss verification process conducted with the victim. If the youth does not have the ability to pay the restitution, he/she is assigned to a work crew and paid \$6.00 per hour.

The Juvenile Restitution Program has remained committed to the principles of victim reparation, and holding youth accountable, as a means of providing a balanced approach. Through the years, this program has continued to develop community partnerships with local public agencies that

have utilized program work crews, and provided job placement for offenders. In this way the program benefits the offender, the community, and the victim.

To date, the total amount disbursed to victims is \$3,713,926.98.

<b>2008 RESTITUTION ACTIVITY</b>	
Referrals	770
Cases Terminated	846
Successfully Terminated	838 (99%)
Unsuccessfully Terminated	8 (1%)
Amount Restitution Collected	\$186,686.86
(closed cases)	
earned \$128,448.50 - 69%	
paid \$58,238.36 - 31%	
Total Amount Generated	\$176,213.85
(payrolls & payments on all cases)	
Assessed on New Cases	\$143,811.62
Total Hours Worked in the Community	19,654

**JUVENILE TREATMENT COURT**

The Lucas County Juvenile Treatment Court (JTC) completed the fourth year of operation under the Bureau of Justice Assistance Grant in August 2008. Since this grant ended, the JTC program had been fortunate enough to open the program to some youth who may not have originally qualified due to past charges. During 2008, the Juvenile Treatment Court program collaborated with several agencies outside of the court, which include: Treatment Alternatives to Street Crimes (T.A.S.C.), Connecting Point, Parents Helping Parent (PHP) and numerous other agencies.

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.

PROBATION DEPARTMENT

In order to be eligible for this program, youth must be between the ages of 14 and 17, been assessed as having substance abuse issues and have a parent/guardian who is willing to participate in the program and follow the parental requirements.

The next table illustrates the number of youth who were served, referred and accepted into the program from January 1, 2008 through December 31, 2008. The following table illustrates the number of youth who were terminated from the program and their status upon termination during this time period and for the years 2005, 2006 and 2007, as well.

<b>2008 JTC YOUTH SERVED</b>	
Youth Served During 2008	42
Program Referrals	25
Number Accepted into Program	25
Number of Males Accepted	15
Number of Females Accepted	10

<b>2008 JTC YOUTH TERMINATED</b>	
Number of Youth that Graduated Successfully	{2006 = 21 / 2007 = 13} 10 (44%)
Number of Youth that were Terminated Unsuccessfully	{2006 = 12 / 2007 = 13} 13 (56%)
Number of Youth that were found to be Inappropriate for Program	{2006 = 3 / 2007 = 0} 0

It is also important to note that the University of Toledo completed a 3 year evaluation on the JTC program. And the findings are as follows. Youth who graduated from the Lucas County JTC were significantly more likely to successfully complete the 12 months following discharge than youth who were terminated from the program. Thirty (78.9%) of the 38 youth who graduated from the program successfully completed 12 months in the community following the program, without any new charges or confinements. Only 20 (57.1%) of the 35 youth who were

terminated from the program successfully completed 12 months in the community following the program, without any new charges or confinements. These statistics proved that the status at discharge proved to be a more powerful predictor of recidivism than race/ethnicity and gender.

**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. Once a decision is made to remove a youth from the home is made, the least restrictive placement is considered. 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. All residential placements are initially screened for approval by the Resource Staffing Level II Committee. All cases are reviewed by the committee every 90 days, with parents present, to assure that treatment goals are met and that reunification of the family is achieved in a timely manner. Out-of-home placement is a temporary episode that ceases once the treatment goals and objectives for the youth and family have been met.

Fiscal issues have drastically influenced the ability of the court to place outside of the home; therefore the numbers for 2008 are down from previous years.

Of the 27 active placement cases, 13 youth were placed for Sex Offender Treatment, 14 were placed for aggressive/ assaultive behaviors, nine had significant Mental Health or Mental Health/Mental Retardation issues and four youth were age 13 and under. 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.

<b>2008 PLACEMENT ACTIVITY</b>	
Youth in Placement on 1/1/08	19
Youth Placed in 2008	8
Total Youth in Placement	27
Cases Terminated	21
Successful Terminations	14
Unsuccessful Terminations	7
Youth in Placement on 12/31/08	6
*Total Placement Costs	\$797,458.44

\*Total includes the Court's contribution of \$123,000.00 to the Lucas County Children's Cluster.

**FAMILY COUNSELING**

The Family Counseling Program uses a systems-based approach to intervene with Court involved youth and families. This family counseling service is predicated on the understanding that the family is powerful in children's lives and is an integral part of a youth's positive or negative functioning. The family counselor also assists the probation staff by recommending realistic intervention strategies for the increasing mental health issues that are evident with court involved youth and families. Furthermore, the Family Counseling Program supports the overall commitment to competency development, consistent with the Balanced and Restorative Justice approach.

<b>2008 FAMILY COUNSELING ACTIVITY</b>	
Number of Families Referred	74
Number of Families Assigned	42
Number of Families Terminated	66
Successful	44
Unsuccessful	5
Other Provider	7
Number of Sessions Held	519

**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PROGRAM**

As a result of the dramatic increase in domestic violence charges over the last few years, the Court initiated a more intensive intervention with youth and parents. Thus, the Domestic Violence Program began receiving referrals in July, 2007. The program is staffed by two domestic violence counselors who conduct assessments of youth and parents who are referred by probation. These assessments then determine whether the youth/parents are appropriate for the domestic violence group. The group is a cognitive based curriculum called "Step-up." It is designed to provide participants with tools to build empathy, accountability and problem-solving. For those who are not appropriate for group, recommendations are made for alternative services or possibly individual work.

<b>2008 DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PROGRAM ACTIVITY</b>	
Families Referred	53
Families Assigned	23
Families Terminated	51
Number of Group Sessions Held	24
Number of Individual Sessions Held	8

**SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES (S.A.S.)**

Substance Abuse Services staff have extensive knowledge regarding drugs and alcohol, and are credentialed by the state as Certified Chemical Dependency Counselors (C.C.D.C.); one is a Licensed Independent Chemical Dependency Counselor. Substance Abuse Services focuses on screening youth referred by the bench and probation officers. The youth are then linked to treatment or other services in the community, including drug and alcohol education classes, out-patient treatment and counseling, residential treatment, and placement, if necessary.

2008 SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES ACTIVITY	
Referrals	576
Successful Terminations	499
Unsuccessful Terminations	38
Other	81
<b>S.A.S. Terminations</b>	<b>618</b>

**SEX OFFENDER TREATMENT PROGRAM (S.O.T.)**

The Lucas County Juvenile Court Sex Offender Treatment (J.S.O.T.) program is committed to reducing the incidence of sexual abuse by developing community partnerships that promote community safety, victim restoration and public education by enhancing healthy relationships, holding youth accountable, and ensuring an effective continuum of care for both survivors and youth who sexually offend.

In 2007, the Juvenile Court entered into a partnership with Harbor Behavioral Healthcare, a community-based mental health organization, to provide comprehensive out-patient treatment to juvenile sexual offenders and their families. The team from Harbor includes a clinical director, four therapists and three case managers, while the Juvenile Court supports the program with a Probation Supervisor/Program Manager, two specialized juvenile sex offender Probation Officers and a Magistrate to conduct sex offender specific Court hearings. Throughout 2008, Harbor Behavioral Healthcare, along with specialized Juvenile Probation Officers have conducted diagnostic assessments, performed weekly group sessions, weekly parent sessions and individual meetings for every youth. Case managers have also conducted home, school and community visits and have utilized these meetings to connect clients with a variety of community-based services. The development of the treatment curriculum was completed, with the major focus on the educational concept of the Mastery of Learning Unit. Designed to last 10 weeks, each learning unit requires a level of mastery of 80% in order to allow the youth to transition to the next

unit. Mastery of Learning Units include the Stages of Change model and Rational Behavioral Thinking (RBT), human sexuality, healthy relationships, an autobiography and relapse prevention.

The Court’s Juvenile Sexual Offender Treatment (J.S.O.T.) team continues to provide an initial comprehensive juvenile sexual offender assessment, allowing for timely and case-specific recommendations to the Judiciary and referrals for community-based treatment providers. In the 2008 calendar year, 48 juvenile sex offender assessments were successfully completed.

The Juvenile Court’s J.S.O.T. team, in collaboration with Harbor Behavioral Healthcare, provides comprehensive sexual offender and mental health services to youth and families. As part of that challenge, the treatment team now offers ten separate groups designed to address specific offender dynamics and developmental issues. Specific groups offered include lower cognitive functioning, female, young adolescent, young adult, parent (2 groups), regular cognitive functioning (2 groups), remedial/introduction to group, and aftercare. Therapeutic groups are held up to two times per week, and are supported by individual sessions and case management services.

The team continues to strive to fulfill its vision statement by providing education to the community. In 2008, the presentation of “A Comprehensive Approach to Juvenile Sexual Management” was shared with a number of school and community shareholders and officials. Presentations were conducted at the State of Ohio “Sexual Offender Management” roundtable in Columbus and at the Alabama Judicial College “Juvenile Judge & Chief Probation Officer Juvenile Code Revision Conference” in Orange Beach, Alabama.

The Juvenile Court is an active participant in the local Juvenile Sexual Offender Management Board whose

primary purpose is to develop standards and practices to protect victims and communities while holding offenders accountable.

As we move into the new year, the Juvenile Sexual Offender Treatment Team will continue to develop its comprehensive approach to managing juvenile sexual offenders in the community. With safety of the community as a guiding principle, the team will utilize collaboration with community agencies, public education and outreach, monitoring and evaluating program goals, obtaining specialized knowledge and training in the field of sexual offenders, and foremost, taking a victim-centered approach for reducing the prevalence of offending behaviors.

<b>2008 SEX OFFENDER TREATMENT (S.O.T.) ACTIVITY</b>	
Number of Referrals	44
Number of Assessments Completed and Staffed (includes 4 carried over from 2006)	44
Number of S.O.T. Group Sessions	320
Number of Individuals in S.O.T. Group	34
Number of Parent Support Group Sessions	160
Cases Terminated Successfully	*
Cases Terminated Unsuccessfully	0
Number Placed in Community	1
Number Placed in YTC	1
Number Committed to DYS	2

\* Due to program transitions starting in 2008, no youth completed treatment in 2008.

**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 in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. The program is an evidence-based mentoring program which is dedicated to working with highly delinquent, at risk youth in Lucas County. 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. Six hours per week are committed to the advocate spending individual time with the youth, engaging in activities that focus on relationship building, while four hours per week are dedicated to group work or group activities that focus on structured activities. These activities may involve recreational activities, such as sporting events, movies, roller skating, picnics, or they may involve activities centered around life skill development, such as independent living skills, pursuing employment opportunities, or competency groups.

Advocates often support the youth with Court related activities as well. YAP goal setting is directly related to the probation treatment plan, and advocates routinely make themselves available to attend Court proceedings with the youth and family. Often times, advocates will transport youth to appointments with their probation officer, counseling appointments with mental health or substance abuse providers, as well as to school. Advocates receive weekly supervision from their Program Director or Program Managers. In 2008, 130 probation youth were referred for services through YAP. Youth terminated from the program totaled 87 in 2008. Of those terminated, 59 youth (69%) successfully met all program related goals while 11 youth (12%) were terminated unsuccessfully, which means they either were resistant to engaging in services or did not meet their defined goals. Terminations broke down as follows: 17 youth (19%) were terminated under the status of “other”, which includes youth who were committed to DYS (6), placed outside of their own (3), were not appropriate for services or were referred to a different provider (4), moved out of Lucas County (2), died (1), or were certified to be tried as an adult (1). The number of youth serviced by the program is much larger than initially anticipated, due in large part to the successful outcomes of youth involved in the program.

PROBATION DEPARTMENT

<b>2008 YOUTH ADVOCATE PROGRAM</b>	
<b>ACTIVITY</b>	
Number of Youth Serviced	130
Number of Youth Terminated	87
Successful	59 (69%)
Unsuccessful	11 (12%)
Other	17 (19%)
Number of Hours Mentors Spent	
With Youth	17,206

**CITE PROGRAM**

The Community Integration and Training for Employment (CITE) Program provides job readiness training, paid work experience, linkage to employment, community service activities and recreational opportunities to youth on probation with the Lucas County Juvenile Court. The staff includes a full time Program Manager and two full time Americorps Members. Programming includes a weekly job training group to help participants develop entry level employment skills and job search assistance. In addition, the CITE Program partners with other community service agencies and the Toledo Botanical Gardens to provide a paid work experience and environment to learn job maintenance skills. The recreational component is offered through a Venture Crew Leadership Program chartered through the Mountain Mentors and run by CITE staff and five adult volunteers.

In 2008, the CITE Program continued the following programming and projects:

- Delinquency Prevention project at the Sofia Quintero Arts and Cultural Center (SQACC): This project (Youth WORKS), funded by IV-E monies, provided a paid work experience for 12 non-adjudicated youth, ages 13-16 referred by Juvenile Court Intake. Ten of the 12 youth completed the program. One dropped out after one week and one quit in week seven.
- CITE continued the Boatbuilding Project at

SQACC which involved building cedar strip canoes with youth on probation. In 2009, CITE hopes to continue this effort by building a sailing skiff and an 18' canoe.

- The CITE Program continues to assign and oversee community service hours to Juvenile Treatment Court youth and other youth on probation. Community service is arranged with many service agencies including The Salvation Army, Toledo Seagate Food Bank, The Kitchen for the Poor, The James C. Caldwell Center, Habitat for Humanity and Toledo Botanical Gardens.
- In 2008, the CITE Program started four new community gardens and a large greenhouse with the Toledo GROWS Program. In North Toledo a 22,000 square foot garden was built (including the greenhouse), supported by funds from The Northriver Weed and Seed Program. These initiatives will continue in 2009 with a youth leadership program and a market garden project to train Court referred youth to grow flowers and vegetables for sale at the Toledo Farmers Market. This project is in collaboration with United North Weed & Seed and Toledo GROWS.

The combined CITE projects employed over 90 court involved and at-risk youth, who received at least one paycheck through the CITE/Toledo GROWS program. The total payroll to youth on Probation was over \$34,000.00.

<b>2008 CITE PROGRAM ACTIVITY</b>	
Referrals	90
Successful Terminations*	37
Unsuccessful Terminations*	12
Not Appropriate	59
Other (moved, YTC or DYS)	17

\* Terminations include some youth carried over from 2007.

# Juvenile Detention Center

---

**Joan Parker, Administrator**

Lucas County Juvenile Detention Center (JDC) provides temporary, safe, secure detention for youth who present a danger to themselves or to the community, or who may abscond pending the disposition of cases and to coordinate social, psychological psychiatric evaluations of children in order to assist and make recommendations to the Court regarding the disposition of cases. JDC had 5,514 bookings (youth brought to the facility by law enforcement) and 3,268 admissions (youth detained overnight in the facility). During 2008, a critical look was given to Detention Philosophy to examine the decisions to hold youth in secure detention by each detention status category. It was agreed upon that there needs to be a concerted effort to cap the detention population in order to ensure the safety, security and individual needs of the detained youth. When the facility is overpopulated, the safety and security is compromised. More information regarding bookings and admissions may be found in the statistical section of this report, along with data from prior years.

**Rational Behavior Training** - JDC continues to improve upon the cognitive approach to teaching youth to be responsible for their behavior. The goal of the program is to teach a set of skills that the youth can use to change things about their lives if they choose to apply them. The program involves looking at the attitudes, beliefs and thinking patterns that guide feelings and behavior. Teaching youth about emotions and how they work is critical to them making changes in the way they react to situations.

Enhancements have been added to the program this past year to encourage youth to earn extra privileges, by making positive changes in their decision making and behavior.

**Rescue Mental Health Services** - Residents who have been diagnosed with mental health disorders or who are in crisis can immediately access the services of a mental health counselor. Rescue provides a licensed counselor to service JDC from 8:00am to 8:00pm, Monday through Friday and 8 hours per day on the weekends and holidays. Counselors meet with youth that are referred at least two times weekly and develop behavioral interventions as needed. Counselors link youth to outpatient services as well as medication management appointments with psychiatrists. During 2008, 1514 residents were served by Rescue while incarcerated at JDC.

**Medical Clinic** - Quality 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. The clinic provides a staff that is sensitive to the needs of the youth in detention. Their care is professional, non-judgmental, courteous and confidential, and they deal with a myriad of issues including pregnancy, sexually transmitted diseases, and identifying and reporting child abuse and neglect. The clinic provides continuity of care for many of the youth, and their particular needs, and consults with their physicians to encourage continued health management outside the detention center.

**Aids Resource Center Ohio** - The Aids Resource Center provides quarterly educational sessions in the Detention Center. The topics covered in the sessions are: Abstinence, Barrier Methods of Protection, Healthy Relationships, and HIV/STD Facts and Myths. Last quarter presentations were made to 90 youth in detention. Of the 90 youth, 75% were youth of color, 96% of youth reported increased knowledge and 100% reported future

risk behavior modification.

**Phoenix Academy Charter School** - Phoenix Academy is chartered by the Toledo Public School System, which provides computer-based individualized curriculum, so that the students have the opportunity to work at their own pace. Special Education teachers facilitate the learning process with the assistance of paraprofessionals. Classes are held throughout the summer months. Motivated youth are able to earn high school credit that is transferable to their home school in any area district. Thirteen students earned a 1/2 credit in English, four students earned a 1/4 credit in Careers, and three students passed their OGT exams. Some individual tutoring is also provided for those youth who may require more individualized attention. This past year, the youth kept a close watch on current events as they related to the presidential election. A mock election was held in the facility after several sessions to explain the political process, including campaign strategies, voter registration, and becoming familiar with the issues. In the summer of 2008 the computer labs were reconfigured so as to accommodate more students having access to computers at one time.

**AIM (Art Integrated Math)** - This program is designed to encourage artistic expression, while learning basic math concepts that can be utilized in future adaptations to everyday experiences. Instructors teach concepts in several different media; watercolor, acrylics, clay and sculpture. Usually, the youth create works around a particular theme which incorporates imaginative use of colors textures and dimensions, while utilizing opportunities to master measurements and shapes. The youth display their works prominently in the hallways of detention, to the delight of all that visit - such as: Masks for Mardi Gras, portraits of Barack Obama and renditions of Ice Cream Cones in the style and technique of Andy Warhol, just to name a few. Many youth in detention are gifted artists, and discover there are free resources in the

community available to them if they desire to pursue their talents. JDC strongly encourages youth to think of their artistic abilities as possible vocations.

**Physical Education** - Residents participate in physical education activities once daily in the JDC Gymnasium. Although many different activities are offered, including conditioning, Basketball seems to be the favorite. One of the up and coming improvements to the program will be collaboration between the JDC and students at the University of Toledo. Students with majors in Physical Education, and members of various sport teams will volunteer to work with the students on the fundamentals and origins of several sports, while mentoring the youth on the idea of continuing their education.

**Second Chance** - Second Chance provides a weekly prostitution prevention oriented group for any female detained in JDC. The program is designed to encourage awareness of trafficking, traffickers and to also encourage development of coping skills and self-esteem. Second chance facilitators are young women who have had personal experiences with the lifestyle and can serve as support once the young woman returns to the community. Part of the reason why young women return to this very dangerous activity is their inability to develop safe alternatives to this behavior. Many of the young ladies in detention have been sexually abused as children, and have a distorted view of themselves, their relationships and their bodies. A history of physical or sexual victimization is one of the most common characteristics of girls in the justice system. Second Chance helps young women to make better choices for themselves.

**Spiritual Enrichment** - Local ministry groups offer spiritual enrichment groups or individual sessions three times per week to residents who choose to participate. Several of the residents meet with their home church pastor while in detention, as well. JDC hosted a presentation by "Team

Extreme”, a group of spiritually based individuals who perform feats of strength to gain the youths’ attention so that they could share their stories of overcoming adversity. JDC believes spirituality is an integral component to providing hope for a brighter tomorrow for our youth.

**Library Services** - The Toledo Lucas County Public Library provides services to the residents in Detention. A library exists within the facility, and youth are encouraged to check out books for free time reading pleasure. Special requests for favorite authors and titles are available with a week’s turnaround time. The library also offers incentives for reading through their Summer Reading Program.

### LOOKING AHEAD

**Math Tutoring** - The Lucas County Juvenile Detention Center is always looking for opportunities to partner with the community. One of the initiatives being explored is tutoring services for those youth that have been identified as having difficulty with simple math concepts. It is our belief that many of our youth have missed the opportunity to master basic math concepts such as addition, subtraction, multiplication, division and fractions because of poor school attendance. It is difficult for the youth to experience success in the classroom in this subject and therefore the youth become discouraged. In a collaboration with the Criminal Justice Program at the University of Toledo

(undergraduate and graduate students) and the Art Integrated Math Program in JDC, after being given an initial diagnostic screening, the youth will be given individual or small group tutoring to assist the youth where he/she becomes frustrated. All testing and improvements will be provided to the youth’s home school.

**Northcoast Fatherhood Initiative** - The Northcoast Fatherhood Initiative is the coordinated effort of community and faith-based organizations that care about and are willing to take action to support responsible fatherhood in Northwest Ohio. The Northcoast Fatherhood initiative will strengthen the young fathers in detention by:

- Assisting participants to identify and utilize a strong support system including family members, religious leaders, mentors and community partners.
- Teaching the young fathers how to build relationships with their children and teach parenting skills
- Developing skills that will lead to employment opportunities
- Encouraging father participation (once released from detention) in various constructive activities with their children

The goal is to help fathers make a difference in the lives of their children by being an active parent, and to become self-sufficient.

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. Systems-based 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 lifestyle through sober and drug-free living
- Participating in restorative justice activities

A total of 551 youth have been placed at YTC since 1995. Of the 551, 471 were male and 80 were female. The following is data from 2008.

<b>2008 YTC REFERRAL BREAKDOWN</b>	
<b>Total Referrals</b>	<b>78</b>
Resource Staffing Referred	15 (19%)
Judicial Referral	31 (39%)
Outside Lucas County	5 (6%)
Males	65
Females	13
African-American	58 (74%)
Caucasian	15 (19%)
Hispanic	1 (1%)
Bi-racial/other	4 (5%)

<b>2008 YTC PLACEMENT BREAKDOWN</b>	
<b>Total Placements</b>	<b>52</b>
From Resource Staffing	7 of 15 (46%)
From Judicial Referral	24 of 31 (77%)
Males	46
Females	6
African-American	37 (60%)
Caucasian	12 (24%)
Hispanic	0
Bi-racial/other	3 (4%)

# Youth Treatment Center (YTC)

Tara L. Hobbs, Administrator

<b>2008 YTC DENIAL BREAKDOWN</b>	
<b>Total Denials</b>	<b>24*</b>
Referred to Less Restrictive Programming (Probation)	2 (3%) (2% of total referrals)
Assessed as Inappropriate for Placement	19 (79%) (24% of total referrals)
Refused YTC Services	5 (20%) (6% of total referrals)

\* One youth was approved for admission from Muskingham County, but denied admission by the presiding Magistrate; two youth were referred in 2008, but the decision to place or not place was not made until 2009.

<b>2008 YTC TERMINATIONS BREAKDOWN</b>	
<b>Total Terminations</b>	<b>46</b>
Successful	41 (89%)
Male	33
Female	8
African-American	23 (56%)
Caucasian	11 (26%)
Hispanic	2 (4%)
Bi-racial/Other	5 (12%)
Unsuccessful	5 (10%)
Male	4
Female	1
African-American	1 (20%)
Caucasian	3 (60%)
Hispanic	0
Bi-racial/other	1 (20%)

YOUTH TREATMENT CENTER

ANNUAL SUMMARY: YTC ACTIVITY					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	Total
Referrals	96	88	61	78	*
Admissions	46	46	25	52	*
Terminations	43	45	39	46	519
Successful	29 (67%)	32 (71%)	27 (69%)	41 (89%)	392 (75%)
Unsuccessful	14 (32%)	13 (28%)	12 (30%)	5 (10%)	125 (24%)

YTC's successful completion rate was 89%. YTC's ongoing goal is to reduce the number of unsuccessful program completions and identify those youth who will not complete successfully at an earlier stage in their treatment.

For 2008, the average length of stay in months was 12.3 for successful terminations, 6.34 for unsuccessful terminations, with the average length of stay for all terminations equalling 11.6 months. Reducing the length of stay is also an ongoing goal for YTC.

**AFTERCARE**


Thirty-nine of the 41 successful terminations from YTC entered aftercare. Four Female residents returned to

Probation for aftercare services from their referring counties. There were 21 terminations from Aftercare: 19 successful terminations and 2 unsuccessful. The average length of stay on aftercare for successful terminations was 8.7 months, 9.0 for unsuccessful terminations, with a total length of stay of 9.2 months for all terminations.

**GOALS 2009**

- Revise Mission and Vision Statement
- Enhance and Develop Cognitive Behavioral Interventions and Programming
- Maintain American Correctional Association Accreditation

ANNUAL SUMMARY: LENGTH OF STAY DATA				
	2005	2006	2007	2008
Successful	414 days (29 youth)	379 days (32 youth)	366 days (27 youth)	369 days (41 youth)
Unsuccessful	210 days (14 youth)	184 days (13 youth)	290 days (12 youth)	190 days (5 youth)
Total	348 days (43 youth)	323 days (45 youth)	343 days (39 youth)	350 days (46 youth)



Various core training programs continued to be offered to Juvenile Division staff in calendar year 2008, as well as mandatory and core orientation training for new employees. The Court continued skill based training to improve the delivery of cognitive/behavioral interventions; managing conflict within the workplace; basic first aid and life saving skills; domestic violence awareness, prevention and intervention; suicide awareness, prevention and intervention; non-violent crisis intervention and responsible restraint and control techniques; discrimination and harassment prevention; team development; PREA Training for all institutional staff; and focused training specific for departmental and specialized program staff.

As the year progressed, staff training and travel began to be scaled back, due to budget concerns and the changing economic conditions across the country.

Training data presented within this report has been broken down into four categories. The report presents an overall picture for the Juvenile Division first, followed by the Juvenile Court, the Juvenile Detention Center and ending with training data for the Youth Treatment Center. It should be noted that prior year training hours have been adjusted to reflect the final totals for those years. Training certificates and verification of training is an ongoing process and year-end totals at the time of annual report submission are subject to change upon receipt of additional training records submitted by staff.

**JUVENILE DIVISION TRAINING DATA**

The tables in the following column show the number of training hours completed by Juvenile Division Employees over the past five years. The first table shows the number of training hours completed on a yearly basis by all Juvenile Division employees and associates. The tables that follow break down the number of training hours completed each year by the Juvenile Court, Detention Center and Youth Treatment Center staff.



# Staff Development & Training

Gary Lenhart, Staff Development Administrator

Training Completed by Juvenile Division	
2004	8,522
2005	9,503
2006	9,470
2007	9,366
2008	8,911

Training Completed by Juvenile Court Staff	
2004	3,948
2005	4,109
2006	3,801
2007	4,244
2008	3,356

Training Completed by JDC Staff	
2004	1,986
2005	3,058
2006	3,433
2007	2,782
2008	

Training Completed by YTC Staff	
2004	2,587
2005	2,336
2006	2,236
2007	2,339
2008	2,517

# Human Resources

---

**Diana Karch**, Human Resources and Employee Benefits Coordinator

The Human Resources Department is committed to being a strategic, proactive partner of the Court. Human Resources acts as a liaison between employees and management, monitors compliance with employment laws and manages the Court's human resources to ensure Court goals and objectives are met. The primary mission of the Human Resources Department is to design and implement legally sound HR policies that will support Court goals and fulfill workforce needs as conditions change.

Core Human Resources responsibilities include:

- Design and delivery of Human Resources programs, practices and processes that meet the needs of the Court and its employees.
- Support line supervisor efforts to achieve Court goals through effective management of employees.
- Contribute to organizational development and strategic planning through developing Human Resources practices that enhance overall efficiency and competency.

## **2008 HIRING AND STAFFING RELATED STATISTICS**

Statistics for hiring and staffing related concerns for the year 2008 are as follows:

1 position within the Court was reviewed and reclassified  
7 Court staff were promoted, went from part time to full time or participated in a lateral move within the Court itself

18 new hires from outside the Court

Turnover for the year 2008 was 31 positions or 10.8% with 1 retirement, 4 resignations, 3 terminations, 16 positions eliminated and 7 promotions. Eliminating promotions, turnover was 24 positions or 8.36 %.



# Information Systems

---

**Celeste Hasselbach, Director**

In August of 2008, Information Systems replaced the server that supports the Court's case management system. The new server offers improved processor speed, expanded memory and expanded disk storage capacity. A new tape loader and tape drive were purchased and installed to replace the existing tape backup system for this server. The combination of the improved speed and capacity of the server and tape backup system reduced system backup time by 85%, providing improved system availability to staff working midnights in the Juvenile Detention Center.

Information Systems worked with the staff in the Court's Fiscal Department to incorporate the use of imaging technology for the purpose of storing records. The County's enterprise wide imaging application was utilized to store and index electronic copies of employee time sheets and leave request forms. Information Systems staff installed software and hardware, developed procedures, provided training and continue to provide ongoing support for this application. This is the first step in reducing space requirements for storage of payroll and financial records.

The Court's case management system was modified to allow for online processing of referrals for services as related to the case file. Prior to the upgrade, online referral processing had only been available within the Probation Information System. Cases are often referred for services and programs for youth and families outside of the Probation arena. Mediation was the first department to work with Information Systems staff to implement this new feature. Custom mediation referral screens were designed

to capture the information necessary to allow for referral management and statistical reporting. Customized data elements were also provided that allow Mediation staff to record performance measures related to each referral.

The cash book module of the Court's case management system was upgraded in September 2008. The upgrade provided for streamlined entry of detail information relating to the collection of court costs. The ability to easily record the details allows for improved efficiency for detailed book keeping. Refund checks and checks to disburse funds to various State and Local agencies are now computer generated, providing an online check register. This upgrade has allowed the Clerk's office to readily meet new collection reporting requirements by the Ohio Department of Public Safety.

As part of the upgrade to the cash book module, the Fiscal Department saw the addition of computer generated checks to pay out restitution funds to victims. Although the restitution money collected from delinquent youths has been automated for several years, the reimbursement of that money to the victim has previously required a hand written check and duplicate entry into a check register. With the upgrade to the Court's case management system, these checks are automatically printed each month and check register information is provided online. This has eliminated redundant data entry of information already captured in the case management system.

# Fiscal And Business

**Amy Matuszewski**, Finance Director

The Fiscal Department is responsible for: the preparation of all division budgets; payroll management; development and maintenance of all financial contracts, reports, and records; coordination of attorney appointments and reimbursement of their fees; grant fiscal management; liaisonship with the Ohio Department of Youth Services and maintenance of youth information; purchasing and procurement of supplies and equipment; and liaisonship with the County Facilities Department to coordinate building maintenance and custodial services.

DESCRIPTION OF OTHER REVENUE	
Juvenile Assistance Trust Interest And Deposits	\$1,631.12
State of Ohio Indigent Driver Alcohol Drug Treatment	\$324.71
Lucas County Indigent Driver Alcohol Drug Treatment	\$56,918.18
Total Other Revenue	\$58,874.01
Prior Year Receipts (1383.17%)	\$3,969.48


Description of Court Costs, Fines and Fees Collected	
Fines and Court Costs	\$163,644.66
State Reparation Paid	\$43,104.96
Ohio State Highway Patrol	\$5,043.00
Traffic Law Library	\$15,961.55
Traffic City Highway	\$1,194.26
Sheriff Fees	\$6,393.30
Restitution Cash Payments	\$57,175.95
Legal Research Fees	\$8,643.50
Computer Automation Fees	\$30,766.40
Blood Testing Fees	\$2,852.45
Custody Investigations	\$4,200.00
Child Placement Support Payments (Parental/CSEA)	\$13,259.65
Child Placement Support Payments (CSB)	\$10,400.00
Publication Fees and Miscellaneous Revenue	\$4,478.60
Township Fees	\$5,580.00
Juvenile Court - Microfilming Fees	\$6,610.00
Juvenile Court - Postage Fees	\$3,305.00
Juvenile Court - Mediation Services Fees	\$22,293.00
Juvenile Court - Mediation Court Cost Fees	\$37,397.00
<b>Subtotal Juvenile Court Fines/ Costs/Fees</b>	<b>\$442,403.28</b>
Prior Year Receipts	\$556,648.86
	-20.52%


DESCRIPTION OF CONTRACT & STATE REIMBURSEMENTS	
Title IV-D Program Cost Center Reimbursement	\$524,469.75
Title IV-E Placement Reimbursement	\$255,031.12
Title IV-E Administrative Reimbursement	\$906,220.86
USDA School Breakfast/Lunch Program	\$160,561.63
Keep Toledo/Lucas County Beautiful Program	\$50.00
<b>SUBTOTAL CONTRACT &amp; STATE REIMBURSEMENT</b>	<b>\$1,846,333.36</b>
<b>PRIOR YEAR RECEIPTS (1.08%)</b>	<b>\$1,826,673.34</b>

FISCAL AND BUSINESS

<b>JUVENILE COURT &amp; DETENTION</b>		
<b>LINE ITEM</b>		
<b>ACCOUNT</b>	<b>JUVENILE</b>	<b>DETENTION</b>
Salaries (Elected Officials)	\$27,847.13	\$ -
Salaries (Employees)	\$6,014,317.84	\$2,799,232.68
<b>TOTAL SALARY</b>		
<b>ACCOUNT</b>	<b>\$6,042,164.97</b>	<b>\$2,799,232.68</b>
Supplies	\$98,395.48	\$155,243.69
Supplies - Postage	\$134,046.83	\$1,561.46
Drug Testing	\$40,272.25	\$ -
Equipment	\$75,787.38	\$49,876.22
Contract Repairs	\$37,011.81	\$9,341.98
Contract Services	\$108,594.69	\$413,073.74
Travel/Training	\$38,282.16	\$3,917.42
Expenses Foreign Judges	\$962.34	\$ -
Per Diem Foreign Judges	\$5,565.00	\$ -
Advertising & Printing	\$1,106.52	\$ -
Copying	\$3,832.19	\$2,214.40
Witness Fees	\$4,860.00	\$ -
Transcripts	\$16,715.50	\$ -
Miscellaneous	\$24,304.63	\$11,702.63
Telephones	\$100,379.98	\$19,102.38
FICA	\$64,382.07	\$36,288.12
Workers Comp.	\$76,295.24	\$35,134.61
PERS	\$847,667.17	\$381,037.70
Insurance Benefits	\$1,336,406.17	\$653,865.02
<b>TOTAL OTHER</b>		
<b>EXPENSES</b>	<b>\$3,014,867.41</b>	<b>\$1,772,359.37</b>
<b>TOTAL BUDGET</b>		
<b>EXPENSES</b>	<b>\$9,057,032.38</b>	<b>\$4,351,592.05</b>
<b>2007 BUDGETED</b>		
<b>EXPENSES</b>	<b>\$8,883,901.98</b>	<b>\$4,345,669.47</b>
<b>CHANGE FROM</b>		
<b>2007</b>	<b>\$173,130.40</b>	<b>\$225,922.58</b>
<b>PERCENT CHANGE</b>	<b>1.95%</b>	<b>5.20%</b>

<b>DESCRIPTION OF GRANT &amp; SUBSIDY FUNDS RECEIVED</b>	
Department of Youth Services	
Reclaim Ohio Funds	\$852,106.54
Department of Youth Services	
Base Funding	\$710,833.00
BJA Juvenile Drug Court	\$134,249.93
Department of Youth Services	
403 Rehab Funds	\$2,614,286.18
JABG	\$66,608.82
CASA (VOCA)	\$23,748.00
CASA (SVAA)	\$2,084.00
CASA (Jamie Farr)	\$22,370.00
CASA (Rotary Grant)	\$2,666.84
Americorp	\$18,441.97
ODADAS Family Drug Court	\$165,981.53
ACF - DHHS Family Drug Court	\$149,439.07
<b>Subtotal Grant &amp; Subsidy Funds</b>	
<b>Received</b>	<b>\$4,762,815.88</b>
Prior Year Receipts	\$5,128,253.85
	-7.13%





# **2008 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 2008 totaled 11,521, a decrease of 537, or 4.5%, from 2007. Of these, a total of 8,552, or 74%, of the offenses were disposed by formal court proceedings and 2,969, or 26%, of the offenses were handled informally. This compares to 75% of the offenses being handled formally during 2007.

### DELINQUENT VS. STATUS OFFENSE

Of the total offenses, 9,832, or 85%, were delinquency and 1689, or 15%, were status offenses. This compares to 75% of the total offenses being delinquent during 2007.

#### Delinquent v. Status Offenses



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

	MALES	FEMALES	UNKNOWN	TOTAL
Formal Proceedings	6629	1923	0	8552
	78%	22%		
Informal Handling	1852	1110	7	2969
	62%	37%	<1%	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>8481</b>	<b>3033</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11,521</b>
	<b>74%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>&lt;1%</b>	

# 1. OFFENSES DISPOSED

## SEX OF OFFENDER FOR OFFENSE

Of the 11,521 offenses 8,481 (or 74%) included males and 3,033 (or 26%) included females, while the sex was undetermined in 7, or less than 1%, of the offenses. This compares with 71% for males and 29% for females during 2007.

	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Delinquency Offenses	7506 76%	2322 24%	4 <1%	9832
Status Offenses	975 58%	711 42%	3 <1%	1689
<b>Totals</b>	<b>8481</b>	<b>3033</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11,521</b>

## RACE OF OFFENDER FOR OFFENSE

Of the 11,521 offenses, 7,854 (or 68%) were non-white youth and 3,479 (or 30%) were white youth. This compares with 68% for non-white youth and 33% for white youth during 2007.

	<b>AFR/AMER</b>	<b>HISPANIC</b>	<b>WHITE</b>	<b>OTHER</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Delinquency Offenses	6262 64%	425 4%	2924 30%	89 1%	132 1%	9832
Status Offenses	975 58%	72 4%	555 33%	31 2%	56 3%	1689
<b>Totals</b>	<b>7237</b> <b>63%</b>	<b>497</b> <b>4%</b>	<b>3479</b> <b>30%</b>	<b>120</b> <b>1%</b>	<b>188</b> <b>2%</b>	<b>11,521</b>

\* Starting with 2007 data, tables began to reflect the difference between formal and informal (or unofficial) handling of cases. The reporting of the number of delinquency and status offenses has been changed to include filings that were handled informally to reflect greater accuracy. Statistical reporting from previous years was rerun and 2004-2006 totals may show a difference of less than 1%, which is not statistically significant. This change was made to give the reader a truer picture of the types of offenses being disposed and how they are handled by the Court.

2008 OFFENSE STATISTICS

The following tables categorize individual offenses that were adjudicated during 2008. 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 2008 and 2007.

**JUVENILE OFFENSES FOR 2008**

<b>TABLE D4: ROBBERY/THEFT OFFENSES DISPOSED FOR 2008</b>				
<b>NUMBER OF OFFENSES</b>	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Breaking and Entering	24	0	0	24
Attempted Breaking and Entering	8	0	0	8
Complicity to Breaking and Entering	1	0	0	1
Reckless Breaking and Entering	1	0	0	1
Burglary	114	7	0	121
Aggravated Burglary	6	2	0	8
Attempted Burglary	25	0	0	25
Complicity to Burglary	15	0	0	15
Complicity to Attempted Burglary	3	3	0	6
Criminal Simulation	1	0	0	1
Forgery	0	1	0	1
Complicity to Forgery	0	1	0	1
Grand Theft Auto	8	2	0	10
Attempted Grand Theft Auto	2	0	0	2
Misuse Credit Card	4	3	0	7
Petty Theft	158	83	0	241
Attempted Petty Theft	3	2	0	5
Complicity to Petty Theft	5	0	0	5
Complicity to Attempted Petty Theft	1	0	0	1
Receiving Stolen Property	73	4	0	77
Attempted Receiving Stolen Property	5	0	0	5
Receiving Stolen Property (Motor Vehicle)	1	1	0	2
Robbery	36	3	0	39
Aggravated Robbery	13	0	0	13
Attempted Robbery	3	0	0	3
Complicity to Robbery	2	1	0	3
Complicity to Aggravated Robbery	5	0	0	5
Conspiracy to Commit Robbery	1	0	0	1
Theft	43	13	0	56
Attempted Theft	6	1	0	7
Complicity to Theft	35	2	0	37
Unlawful Use of Motor Vehicle	14	7	0	21
Complicity to Unlawful Use of Motor Vehicle	1	1	0	2
Unlawful Use of Property	45	31	0	76
Complicity to Unlawful Use of Property	2	0	0	2
Vehicle Trespassing	18	5	0	23
<b>2008 Adjudicated Offense Totals</b>	<b>683</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>853</b>
<b>2007 Adjudicated Offense Totals</b>	<b>617</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>800</b>
<b>2008 Dismissals</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>518</b>
<b>2007 Dismissals</b>	<b>353</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>506</b>

During 2008, the total number of robbery/theft offenses disposed (1,371) increased 5% from 2007 (1,306). Adjudicated offenses increased 7% and dismissals increased 2%.

## 2008 OFFENSE STATISTICS

<b>NUMBER OF OFFENSES</b>	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Gross Sexual Imposition	21	3	0	24
Attempted Gross Sexual Imposition	2	0	0	2
Loiter/Solicit	0	1	0	1
Public Indecency	5	0	0	5
Rape	14	0	0	14
Attempted Rape	2	0	0	2
Soliciting	0	4	0	4
<b>2008 Adjudicated Offense Totals</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>52</b>
2007 Adjudicated Offense Totals	53	14	0	67
<b>2008 Dismissals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27</b>
2007 Dismissals	42	11	0	53

During 2008, the total number of sex offenses disposed (79) decreased 34% from 2007 (120). Adjudicated offenses decreased 22% and dismissals decreased 49%.

<b>NUMBER OF OFFENSES</b>	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Abduction	1	0	0	1
Assault	170	53	0	223
Aggravated Assault	5	1	0	6
Complicity to Assault	2	0	0	2
Assault of Police Officer	1	0	0	1
Negligent Assault	2	0	0	2
Child Endangerment	1	1	0	2
Domestic Violence	109	58	0	167
Domestic Violence (w/ Prior Offense)	1	0	0	1
Felonious Assault	18	3	0	21
Attempted Felonious Assault	4	0	0	4
Vehicular Homicide	1	0	0	1
<b>2008 Adjudicated Offense Totals</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>431</b>
2007 Adjudicated Offense Totals	323	142	0	465
<b>2008 Dismissals</b>	<b>561</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>824</b>
2007 Dismissals	609	357	0	966

During 2008, the total number of injury to person offenses disposed (1,255) decreased 12% from 2007 (1,431). Adjudicated offenses decreased 7% and dismissals decreased 15%.

2008 OFFENSE STATISTICS

**TABLE D7: WEAPON OFFENSES DISPOSED FOR 2008**

<b>NUMBER OF OFFENSES</b>	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Carrying a Concealed Weapon	58	5	0	63
Attempted Poss. of Deadly Weapon in Detention	1	0	0	1
Discharge Firearms	2	0	0	2
Illegal Conveyance	10	2	0	12
Attempted Illegal Conveyance	1	0	0	1
Illegal Conveyance in Detention Facility	2	0	0	2
Improper Furnishing of Firearms	1	0	0	1
Possession of Weapon Under Disability	1	0	0	1
Possession of Weapon at School	1	1	0	2
<b>2008 Adjudicated Offense Totals</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>85</b>
2007 Adjudicated Offense Totals	77	6	0	83
<b>2008 Dismissals</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>85</b>
2007 Dismissals	70	13	0	83

During 2008, the total number of weapon offenses disposed (170) increased by 2% from 2007 (166). Adjudicated offenses increased 2% and dismissals increased 2%.

**TABLE D8: DRUG OFFENSES DISPOSED FOR 2008**

<b>NUMBER OF OFFENSES</b>	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Counterfeit Substance	7	0	0	7
Dangerous Drugs	1	1	0	2
Drug Abuse	103	8	0	111
Attempted Drug Abuse	4	2	0	6
Drug Paraphernalia	39	4	0	43
Possession of Drugs	79	3	0	82
Aggravated Possession of Drugs	1	0	0	1
Attempted Possession of Drugs	9	0	0	9
Trafficking Drugs	5	0	0	5
Aggravated Trafficking Drugs	13	0	0	13
Attempted Trafficking Drugs	11	1	0	12
Attempted Aggravated Trafficking Drugs	6	0	0	6
<b>2008 Adjudicated Offense Totals</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>297</b>
2007 Adjudicated Offense Totals	293	23	0	316
<b>2008 Dismissals</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>370</b>
2007 Dismissals	298	56	0	354

During 2008, the total number of drug offenses disposed (667) decreased less than one percent from 2007 (670). Adjudicated offenses decreased 6% and dismissals increased 5%.

## 2008 OFFENSE STATISTICS

**TABLE D9: ALCOHOL OFFENSES DISPOSED FOR 2008**

NUMBER OF OFFENSES	MALES	FEMALES	UNKNOWN	TOTAL
Consume Alcohol Underage	45	19	0	64
Minor Purchasing	3	0	0	3
Permit Alcohol	4	0	0	4
Possession of Alcohol	38	4	0	42
Prohibition of Minors	4	2	0	6
<b>2008 Adjudicated Offense Totals</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>119</b>
2007 Adjudicated Offense Totals	117	28	0	145
<b>2008 Dismissals</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>197</b>
2007 Dismissals	122	78	0	200

During 2008, the total number of alcohol offenses disposed (316) decreased 8% from 2007 (345). Adjudicated offenses decreased 18% and dismissals decreased 2%.

**TABLE D10: PROPERTY DAMAGE OFFENSES DISPOSED FOR 2008**

NUMBER OF OFFENSES	MALES	FEMALES	UNKNOWN	TOTAL
Arson	6	1	0	7
Attempted Arson	3	0	0	3
Attempted Aggravated Arson	1	0	0	1
Criminal Damage	101	13	0	114
Complicity to Criminal Damage	5	0	0	5
Harmful Object	1	0	0	1
Hit Skip/Leave Scene	1	0	0	1
Vandalism	6	2	0	8
Vehicular Vandalism	3	0	0	3
<b>2008 Adjudicated Offense Totals</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>142</b>
2007 Adjudicated Offense Totals	168	23	0	191
<b>2008 Dismissals</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>189</b>
2007 Dismissals	205	39	0	244

During 2008, the total number of property damage offenses disposed (332) decreased 24% from 2007 (435). Adjudicated offenses decreased 26% and dismissals decreased 23%.

**TABLE D11: STATUS OFFENSES DISPOSED FOR 2008**

NUMBER OF OFFENSES	MALES	FEMALES	UNKNOWN	TOTAL
Unruly	20	12	0	32
Unruly/Curfew	3	0	0	3
Unruly/Runaway	1	1	0	2
Unruly/Truancy	4	1	0	5
<b>2008 Adjudicated Offense Totals</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>42</b>
2007 Adjudicated Offense Totals	15	12	0	27
<b>2008 Dismissals</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>414</b>
2007 Dismissals	217	252	0	442

During 2008, the total number of status offenses disposed (456) decreased 3% from 2007 (469). Adjudicated offenses increased 36% and dismissals decreased 6%. Note that 91% of status offenses were dismissed.

**TABLE D12: PUBLIC NUISANCE OFFENSES DISPOSED FOR 2008**

<b>NUMBER OF OFFENSES</b>	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Criminal Mischief	9	1	0	10
Criminal Trespassing	146	15	0	161
Disorderly Conduct	379	117	0	496
Escape	8	0	0	8
Complicity to Escape	2	0	0	2
Ethnic Intimidation	3	0	0	3
Complicity to Ethnic Intimidation	0	1	0	1
Failure to Comply with Police	11	0	0	11
Attempted Failure to Comply with Police	1	0	0	1
Failure to Disperse	2	0	0	2
Failure to Disclose	1	0	0	1
False Alarm	1	2	0	3
Falsification	43	11	0	54
Attempted Falsification	0	1	0	1
Furnish False Information	21	5	0	26
Gambling	2	0	0	2
Harrass/Body Fluids	2	0	0	2
Harrass Inmate	4	0	0	4
Induce Panic	6	1	0	7
Interfere with Custody	1	0	0	1
Intimidation	1	0	0	1
Intimidation of Victim/Witness	5	1	0	6
Attempted Intimidation of Victim/Witness	1	0	0	1
Littering	1	0	0	1
Loitering	32	2	0	34
Menacing	45	9	0	54
Aggravated Menacing	28	2	0	30
Menacing by Stalking	3	1	0	4
Obstruct Justice	7	0	0	7
Obstruct Official Business	182	23	0	205
Possession of Cigarettes	1	0	0	1
Possession of Criminal Tools	11	0	0	11
Registration Required	1	0	0	1
Resist Arrest	48	10	0	58
Resist Arrest/Harm	13	3	0	16
Riot	15	4	0	19
Aggravated Riot	1	0	0	1
Attempted Riot	3	1	0	4
Safe School Ordinance	334	114	0	448
Attempted Safe School Ordinance	1	0	0	1
Smoking Minor	1	0	0	1
Tampering with Evidence	2	0	0	2
Telecommunications Harrassment	1	0	0	1
Telephone Harrassment	0	2	0	2
Aggravated Trespassing	2	2	0	4
<b>2008 Adjudicated Offense Totals</b>	<b>1381</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1709</b>
<b>2007 Adjudicated Offense Totals</b>	<b>1489</b>	<b>439</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1928</b>
<b>2008 Dismissals</b>	<b>1725</b>	<b>473</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2198</b>
<b>2007 Dismissals</b>	<b>1698</b>	<b>483</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2181</b>

During 2008, the total number of public nuisance offenses disposed (3,907) decreased 5% from 2007 (4,109). Adjudicated offenses decreased 11% and dismissals increased 1%.

2008 OFFENSE STATISTICS

**TABLE D13: 2008 OFFENSE SUMMARY**


**MALES FEMALES UNKNOWN TOTAL**

	MALES	FEMALES	UNKNOWN	TOTAL
<b>1.) 2008 Adjudicated Delinquency Offenses</b>	<b>3016</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3713</b>
a.) 2007 Adjudicated Delinquency Offenses	3146	861	0	4007
<b>2.) 2008 Dismissed Delinquent</b>	<b>3460</b>	<b>1022</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4482</b>
b.) 2007 Dismissed Delinquent	3438	1212	0	4650
<b>3.) 2008 Total Delinquent Offenses (lines 1 &amp; 2)</b>	<b>6476</b>	<b>1719</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8195</b>
c.) 2007 Total Delinquent Offenses (lines a & b)	6584	2073	0	8657
<b>4.) 2008 Adjudicated Status Offenses</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18</b>
d.) 2007 Adjudicated Status Offenses	6	9	0	15
<b>5.) 2008 Dismissed Status Offenses</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>340</b>
e.) 2007 Dismissed Status Offenses	177	203	0	380
<b>6.) 2008 Total Status Offenses (lines 4 &amp; 5)</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>358</b>
f.) 2007 Total Status Offenses (lines d & e)	183	212	0	395
<b>7.) 2008 Total Adjudicated Offenses (lines 1 &amp; 4)</b>	<b>3027</b>	<b>704</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3731</b>
g.) 2007 Total Adjudicated Offenses (lines a & d)	3152	870	0	4022
<b>8.) 2008 Total Dismissed Offenses (lines 2 &amp; 5)</b>	<b>3603</b>	<b>1219</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4822</b>
h.) 2007 Total Dismissed Offenses (lines b & e)	3615	1415	0	5030
<b>9.) 2008 Total Official Terminations (lines 7 &amp; 8)</b>	<b>6630</b>	<b>1923</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8553</b>
i.) 2007 Total Official Terminations (lines g & h)	6767	2285	0	9052
<b>10.) 2008 Unofficial Handling - Delinquency</b>	<b>1097</b>	<b>635</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1736</b>
j.) 2007 Unofficial Case Handling - Delinquency	1140	750	3	1893
<b>11.) 2008 Unofficial Handling - Status</b>	<b>754</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1232</b>
k.) 2007 Unofficial Case Handling - Status	668	440	5	1113
<b>12.) 2008 Grand Total Disposed Cases (lines 9-11)</b>	<b>8481</b>	<b>3033</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11,521</b>
l.) 2007 Grand Total Disposed Cases (lines i-k)	8575	3475	8	12,058

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

	2008	2007
<b>Adjudicated Offenses</b> (Table D13, Line 7)	<b>32%</b> (3731 of 11,521)	<b>33%</b> (4022 of 12,058)
<b>Dismissed Offenses</b> (Table D13, Line 8)	<b>42%</b> (4822 of 11,521)	<b>42%</b> (5030 of 12,058)
<b>Unofficial Case Handling</b> (Table D13, Lines 10&11)	<b>26%</b> (2968 of 11,521)	<b>25%</b> (2991 of 12,058)

### Percent Of Total for Offense Summary




In summary, the total number of cases disposed during 2008 (11,521) decreased by 4.5% from 2007 (12,058). During 2008, 32% of all cases disposed were adjudicated (33% in 2007), 42% were dismissed (42% in 2007), and 26% were handled unofficially (25% in 2007).

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

	2008	2007
<b>Robbery/Theft Offenses (1371 of 8553)</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>Sex Offenses (79 of 8553)</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>
<b>Injury to Person Offenses (1255 of 8553)</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>Weapon Offenses (170 of 8553)</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>Drug Offenses (667 of 8553)</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>Alcohol Offenses (316 of 8553)</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>Property Damage Offenses (332 of 8553)</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>Status Offenses (456 of 8553)</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>Public Nuisance Offenses (3907 of 8553)</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>45%</b>

The percentage of offenses by category remained relatively stable from 2007 with a few exceptions. There was a slight increase in Robbery/Theft offenses, Drug offenses and Public Nuisance offenses, a slight decrease in Injury to Person offenses and Property Damage offenses disposed during 2008.


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



**FIVE YEAR TRENDS FOR OFFENSES**

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>Number Offenses Disposed</b>	10,330	10,500	12,242	12,058	11,521
<b>Annual Difference</b>	3%	2%	17%	-1.5%	-4.5%


**Offenses Disposed**




	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>Males</b>	68%	70%	73%	71%	74%
<b>Females</b>	32%	30%	27%	29%	26%

2008 OFFENSE STATISTICS

**Sex By Percentage**



**Race By Percentage**



**TABLE D18: OFFENSE BY RACE**

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>African-American</b>	54%	57%	57%	61%	63%
<b>Caucasian</b>	38%	36%	36%	33%	30%
<b>Hispanic</b>	6%	5%	5%	4%	4%

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

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>Delinquency</b>	85%	88%	88%	75%	85%
<b>Status</b>	15%	12%	12%	25%	15%

**TABLE D20: ADJUDICATED OFFENSES**

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

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

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>Number of Offenses</b>	880	940	964	800	853
<b>Percent of All Adjudicated Offenses</b>	26%	25%	24%	20%	23%
<b>Offense Difference from Prior Year</b>	-206	60	24	164	53
<b>Percent of Difference from Prior Year</b>	-19%	7%	3%	-17%	7%

2008 OFFENSE STATISTICS

**TABLE D20-B: SEX OFFENSES**

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>Number of Offenses</b>	44	64	59	67	52
<b>Percent of All Adjudicated Offenses</b>	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%
<b>Offense Difference from Prior Year</b>	-8	20	-5	8	-15
<b>Percent of Difference from Prior Year</b>	-15%	45%	-8%	14%	-22%

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

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>Number of Offenses</b>	488	524	509	465	431
<b>Percent of All Adjudicated Offenses</b>	17%	14%	11%	12%	12%
<b>Offense Difference from Prior Year</b>	-5	36	-15	-44	-34
<b>Percent of Difference from Prior Year</b>	-1%	7%	-3%	9%	-7%

**TABLE D20-D: WEAPON OFFENSES**

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>Number of Offenses</b>	76	76	88	83	85
<b>Percent of All Adjudicated Offenses</b>	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
<b>Offense Difference from Prior Year</b>	4	0	12	-5	2
<b>Percent of Difference from Prior Year</b>	6%	-	16%	-6%	2%

**TABLE D20-E: DRUG OFFENSES**

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>Number of Offenses</b>	299	248	367	316	297
<b>Percent of All Adjudicated Offenses</b>	8%	7%	9%	8%	8%
<b>Offense Difference from Prior Year</b>	17	-51	119	-51	-19
<b>Percent of Difference from Prior Year</b>	6%	-17%	48%	-14%	-6%

**TABLE D20-F: ALCOHOL OFFENSES**

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>Number of Offenses</b>	101	87	110	145	119
<b>Percent of All Adjudicated Offenses</b>	4%	2%	3%	4%	3%
<b>Offense Difference from Prior Year</b>	-9	-14	23	35	-26
<b>Percent of Difference from Prior Year</b>	-8%	-14%	26%	32%	-18%

2008 OFFENSE STATISTICS

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

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>Number of Offenses</b>	155	187	223	191	143
<b>Percent of All Adjudicated Offenses</b>	5%	5%	5%	5%	4%
<b>Offense Difference from Prior Year</b>	37	32	36	-31	-48
<b>Percent of Difference from Prior Year</b>	31%	21%	19%	-14%	-25%

**TABLE D20-H: STATUS OFFENSES**

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>Number of Offenses</b>	51	34	38	27	42
<b>Percent of All Adjudicated Offenses</b>	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%
<b>Offense Difference from Prior Year</b>	-13	-17	4	-11	15
<b>Percent of Difference from Prior Year</b>	-20%	-33%	12%	-29%	56%


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

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>Number of Offenses</b>	1086	1558	1477	1928	1709
<b>Percent of All Adjudicated Offenses</b>	36%	42%	36%	48%	46%
<b>Offense Difference from Prior Year</b>	-266	472	81	451	-219
<b>Percent of Difference from Prior Year</b>	-20%	43%	-5%	31%	-11%

**TABLE D21: ADJUDICATED OFFENSE TOTAL**

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>Adjudicated Offense Total</b>	3362	3718	4064	4022	3731
<b>Annual Offense Difference</b>	-267	356	346	-42	-291
	-7%	11%	9%	-1%	-7%

**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.

**TABLE D22: VIOLENT CRIME INDEX ADJUDICATED MALES OFFENSES**

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Aggravated Robbery & Robbery	38	30	53	54	49
Homicide Offenses	2	4	3	2	1
Felonious & Aggravated Assault	23	23	25	18	23
Rape & Felonious Sexual Penetration	13	24	9	14	14
<b>Totals</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>Annual Difference</b>	<b>-1%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>-2%</b>	<b>2%</b>

**TABLE D23: ADJUDICATED VIOLENT CRIMES COMPARED TO ALL MALES**

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>Total Adjudicated Violent Crimes-Males</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>Total Adjudicated Offenses-Males</b>	<b>2564</b>	<b>2898</b>	<b>3266</b>	<b>3152</b>	<b>3027</b>
<b>Percent Of Violent</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>2.9%</b>

**TABLE D24: VIOLENT CRIME INDEX ADJUDICATED FEMALES OFFENSES**

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Aggravated Robbery & Robbery	1	1	5	4	3
Homicide Offenses	1	1	0	2	0
Felonious & Aggravated Assault	5	4	6	4	4
Rape & Felonious Sexual Penetration	0	0	0	1	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Annual Difference</b>	<b>-42%</b>	<b>-14%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-36%</b>


**TABLE D25: ADJUDICATED VIOLENT CRIMES COMPARED TO ALL FEMALES**

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>Total Adjudicated Violent Crimes-Females</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Total Adjudicated Offenses-Females</b>	<b>798</b>	<b>820</b>	<b>798</b>	<b>870</b>	<b>704</b>
<b>Percent Of Violent</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>

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

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Aggravated Robbery & Robbery	39	31	58	58	52
Homicide Offenses	3	5	3	4	1
Felonious & Aggravated Assault	28	27	31	22	27
Rape & Felonious Sexual Penetration	13	24	9	15	14
<b>Totals</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>Trends</b>	<b>-7%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>-2%</b>	<b>-5%</b>

### Adjudicated Violent Offenses



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

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Total Adjudicated Violent Crimes-Males & Females	83	87	101	99	94
Total Adjudicated Offenses-Males & Females	3362	3718	4064	4022	3731
Percentage Violent of All Adjudicated Offenses	2.5%	2.3%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%

## 2008 OFFENSE STATISTICS

	2004		2005		2006		2007		2008	
First Degree Felony	98		99		110		112		108	
Second Degree Felony	193		292		364		303		335	
Third Degree Felony	110		154		175		203		157	
Fourth Degree Felony	492		475		510		357		282	
Fifth Degree Felony	465		418		606		528		461	
<b>Total Felonies</b>	1358	13%	1438	14%	1765	14%	1503	12%	1343	12%
First Degree Misdemeanor	4611		4683		5230		5177		4877	
Second Degree Misdemeanor	914		1096		1298		1199		1094	
Third Degree Misdemeanor	121		90		129		129		105	
Fourth Degree Misdemeanor	1046		1209		1530		1549		1472	
Fifth Degree Misdemeanor	0		0		0		0		1	
Minor Misdemeanor	620		709		824		913		930	
<b>Total Misdemeanors</b>	7312	70%	7787	74%	9011	73%	8967	74%	8479	74%
<b>Total Status Offenses</b>	1609	15%	1250	12%	1465	12%	1558	13%	1677	15%
<b>Total Unknown Degree</b>	133	1%	68	1%	49	<1%	30	<1%	22	<1%
<b>Total Annual Offenses</b>	10,412		10,543		12,290		12,058		11,521	


	MALES	FEMALES	UNKNOWN	TOTAL
First Degree Felony	101 (94%)	7 (6%)	0	108
Second Degree Felony	303 (90%)	32 (10%)	0	335
Third Degree Felony	148 (94%)	9 (6%)	0	157
Fourth Degree Felony	227 (80%)	55 (20%)	0	282
Fifth Degree Felony	405 (88%)	56 (12%)	0	461
<b>Felonies</b>	<b>1184 (88%)</b>	<b>159 (12%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1343</b>
First Degree Misdemeanor	3356 (69%)	1521 (31%)	0	4877
Second Degree Misdemeanor	909 (83%)	185 (17%)	0	1094
Third Degree Misdemeanor	82 (78%)	23 (22%)	0	105
Fourth Degree Misdemeanor	1209 (82%)	259 (18%)	4 (<1%)	1472
Fifth Degree Misdemeanor	1 (100%)	0	0	1
Minor Misdemeanor	752 (81%)	178 (19%)	0	930
<b>Misdemeanors</b>	<b>6309 (74%)</b>	<b>2166 (26%)</b>	<b>4 (&lt;1%)</b>	<b>8479</b>
Total Status Offenses	967 (58%)	707 (42%)	3 (<1%)	1677
Total Unknown Degree	21 (95%)	1 (5%)	0	22
<b>Total Offenses for 2008</b>	<b>8481</b>	<b>3033</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11,521</b>
	<b>74%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>&lt;1%</b>	

2008 OFFENSE STATISTICS

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

	<b>HIS- AFR/AMER</b>	<b>PANIC</b>	<b>WHITE</b>	<b>OTHER</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
First Degree Felony	77 (71%)	3 (3%)	26 (24%)	2 (2%)	0	108
Second Degree Felony	238 (71%)	20 (6%)	73 (22%)	4 (1%)	0	335
Third Degree Felony	105 (67%)	8 (5%)	44 (28%)	0	0	157
Fourth Degree Felony	179 (63%)	23 (8%)	75 (27%)	2 (1%)	3 (1%)	282
Fifth Degree Felony	271 (59%)	26 (6%)	153 (33%)	3 (1%)	8 (2%)	461
<b>Total Felonies</b>	<b>870 (65%)</b>	<b>80 (6%)</b>	<b>371 (28%)</b>	<b>11 (1%)</b>	<b>11 (1%)</b>	<b>1343</b>
First Degree Misdemeanor	3029 (62%)	197 (4%)	1550 (32%)	55 (1%)	46 (1%)	4877
Second Degree Misdemeanor	742 (68%)	57 (5%)	277 (25%)	6 (1%)	12 (1%)	1094
Third Degree Misdemeanor	45 (43%)	3 (3%)	51 (49%)	0	6 (6%)	105
Fourth Degree Misdemeanor	904 (61%)	41 (3%)	469 (32%)	14 (1%)	44 (3%)	1472
Fifth Degree Misdemeanor	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	1
Minor Misdemeanor	662 (71%)	46 (5%)	210 (23%)	4 (<1%)	8 (1%)	930
<b>Total Misdemeanors</b>	<b>5383 (63%)</b>	<b>344 (4%)</b>	<b>2557 (30%)</b>	<b>79 (1%)</b>	<b>116 (1%)</b>	<b>8479</b>
Total Status Offenses	971 (58%)	72 (4%)	548 (33%)	30 (2%)	56 (3%)	1677
Total Unknown Degree	13 (59%)	1 (5%)	3 (14%)	0	5 (23%)	22
<b>Total Offenses for 2008</b>	<b>7237</b>	<b>497</b>	<b>3479</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>11,521</b>
	<b>63%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>2%</b>	

Lucas County Juvenile Court 2008 Offense Statistics gathered and processed by Sarah Nopper (snoppe@co.lucas.oh.us) and reflect information gathered on April 2nd, 2009.



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.

## 2. CASES DISPOSED

### VOLUME OF CASES

A total of 9,826 cases were disposed during 2008, a decrease of 155, or 1.6%, from 2007. Of these, a total of 6,992, or 71%, of the cases were disposed by formal court action and 2,834, or 29%, were handled unofficially.

This compares to 72% of the cases being disposed by formal court action during 2007.

### DELINQUENT vs. STATUS OFFENSES


Of the 6,992 cases disposed by formal court action, 6,626, or 95%, were delinquency and 366, or 5%, were status.

This compares to 94% of the formal offenses being delinquent during 2007.


### JUVENILE CASES BY SEX

Of the 9,826 cases, 7,052, or 72%, were males and 2,767, or 28%, were females, while the sex was undetermined in 7, or less than 1%, of the cases. This compares to 70% males and 30% females during 2007.

Delinquent Vs. Status - Cases Disposed



Juvenile Cases by Sex



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

	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Delinquency Cases	5148 78%	1478 22%	0	6626
Status Cases	159 43%	207 57%	0	366
Unofficial Cases	1745 62%	1082 38%	7 <1%	2834
<b>Total Cases</b>	<b>7052</b> <b>72%</b>	<b>2767</b> <b>28%</b>	<b>7</b> <b>&lt;1%</b>	<b>9826</b>


**RACE OF OFFENDER FOR CASES DISPOSED**

Of the 9,826 cases, 67% were non-white youth and 31% were white youth. This compares to 65% non-white youth and 34% white youth during 2007.

**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	4283 65%	301 5%	1937 29%	58 1%	47 1%	6626
Status Offenses	243 66%	20 5%	89 24%	10 3%	4 1%	366
Unofficial	1587 56%	107 4%	999 35%	35 1%	106 4%	2834
<b>Totals</b>	<b>6113</b> <b>62%</b>	<b>428</b> <b>4%</b>	<b>3025</b> <b>31%</b>	<b>103</b> <b>1%</b>	<b>157</b> <b>2%</b>	<b>9826</b>

**Race of Offender for 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
7	1	0	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	6
8	5	0	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	11
9	5	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	14
10	29	0	27	3	1	2	0	0	0	32	1	29
11	61	1	62	24	2	16	0	0	0	85	3	78
12	215	3	98	55	2	65	0	0	0	270	5	163
13	440	9	203	128	18	140	0	0	1	568	27	344
14	856	33	298	250	42	194	0	0	1	1106	75	493
15	1076	40	345	341	58	225	0	0	0	1417	98	570
16	1150	43	325	350	46	212	0	0	3	1500	89	540
17	1261	28	345	313	37	217	0	0	2	1574	65	564
18	48	2	12	13	1	5	0	0	0	61	3	17
19+	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>5148</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>1745</b>	<b>1478</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>1082</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6626</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>2834</b>

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

A total of 79% of the males' cases received were repeat offenders. This compares to 75% in 2007. A total of 63% of the females' cases received were repeat offenders. This compares to 64% in 2007.

	First Time Offenders	Repeat Offenders
<b>Males</b>	21% (1285 of 6048)	79% (4763 of 6048)
<b>Females</b>	37% (890 of 2429)	63% (1539 of 2429)
<b>Unknown</b>	100% (18 of 18)	(0 of 18)
<b>Total</b>	26% (2193 of 8495)	74% (6302 of 8495)

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

A total of 62% of White youth were repeat offenders, compared to 82% for African American youth and 75% for Hispanic youth. Percentages for 2007 were 62% repeat offenders in White youth, 79% repeat offenders in African American Youth, and 69% repeat offenders for Hispanic youth.

	First Time Offenders	Repeat Offenders
Caucasian	38%	62%
African/American	18%	82%
Hispanic	25%	75%
Other	26%	74%
<b>Total</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>74%</b>

2008 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	9	0	7	2	0	2	0	0	0	11	0	9
43602	110	0	15	26	4	11	0	0	0	136	4	26
43603	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
43604	191	9	55	63	10	32	0	0	0	254	19	87
43605	434	24	118	156	34	79	0	0	1	590	58	198
43606	265	2	78	83	13	55	0	0	0	348	15	133
43607	685	20	248	209	28	127	0	0	0	894	48	375
43608	743	19	207	186	35	129	0	0	1	929	54	337
43609	516	8	154	119	10	91	0	0	0	635	18	245
43610	228	12	65	51	8	31	0	0	1	279	20	97
43611	198	4	95	56	7	42	0	0	0	255	11	137
43612	267	11	141	92	7	96	0	0	0	359	18	237
43613	203	7	94	37	10	57	0	0	1	240	17	152
43614	122	5	58	37	4	47	0	0	0	159	9	105
43615	326	15	114	92	7	61	0	0	0	418	22	175
43616	110	0	30	21	0	12	0	0	0	131	0	42
43617	9	0	8	14	0	7	0	0	0	23	0	15
43618	11	0	3	10	0	1	0	0	0	12	0	4
43619	8	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	0	3
43620	109	4	23	51	5	22	0	0	0	160	9	45
43623	50	2	28	19	1	28	0	0	0	69	3	56
43624	19	1	2	4	0	3	0	0	0	232	1	5
43635	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>4616</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>1546</b>	<b>1319</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>934</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5935</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>2484</b>

COUNTY	MALES			FEMALES			UNKNOWN			TOTAL		
	DEL	STATUS	UNOFF	DEL	STATUS	UNOFF	DEL	STATUS	UNOFF	DEL	STATUS	UNOFF
43412	9	0	5	6	0	4	0	0	0	15	0	9
43434	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
43504	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
43522	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	1
43528	93	4	53	22	4	24	0	0	0	115	8	77
43537	162	2	44	26	0	24	0	0	0	188	2	68
43542	16	0	3	3	0	5	0	0	0	19	0	8
43558	37	0	14	15	3	12	0	0	0	52	0	26
43560	92	4	26	35	5	16	0	0	0	127	3	42
43565	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0
43566	11	0	5	5	0	7	0	0	0	16	0	12
43571	18	0	3	8	0	7	0	0	0	26	0	10
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>446</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>566</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>253</b>
Wood Co.	18	0	16	6	0	11	0	0	1	24	0	28
So. Mich.	27	1	18	14	2	22	0	0	0	41	3	40
Not Lucas Co.	30	2	7	15	10	12	0	0	1	45	12	20
Unknown	11	3	5	4	0	3	0	0	1	15	3	9
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>5148</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>1745</b>	<b>1478</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>1082</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6626</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>2834</b>

Lucas County Juvenile Court 2008 Case Statistics gathered and processed by Sarah Nopper (snoppe@co.lucas.oh.us) and reflect information gathered on April 2nd, 2009.

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.

## 3. FILING STATISTICS

### VOLUME OF NEW OFFENSES FILED

A total of 10,776 new offenses were filed during 2008, a decrease of 952 offenses, or 8%, from 2007.

Of these 10,776 new offense filings, a total of 7,744, or 72%, were designated to be handled by formal court proceedings and 3,032, or 28%, were designated to be diverted for informal handling. This compares to 75% of the cases being disposed by formal court action during 2007.

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

	MALES	FEMALES	UNKNOWN	TOTAL
Formal Proceedings	6011	1723	10	7744
	78%	22%	<1%	
Informal Handling	1881	1142	9	3032
	62%	38%	<1%	
<b>Total Offenses</b>	<b>7892</b>	<b>2865</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>10,776</b>
	<b>73%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>&lt;1%</b>	


### SEX OF OFFENDERS FOR NEW OFFENSES FILED

Of the 10,776 new offenses filed - 7,892, or 73%, involved males - 2,865, or 27%, involved females - and 19, or less than 1%, were offenses for which the juvenile's sex was not recorded. This compares to 71% involving males and 28% females during 2007.


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

	MALES	FEMALES	UNKNOWN	TOTAL
Delinquency	6976	2222	16	9,214
	76%	24%	<1%	
Status	916	643	3	1562
	59%	41%	<1%	
<b>Total Offenses</b>	<b>7892</b>	<b>2865</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>10,776</b>

**Sex of Offenders for New Offenses Filed**



**Race of Offenders for New Offenses Filed**



**RACE OF OFFENDER FOR NEW OFFENSES FILED**

During 2008, 67% of the new offenses filed involved minority youth. This was an increase of 2% from the 65% of minority filings during 2007.

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

	AFR/AMER	HISPANIC	WHITE	OTHER	UNKNOWN	TOTAL
Delinquency	5852	402	2730	87	143	9214
	64%	4%	30%	1%	2%	
Status	923	69	482	31	57	1562
	59%	4%	31%	2%	4%	
<b>Total Offenses</b>	<b>6775</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>3212</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>10,776</b>
	<b>63%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>2%</b>	


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

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Formal Proceedings	7628	8652	8905	8785	7744
Informal Handling	3103	2957	3252	2943	3032
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,731</b>	<b>11,609</b>	<b>12,166</b>	<b>11,728</b>	<b>10,776</b>


\* Starting with 2007 data, tables began to reflect the difference between formal and informal (or unofficial) handling of cases. The reporting of the number of delinquency and status offenses has been changed to include filings that were handled informally to reflect greater accuracy. Statistical reporting from previous years was rerun and 2004-2006 totals may show a difference of less than 1%, which is not statistically significant. This change was made to give the reader a truer picture of the types of offenses being filed and how they are handled by the Court.

	2004*	2005*	2006*	2007	2008
Delinquency	9224	10,400	10,580	10,314	9214
Status	1507	1209	1586	1414	1562
<b>Total</b>	<b>10,731</b>	<b>11,609</b>	<b>12,166</b>	<b>11,728</b>	<b>10,776</b>

**Five Year Trend By Procedure**



**Five Year Trend By Case Code**



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

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
First Degree Felony	99	112	90	113	100
Second Degree Felony	199	361	303	298	342
Third Degree Felony	133	163	188	155	144
Fourth Degree Felony	528	530	414	314	266
Fifth Degree Felony	457	578	542	507	411
<b>Total Felonies</b>	<b>1416</b> 13%	<b>1744</b> 15%	<b>1537</b> 13%	<b>1387</b> 12%	<b>1263</b> 12%
First Degree Misdemeanor	4709	5209	5185	5011	4614
Second Degree Misdemeanor	980	1205	1281	1180	974
Third Degree Misdemeanor	131	112	121	115	102
Fourth Degree Misdemeanor	1148	1306	1234	1559	1301
Fifth Degree Misdemeanor	0	0	0	1	0
Minor Misdemeanor	662	799	858	969	864
<b>Total Misdemeanors</b>	<b>7630</b> 71%	<b>8631</b> 74%	<b>8979</b> 74%	<b>8835</b> 75%	<b>7855</b> 73%
<b>Total Status Offenses</b>	<b>1540</b> 14%	<b>1250</b> 11%	<b>1638</b> 13%	<b>1494</b> 13%	<b>1643</b> 15%
<b>Total Unknown Degree</b>	<b>144</b> 1%	<b>36</b> <1%	<b>12</b> <1%	<b>12</b> <1%	<b>15</b> <1%
<b>Total Annual Offenses</b>	<b>10,730</b>	<b>11,661</b>	<b>12,166</b>	<b>11,728</b>	<b>10,776</b>

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

	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
First Degree Felony	95 (95%)	5 (5%)	0	100
Second Degree Felony	309 (90%)	33 (10%)	0	342
Third Degree Felony	137 (95%)	7 (5%)	0	144
Fourth Degree Felony	219 (82%)	47 (18%)	0	266
Fifth Degree Felony	358 (87%)	52 (13%)	1 (<1%)	411
<b>Felonies</b>	<b>1118 (89%)</b>	<b>144 (11%)</b>	<b>1 (&lt;1%)</b>	<b>1263</b>
First Degree Misdemeanor	3187 (69%)	1422 (31%)	5 (<1%)	4614
Second Degree Misdemeanor	789 (81%)	183 (19%)	2 (<1%)	974
Third Degree Misdemeanor	84 (82%)	18 (18%)	0	102
Fourth Degree Misdemeanor	1050 (81%)	246 (19%)	5 (<1%)	1301
Fifth Degree Misdemeanor	0	0	0	0
Minor Misdemeanor	680 (79%)	182 (21%)	2 (<1%)	864
<b>Misdemeanors</b>	<b>5790 (74%)</b>	<b>2051 (26%)</b>	<b>14 (&lt;1%)</b>	<b>7855</b>
Status Offenses	970 (59%)	669 (41%)	4 (<1%)	1643
Unknown Degree	14 (93%)	1 (7%)	0	15
<b>Total Offenses for 2008</b>	<b>7892</b>	<b>2865</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>10,776</b>
	<b>73%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>&lt;1%</b>	

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

	<b>AFR/AMER</b>	<b>HISPANIC</b>	<b>WHITE</b>	<b>OTHER</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
First Degree Felony	76 (76%)	2 (2%)	21 (21%)	1 (1%)	0	100
Second Degree Felony	243 (71%)	20 (6%)	75 (22%)	4 (1%)	0	342
Third Degree Felony	99 (69%)	5 (3%)	39 (27%)	0	1 (1%)	144
Fourth Degree Felony	169 (64%)	20 (8%)	76 (29%)	0	1 (<1%)	266
Fifth Degree Felony	251 (61%)	32 (8%)	118 (29%)	4 (1%)	6 (1%)	411
<b>Felonies</b>	<b>838 (66%)</b>	<b>79 (6%)</b>	<b>329 (26%)</b>	<b>9 (1%)</b>	<b>8 (1%)</b>	<b>1263</b>
First Degree Misdemeanor	2851 (62%)	183 (4%)	1473 (32%)	52 (1%)	55 (1%)	4614
Second Degree Misdemeanor	647 (66%)	50 (5%)	262 (27%)	4 (<1%)	11 (1%)	974
Third Degree Misdemeanor	37 (36%)	3 (3%)	55 (54%)	1 (1%)	6 (6%)	102
Fourth Degree Misdemeanor	810 (63%)	38 (3%)	392 (30%)	14 (1%)	47 (4%)	1301
Fifth Degree Misdemeanor	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minor Misdemeanor	614 (71%)	48 (6%)	184 (21%)	5 (1%)	13 (2%)	864
<b>Misdemeanors</b>	<b>4959 (63%)</b>	<b>322 (4%)</b>	<b>2366 (30%)</b>	<b>76 (1%)</b>	<b>132 (2%)</b>	<b>7855</b>
<b>Status Offenses</b>	<b>966 (59%)</b>	<b>70 (4%)</b>	<b>514 (31%)</b>	<b>33 (2%)</b>	<b>60 (4%)</b>	<b>1643</b>
<b>Unknown Degree</b>	<b>12 (80%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3 (20%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Total Offenses for 2008</b>	<b>6775</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>3212</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>10,776</b>
	<b>63%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>1%</b>	

## 2008 FILING STATISTICS

The following tables represent the offenses most commonly referred to the Court. A total of 24 offenses represent 85% of all offense filings.

	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>	<b>UNKNOWN</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
Assault	467	181	0	648
Burglary	217	15	0	232
Carrying a Concealed Weapon	110	8	2	120
Criminal Damage	229	39	1	269
Criminal Trespassing	384	73	0	457
Consume Underage	120	75	4	199
Disorderly Conduct	495	165	1	661
Domestic Violence	430	223	1	654
Drug Abuse	175	35	1	211
Drug Paraphernalia	124	31	1	156
Falsification	90	28	1	119
Loitering	187	11	0	198
Menacing	132	34	0	166
Obstructing Official Business	454	113	1	568
Petty Theft	445	360	1	806
Possession of Alcohol	72	29	0	101
Possession of Drugs	170	17	0	187
Receiving Stolen Property	148	24	0	172
Resist Arrest	112	34	0	146
Safe School Ordinance	979	443	0	1422
Theft	77	30	1	108
Unruly	628	397	3	1028
Unruly/Curfew	211	109	0	320
Unruly/Runaway	113	147	0	260
<b>a) Totals</b>	<b>6569</b>	<b>2621</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>9208</b>
b) Total 2008 Filings	7892	2865	19	10,776
<b>c) 'a' divided by 'b'</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>85%</b>

The most commonly referred offense is Safe School Ordinance, as was the case during 2007.

	<b>Number of Offenses in 2008</b>	<b>% of Total Findings</b>
Safe School Ordinance	1422	13%
Unruly	1028	10%
Petty Theft	802	7%
Disorderly Conduct	661	6%
Domestic Violence	654	6%
Assault	648	6%
<b>% of Total Filings</b>		<b>48%</b>

2008 FILING STATISTICS

The most commonly referred males offense is Safe School Ordinance, as was the case during 2007.

	<b>Number of Offenses in 2008</b>	<b>% of Total Findings</b>
Safe School Ordinance	979	15%
Unruly	628	10%
Disorderly Conduct	495	8%
Assault	467	7%
Obstructing Official Business	454	7%
Petty Theft	445	7%
<b>% of Total Filings</b>		<b>54%</b>

The most commonly referred females offense is Safe School Ordinance, as was the case during 2007.

	<b>Number of Offenses in 2008</b>	<b>% of Total Findings</b>
Safe School Ordinance	443	19%
Petty Theft	397	15%
Unruly	360	14%
Domestic Violence	223	9%
Assault	181	7%
Disorderly Conduct	165	6%
<b>% of Total Filings</b>		<b>70%</b>

A total of 268 violent offense filings occurred during 2007, compared to 223 during 2006.

	<b>Males</b>	<b>Females</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	<b>Total</b>
Aggravated & Felonious Assault	80	16	0	96
Aggravated Robbery & Robbery	124	9	0	133
Homicide Offenses	1	0	0	1
Rape	24	1	0	25
<b>Total</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>255</b>
<b>% of Total Filings</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>&lt;1%</b>		<b>2%</b>

Lucas County Juvenile Court 2008 Filing Statistics gathered and processed by Sarah Nopper (snoppe@co.lucas.oh.us) and reflect information gathered on March 27th, 2009.

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.

## 4. COMMITMENTS AND CERTIFICATIONS

### COMMITMENTS

A total of 67 youth were committed to the Ohio Department of Youth Services during 2008, compared to 103 during 2007 (a decrease of 36 or 35%). The breakdown was 51 commitments during 2008 compared to 76 during 2007 (a decrease of 25 or 33%) and 16 parole revocations during 2008 compared to 27 during 2007 (a decrease of 11 or 41%).

	<b>Males</b>	<b>Females</b>	<b>Total</b>
New Commitments	39	2	41
Re-Commitments	7	2	9
Prior Commitments	2	0	2
<b>Total Commitments</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>51</b>
Parole Revocations	16	0	16
Judicial Release Violations	0	0	0
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>67</b>

A total of 43% of the commitments were for Felony 1 and Felony 2 offenses, compared to 44% during 2007.

	<b>Commitments</b>	<b>Revocations/Rel. Violations</b>
Felony 1	7 or 14%	4 or 25%
Felony 2	15 or 29%	2 or 12.5%
Felony 3	15 or 29%	2 or 12.5%
Felony 4	10 or 20%	6 or 37.5%
Felony 5	4 or 8%	2 or 12.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>16</b>


African-American	37 or 72.5%	12 or 75%
Caucasian	12 or 23.5%	4 or 25%
Hispanic	2 or 4%	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>16</b>

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

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>New Commitments</b>	50	45	76	69	41
<b>Recommitments</b>	4	4	4	5	8
<b>Prior Commitments</b>	2	2	1	2	2
<b>Total Commitments</b>	56	51	81	76	51
<b>Parole Revocations</b>	17	18	18	27	16
<b>Grand Total</b>	73	69	99	103	67

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>African American</b>	52 (71%)	45 (65%)	77 (78%)	75 (73%)	49 (73%)
<b>Caucasian</b>	16 (22%)	22 (32%)	17 (17%)	25 (24%)	16 (24%)
<b>Hispanic</b>	5 (7%)	2 (3%)	5 (5%)	3 (3%)	2 (3%)
<b>Males</b>	69 (95%)	64 (93%)	94 (95%)	95 (92%)	64 (96%)
<b>Grand Total</b>	73	69	99	103	67

**Commitments & Revocations**




## CERTIFICATIONS

During 2008, a total of 9 youth were certified to the General Trial Division to stand trial as an adult. This exactly the same number that were certified during 2007. The prosecutor made 32 filings for certifications during 2008, compared to 21 in 2007 - an increase of 11 or 52%.

<b>Certification Offenses</b>		
Aggravated Robbery		5
Conspiracy to Robbery		1
Felonious Assault		1
Burglary		10
Attempted Burglary		1
Intimidating Victim/Witness		1
Escape		1
Breaking and Entering		1
<b>Sex</b>		
Male		9
Female		0
<b>Race</b>		
Caucasian		1
African American		8
<b>Age</b>		
16		2
17		6

### Certifications - 5 Year Trend



Lucas County Juvenile Court 2008 Commitment and Certification Statistics gathered and processed by Dan Pompa (Court Administrator) and reflect information submitted on July 6th, 2009.

## 5. SERIOUS YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS

---

**TABLE S1: SERIOUS YOUTHFUL OFFENDER DISPOSITIONS 2004-2008**

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>Boys</b>	15	3	0	0	0
<b>Girls</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total SYO Dispositions</b>	15	3	0	0	0

### Interesting Points of Note:

The four Serious Youthful Offender Filings from 2007 were filed on just two youth, one with three serious offenses.

There was a case in 2008 in which the Adult Sentence was invoked for a Serious Youthful Offender. That filing occurred in 2005.

2008 SERIOUS YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS

<b>Offenses</b>	Aggravated Arson	1
	Aggravated Assault	1
	Breaking & Entering	1
	Burglary	2
	Criminal Trespassing	1
	Drug Abuse	1
	Felonious Assault	5
	Grand Theft Auto	1
	Rape	1
	Receiving Stolen Property - Motor Vehicle	2
	Aggravated Riot	1
	Robbery	3
	Aggravated Robbery	7
	Theft	1
	<b>Total Offenses</b>	<b>28</b>
		-
<b>Sex</b>	Male	18 (100%)
	Female	0
		-
<b>Race</b>	Caucasian	2 (11%)
	African/American	13 (72%)
	Hispanic	3 (17%)
	Other	0
		-
<b>Age</b>	13	1 (6%)
	14	0
	15	2 (11%)
	16	8 (44%)
	17	7 (39%)
	18	0

Lucas County Juvenile Court 2008 Serious Youthful Offender Statistics gathered and processed by Sarah Nopper (Data Analyst) and reflect information gathered on May 28th, 2009.

## 6. 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	750	337	0	1087
Hispanic	102	31	0	133
Caucasian	1078	695	0	1773
Other	5	3	0	8
Unknown	18	10	0	28
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1953</b>	<b>1076</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3029</b>

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

	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
Males	2815	2767	2982	2497	1953
Females	1355	1223	1295	1157	1076
<b>Total</b>	<b>4184</b>	<b>4006</b>	<b>4282</b>	<b>3655</b>	<b>3029</b>


Lucas County Juvenile Court 2008 Traffic Statistics gathered and processed by Sarah Nopper (snoppe@co.lucas.oh.us) and reflect information gathered on March 26th, 2009.

**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 RiskAssessment Instrument. If a youth was booked twice within the year he/she may be counted twice in the numbers represented below.

# 7. DETENTION STATISTICS

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Caucasian	1779 (32%)	1740 (30%)	1834 (29%)	1705 (27%)	1297 (24%)
Minority	3841 (68%)	4035 (70%)	4582 (71%)	4537 (73%)	4217 (76%)
Unknown	40 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	0	0	1 (<1%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5660</b>	<b>5776</b>	<b>6416</b>	<b>6242</b>	<b>5515</b>
Male	3895 (69%)	4132 (72%)	4695 (73%)	4493 (72%)	4113 (75%)
Female	1764 (31%)	1644 (28%)	1721 (27%)	1749 (28%)	1402 (25%)
Unknown	1 (<1%)	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5660</b>	<b>5776</b>	<b>6416</b>	<b>6242</b>	<b>5515</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.

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Caucasian	1109 (31%)	1029 (30%)	1080 (29%)	919 (26%)	762 (23%)
Minority	2493 (69%)	2427 (70%)	2671 (71%)	2603 (74%)	2506 (77%)
Unknown	21 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3623</b>	<b>3457</b>	<b>3751</b>	<b>3522</b>	<b>3268</b>
Male	2605 (72%)	2554 (74%)	2809 (75%)	2601 (74%)	2526 (77%)
Female	1018 (28%)	903 (26%)	942 (25%)	921 (26%)	742 (23%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3623</b>	<b>3457</b>	<b>3751</b>	<b>3522</b>	<b>3268</b>

2008 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>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
Caucasian	63%	59%	59%	54%	59%
Minority	69%	60%	58%	57%	59%
Male	67%	62%	60%	58%	61%
Female	58%	55%	55%	53%	53%

<b>TABLE JDC4: AVERAGE DAILY POPULATION</b>					
Calendar Year	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
	63	61	65	69	67


\***Note:** before the implementation of Community Detention in September, 2000, the average daily population for the Child Study Institute was 80, showing a drop to an average of just 62 in 2001.

<b>TABLE JDC5: AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY</b>					
Calendar Year	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
Days	7.45	6.52	6.76	7.90	8.40

Lucas County Juvenile Court 2008 Detention Statistics gathered and processed by Sarah Nopper (snoppe@co.lucas.oh.us) and reflect information gathered on March 27th, 2009.



# 8. COMMUNITY CONTROL STATISTICS



Lucas County Juvenile Court 2008 Community Control Statistics gathered and processed by Kendra Kec (Assistant Court Administrator) and reflect information submitted on July 23rd, 2009.

# 9. VICTIM STATISTICS

---

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.

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

	<b>Property</b>	<b>Theft</b>	<b>Violent</b>
Delinquent Complaints Filed	10	49	1
Adjudications	4	25	1
Adjudication & Restitution	2	18	0
Committed to an Institution	0	3	0
Transferred for Criminal Prosecution	0	0	0

Lucas County Juvenile Court 2008 Victim Statistics gathered and processed by Sarah Nopper (snoppe@co.lucas.oh.us) and reflect information gathered on March 31st, 2009.

## Administrative and Supervisory Staff With Contact Information

---

**Judge Denise Navarre Cubbon**

Administrative Judge  
(419)213-6778

**Judge Connie Zimmelman**

(419)213-6717

**Dan Pompa**

Court Administrator  
(419)213-6700

**Kendra Kec**

Assistant Court Administrator  
(419)213-6712

**Donna Mitchell**

Chief Legal Counsel  
(419)213-6762

**Deborah Hodges**

Administrator of Probation Services  
(419)213-6612

**Michael Brennan**

Assistant Administrator of  
Probation Services  
(419)213-6611

**Celeste Hasselbach**

Information Systems Director  
(419)213-6697

**Gary Lenhart**

Staff Development Director  
(419)213-6695

**Diana Karch**

Human Resources and Employee  
Benefits Coordinator  
(419)213-6696

**Pat Balderas**

Administrator of Case Flow  
Services  
(419)213-6736

**Tara Hobbs**

Youth Treatment Center  
Administrator  
(419)213-6161

**Joan Parker**

Juvenile Detention Center  
Administrator  
(419)213-6723

**Judy Fornof**

Civil Magistrate  
(419)213-6680

**William Hutchenson**

Civil Magistrate  
(419)213-6685

**John Yerman**

Delinquency Magistrate  
(419)213-6744

**Geoff Waggoner**

Delinquency Magistrate  
(419)213-6745

**Brian Goodell**

Civil Magistrate  
(419)213-6682

**Pamela Manning**

Civil Magistrate  
(419)213-6681

**Sue Cairl**

Delinquency Magistrate  
(419)213-6742

**Laura Restivo**

Delinquency Magistrate  
(419)213-6743

**Brenda Rutledge**

Civil Magistrate  
(419)213-6914

Court Appointed Special Advocates

**Carol Martin**, Director CASA/  
CRB

**Anital Levin**, Associate Director,  
CASA

**Judy Leb**, Recruiter/Training  
Coordinator  
(419)213-6753

Citizens Review Board/Closure  
Board  
(419)213-6754

**Linda Sorah**

Director Mediation Services  
(419)213-6914

**Jennifer Styblo**

Assistant Mediation Coordinator  
(419)213-6678

**Amy Matuszewski**

Fiscal Manager  
(419)213-6703

Court-wide Fax

(419)213-6794

---

The 2008 Annual Report was written by various members of the Juvenile Court Administrative staff.

Statistics and data collection were performed by Sarah Nopper, Data Analyst; and Dan Pompa, Court Administrator.

Design layout was performed by Sarah Nopper, Data Analyst, Juvenile Court Information Systems.

Final editing, planning and layout was performed by Sarah Nopper, Data Analyst; Dan Pompa, Court Administrator; and Celeste Hasselbach, Director of Information Systems.