

THE JUVENILE COURT IN SEATTLE

REPORT OF A STUDY

1939

To my friend, Mrs. Powell -
D. G. Long

RALPH G. WALES
Director Western Office
San Francisco

MARJORIE BELL
Assistant Director
New York

NATIONAL PROBATION ASSOCIATION

50 West Fiftieth Street

NEW YORK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Foreword	
2. History	1
3. Law and Jurisdiction	4
4. Physical Setting	6
5. Court Hearings	8
6. Organization and Administration	24
7. Special Function of the Court	35
8. Case Work Techniques	39
9. Records and Statistics	48
10. Relationships with Other Agencies	54
11. Detention	61
12. Interpretation of Work to the Community . . .	79
13. Recommendations	82

TABLES

I	18
II	20
III	22

CHARTS

I	25
II	27

F O R E W O R D

This study of the organization and work of the juvenile court of King county, Washington, was made at the request of Judge William G. Long of the juvenile and superior courts. For several years Judge Long had been desirous of having such a critical study made by a disinterested national organization equipped to do the work.

In December 1938, as the result of a letter sent out by Judge Long to a selected list of citizens in Seattle, a number of contributions were received toward defraying the expense of the survey, including particularly a generous gift from Mrs. Genevieve S. Blethen of Seattle, whose assistance, which made possible the carrying on of the work, is gratefully acknowledged.

Mr. Ralph G. Wales, director of the western branch office of the National Probation Association, established last year at San Francisco, spent five weeks in Seattle beginning on April 7, carrying on the field work of the study. For two weeks of this time he was ably assisted by Mrs. Marjorie Bell, the assistant director of the Association, who came from New York for this purpose. This report has been prepared jointly by the two participants.

This study has concentrated on the work of the juvenile court. No attempt was made to study intensively the work of other organizations dealing with delinquent or dependent children except as their work was revealed in the work and records of the juvenile court. Close observation was made of the daily work of the juvenile court. All available records were studied and all persons concerned in the work of the court were

interviewed repeatedly. A mass of information was collected but only the essential findings with particular reference to needs and recommendations are here presented.

Juvenile court studies are greatly needed at the present time. The opinion has been expressed by many competent observers that these courts have not as yet lived up to the expectations and hopes of the founders of the movement. While some of the courts have made marked progress in recent years, others have retrogressed. Too many of the courts have not been able to present any convincing evidence that they have developed uniform and effective service for the children with whose care they have been charged, nor have they shown results in reducing delinquency or in helping to solve the problems that bring unfortunate children in such great numbers into our courts. The failures of these courts can largely be laid to one outstanding defect: namely, to an insufficient, inadequate or incompetent personnel. This cannot be called as much a failure of the courts themselves as a failure of the public to provide these essential agencies with the able and experienced workers from the judge down, which are essential to successful operation.

Throughout the making of this study we have enjoyed the constant cooperation and assistance of Judge William G. Long. The findings and recommendations of the survey were frankly discussed with him. In addition to this report, it was thought best to submit to him a brief confidential report containing our appraisal and recommendations in regard to the staff personnel. This was done in order to avoid the possibility of personal embarrassment. The judge has already shown by the selections that he has made of trained workers as replacements on the staff that he

is in agreement with the suggestions made in regard to the development of higher professional qualifications and the need for further staff changes.

Throughout the study we enjoyed the cooperation and assistance of every member of the staff. We also acknowledge the aid given by leaders in social welfare and other persons in the community.

If this study of one of the older and more important juvenile courts of the country should result in a reorganization and development of the facilities and especially of the personnel required for a more effective service to its community, those who have contributed to this work will be amply repaid.

CHARLES L. CHUTE

Executive Director

September 1939

HISTORY

Washington enacted its first juvenile court law in 1905. It followed two sister western states, California and Colorado which had enacted juvenile court and probation laws in 1903, after Illinois sounded the tocsin in 1899. Washington led a procession of ten states, including Idaho, Oregon and Utah, who enacted laws in 1905. That year marked the greatest advance in the number of states enrolled in the campaign for a more humane and intelligent treatment of the child offender.

King county, under the leadership of the Honorable A. W. Frater, judge of the superior court, established its juvenile court on June 10, 1905. Judge Frater had little precedent to guide him and though the statute made possible the organization of court and staff it made no provision for the salary of a probation officer. Civic minded individuals and organizations rallied to his support and contributed the salary of the first officer to be attached to the court. Two years later legislation remedied the omission and authorized the Board of Commissioners to provide salaries for a man and a woman officer. The probation and detention staffs developed gradually throughout the years as the court program and work increased in scope. At present there are eight workers on the probation staff and seven in the detention home.

In 1915, four years after the centralization of all juvenile court activities in an old residence had been essayed, the continued enthusiastic support of the citizens interested in the work of the court made possible the establishment of a modern building still in use at 200 Broadway, housing the juvenile court, the probation department and the detention

home, probably the first of its kind in the country.

In the long span from June 1905 to the end of 1938 approximately fifty thousand children's hearings have been held. In that span of time there have been but four judges of the juvenile court, the founder, A. W. Frater, King Dykeman, Everett Smith and William G. Long. The long terms served by these men attest the esteem of their colleagues on the bench and the confidence of the community.

Early in its development the Seattle juvenile court began to buttress the work of its officers with extra facilities to provide the best treatment available for children's problems. A department of research was instituted in 1911 and was continued until the death in 1924 of its director, the chief probation officer, Dr. Lilburn E. Merrill. Through arrangements with the Gatzert Foundation for Child Welfare the services of Dr. Stevenson Smith as psychologist to the department were secured. Thus the court, in advance of many other juvenile courts, implemented itself with one of the most effective instruments in child welfare work. The psychologist provided the court with a more thorough study of the child and the factors which occasioned his appearance, and subsequently made recommendations for the care and treatment of the child.

Early too in its history the court developed close and cooperative relationships with the police, the schools, and social agencies in the community. An excerpt from the first annual report of the court issued in 1911 crystallizes the philosophy with which the early work was impregnated: "By cooperating through our courts, schools, churches, clubs and kindred organizations we may bring about such a condition that neglect and delinquency will be reduced to a minimum." Today the police and schools con-

tinue to be the greatest sources of cases referred to the court, and their representatives are in daily contact with the probation staff.

Although no annual reports were issued for the years 1905-1911, those issued from 1911 to 1931 reflect the efforts of judges and staff to build in the community an enduring and constructive social agency for children. It is unfortunate that annual reports, save for statistical summaries, have been discontinued since 1930. A chronological record of development is thereby interrupted, and a valuable means of disseminating information to the community about the work and problems of the juvenile court is lost.

In 1912 in his annual report Judge Frater recommended legislation for mothers' pensions, and in 1913 the law was passed. Amended and broadened in 1915 and 1919, the law was administered by the court through a special division of the probation department until about two years ago when new legislation transferred it to the State Department of Social Security.

About five years ago the court instituted, through appointment of a worker designated a "council coordinator," a countywide development of coordinating councils. A total of nineteen neighborhood councils have been established. They vary in activity but in general they operate through monthly meetings, studying community causative factors of juvenile delinquency and attempting in divers ways to provide means for the reduction of juvenile misbehavior and for the building up of facilities for healthful play.

LAW AND JURISDICTION

In King County the judges of the superior court designate one of their number to hear juvenile cases in a court known as the juvenile court, which has original jurisdiction over delinquent, dependent and neglected children under the age of eighteen years. The law provides the juvenile court with exclusive original jurisdiction in such cases. If wardship is established before the child attains its eighteenth birthday the court may retain jurisdiction until the child is twenty-one,¹ even though the child be married. It has concurrent jurisdiction over adults who are charged with contributing to the delinquency or dependency of children. For the most part such cases are handled in the criminal division of the superior court. A provision authorizing jury trials in juvenile courts was eliminated from the law by an amendment in 1937. No children under the age of sixteen years may be held in a jail, common lockup or police station.

The judge may appoint probation officers at salaries to be fixed by the board of county commissioners. He may appoint the head of the detention home. He has the power also to appoint an unpaid "board of visitation" made up of four citizens whose duty it is to visit as often as twice a year all institutions receiving children from the juvenile court.

Probation officers are required to make written reports in every case brought before the court. The investigation record and report must be withheld from public inspection but must be available for inspection by the child, its parents or guardian, its attorney, and to other persons who may

¹ This provision of the law is rarely, if ever, invoked.

secure a special order from the court. These records are termed "unofficial records of the court" and may be destroyed by the judge at will when or before the child reaches the age of twenty-one years. The law should be amended so that the records shall be open only by order of the court.

The court has the power to exclude the general public from the courtroom, admitting only those persons who have a direct interest in the case. Any child has a right to request a private hearing.

There are eighteen definitions of dependency, some of which by strict construction should more properly be definitions of delinquency and neglect. The definitions of delinquency need clarification and modernizing. In many respects, however, the present law is an adequate one. Both the present law, and the one prepared by the judge and other interested citizens and presented to the last two sessions of the legislature, require careful study and need revision to conform with the standard law developed by the National Probation Association.

PHYSICAL SETTING

It was an early design of the pioneers in juvenile court work in Seattle to provide a "children's building" not only for the work of the court and its staff but also for the use of "all auxiliary enterprises for child welfare which desire to make use of it." Time proved the latter concept to be over-ambitious, but the building has served well in centralizing all the work of the court for over a quarter of a century.

The juvenile court building is well located on a hill above the business section of the city on a plot 120 by 196 feet. Constructed of steel and concrete, with a veneer of red burlap brick, it is colonial in style and is made in the form of a T. A well-kept lawn and shrubs adorn the Broadway side. Wide lawns extend many feet to the rear and serve as playgrounds for the children. A high board fence separates the boys' side from the girls'. The outer bounds are hedged in by high board fences surmounted by strands of barbed wire.

The entire front on the first or main floor is given over to the offices of the probation staff and to the courtroom. An entrance is provided to the reception room of the detention home which occupies the upper and rear parts of the building. A more complete description of the layout and facilities of the latter will be made in a subsequent chapter.

The Courtroom Facing upon quiet back lawns with no distractions from traffic or other street noises, is the courtroom. Easily accessible and adequate in size, it is suitably furnished with simple desks for the judge and the clerk of the court, and chairs for witnesses and interested

parties. Well selected pictures are upon the walls and a silk flag stands at the right of the judge's desk. There are no chambers to which the court may retire, but one of the staff rooms is used when occasion demands. The judge enters the courtroom from a door in the rear; parents, witnesses and friends enter from the main hallway and children who have been detained enter through a door connecting detention home and courtroom. The space and setting are wholly appropriate for the purposes of the court.

Staff Quarters The main floor at the front of the building is shared by the clerk of the court, the council coordinator and the probation staff. The large reception hall, the clerk's office with records vault, the room in which the council coordinator works, three washrooms and a stairway to the basement consume a large part of the floor space. Six rooms remain for seven probation officers, including the chief, and one room for files which are handled by the chief's secretary. One stenographer works in the office of the council coordinator, while the one remaining clerical worker, who is exchange operator, receptionist and part time stenographer, works at a desk in a corner of the reception hall.

The offices of the chief and of the four women workers of the probation staff are light and airy and are suitable for the conduct of private interviews. The two men officers share one small room, an arrangement which renders difficult the conduct of thorough interview and of case work treatment.

Taken as a whole the unit was constructively planned and has absorbed until recently the increase of staff and extension of operation over the years. In some respects it is now unsatisfactory and needs rearrangement and alteration to conform to present and contemplated uses.

COURT HEARINGS

Juvenile Court
Philosophy

It is part of the basic philosophy of the juvenile court that its hearings, which are never designated as trials nor regarded as such, should be informal, private, friendly and clinical in their approach to the problem of the particular child in this crisis in his life. The juvenile court is a children's agency which has the gravest of problems to consider, that of the delinquent child who is brought to the court usually at the point where he has violated the law.

It is necessary to establish the facts of his delinquency so that the court may take jurisdiction. However, usually the facts of the overt act itself are already evident and admitted. So far as the child and the disposition to be made of the case are concerned, the offense is far less important than the boy himself or the setting in which he is living. Of great importance are such things as his relationship to his parents, to the other members of his family, the discipline of the home, his school experience and his happiness in school, how he plays, and in what he is interested. Much more time may be spent during a hearing by a careful judge in evaluating such factors as these than in dwelling on the particular circumstance of the escapade in which the boy has engaged.

Everything possible should therefore be done to draw out the child, the parents, the witnesses and others who may have something to contribute to the picture of the boy in his present predicament. The attitude of the judge, the probation officer, the police officer, in fact of everyone concerned has an immediate effect on the responsiveness of the

child. Anything which formalizes the hearing or tends to check friendly witnesses in their spontaneous contributions or to keep anyone concerned from being frank and outspoken, is detrimental to the case.

The arrangements for the hearing and the procedures which follow are of grave importance to the emotional well-being of a child experiencing his first contact with the authority of the state. Unhappy incidents occurring here may frustrate or postpone the success of painstaking procedures and techniques. Bewilderment and resentment alike are intensified by the presence of too many observers, by any procedure which savors of an adult criminal trial.

The experience of the best juvenile courts in the country over a long period of years has developed certain standards for juvenile court hearings. Reduction of the number present in the courtroom to a minimum means that only those who have a direct legitimate interest in the case should be present; witnesses should be admitted only when they are giving evidence pertinent to the case; probation officers and other court workers should appear only in cases in which they are concerned.

Swearing of witnesses often when there is little to be gained by having statements made under oath is a practice taken over from adult criminal procedure and can be eliminated in the juvenile court except in rare cases involving controversy where the honesty of witnesses may be questioned, or where an appeal may be taken such as over the custody of a child. The average person put under the unusual and to him unnatural restraint of an oath is likely to limit his testimony to bare facts and to hesitate about telling vital things in the child's situation which the court needs to know, and which usually come out spontaneously if the

formality of an oath is dispensed with.

Similarly, insistence on only first hand evidence in the juvenile court is a hangover from criminal practice, which happily is reduced to a minimum under the guidance of progressive judges. Formal adherence to the rules of evidence is rarely necessary in the juvenile court. Indirect evidence, secured through informal questioning and evaluated by the judge, may be vastly more important than direct evidence in the particular case. The opinion of a dependable witness as to the child's happiness in his home, for instance, often enlightens the judge, and what those concerned with the case tell spontaneously, if encouraged to do so, may open up avenues of understanding which would otherwise remain closed. What would be considered inadmissible evidence in a criminal court may be a valuable contribution in a juvenile court hearing where the laws of evidence can be relaxed in most cases and the procedure is clinical.

The presence of attorneys, appearing in defense of delinquent children, is again a transfer from procedure in the criminal court. The assumption is that the child is on trial; that he is entitled to representation and will have a better chance at the hands of the court if his parents employ a lawyer to protect his interests. If we hold to the concept of the juvenile court as a social agency whose whole program is for and not against the child, we can easily see that defense attorneys are unnecessary. There is no prosecutor who represents the cause of the state against the child. Instead there is a judge whose sole objective is to find out, through his investigators and other social workers, and through his own judgment of the facts brought out in the hearing, what is the best thing to do for the retraining of the boy or girl before him who has gotten into difficulty

with the law. There are no legal arguments nor summations to be made, and the child needs no one to speak or plead for him in a situation like this. The court itself is ever vigilant for the legal rights of the children brought before it.

Attorneys in many communities with progressive juvenile courts have come to understand the philosophy and the method of the juvenile court and to regard their services as superfluous. Employing a lawyer is an unfair financial burden on these clients, usually poor parents who can ill afford such professional assistance. Where it is known that attorneys do not appear in the juvenile court, parents no longer seek to get better treatment for their children by going to a lawyer. Those parents whose financial circumstances make such services entirely out of the question do not then feel that they are at a disadvantage, and that they are less likely to get justice for their children than are the more prosperous parents who have legal aid.

Stenographic reporting of a juvenile court hearing is another carryover from adult trials which can be almost wholly eliminated. This is another check on the spontaneity of those participating in a hearing. It is part of the function of a good probation officer to summarize everything essential which comes out in a court hearing. This then becomes a part of the social case history. A transcript of testimony is cumbersome and superfluous. In fact it is not really necessary for the clerk of the court to be present at the hearings as this tends to formalize and stiffen them.

Court hearings in Seattle are held Monday, Wednesday and Friday at 9.30 to 12 o'clock in the morning. If cases are many or long, hearings

are continued in the afternoon. Present during hearings are the chief, the clerk of the court, the worker in charge of the case and workers or specialists from other agencies and clinics. Outsiders often are present, with permission of the court. The detention home superintendent sits through many of the hearings, though seldom called upon to furnish information or to participate in case discussions. No doubt this is a carryover from her earlier role of chief adviser to the court on girls' cases but it is unnecessary to have her appear except when she is testifying. Frequently one of the men workers is in the courtroom although his cases are not under discussion. The chief need not be present so much of the time although he should be available on court mornings. Unnecessary court attendance wastes time which might better be used for other duties.

In addition to professional personnel there are others whose presence should be largely if not entirely eliminated. Early in his term the judge, in an effort to arouse the community to awareness of its juvenile problem, made it possible for representatives of civic, service and social groups to attend hearings. This practice still continues although whatever lay education may come from such attendance seems more than counterbalanced by the negative effects upon the individual child. It has happened that some of these visitors have been present at hearings of children from their own neighborhood. The efforts of the coordinating council and the appearance in court of these representatives over the past few years should by now have accomplished their contemplated purpose of community awakening. It is therefore recommended that such attendance be eliminated and that the judge and the chief continue educa-

tional work through personal conferences with such groups.

It is evident also that the judge has sought to give practical demonstrations of the work of the juvenile court and the problems encountered to students of social case work and sociology in the university. He has made a working agreement with the department of sociology for selected students to attend hearings and they come in small groups, sitting in the rear of the room, following the course of the hearing and subsequently going over the case record and files with the chief. The desire thus to cooperate with the university is commendable. However, students in sociology are developing a broad approach to community problems. Social work students, on the contrary, are concerned in getting a case work angle. It would therefore be well to eliminate the attendance of sociology students and make it possible for only certain selected students in social case work, who already have a professional approach, to attend on a training basis. It was learned from outside sources that sociology students who had attended hearings and read the case records were visiting the children involved at school or elsewhere for the purpose of interviewing them. This practice is certainly detrimental to good case work.

There is an almost constant passing to and from the courtroom while hearings are in progress. Opening and shutting of doors, shuffling about of witnesses and others present in the courtroom prove most distracting. With a little forethought in assembling material and organizing the order of hearings this difficulty could be avoided. Another discordant note is the frequent opening and closing of the communicating door between the courtroom and the detention home, accompanied by a rattling of keys and

snapping of locks. A child could not escape from the detention home or the courtroom in the course of a hearing and this locking and unlocking introduce a suggestion of jail routine.

Children brought to court by their parents or relatives, and others who have been in the detention home, are usually clean. Those older boys brought from the city or county jail often present a dirty and dishevelled appearance, like vagrants in police court, and are obviously embarrassed by their untidiness. If the juvenile court is to help boys to a sense of responsibility and self respect some thought should be given to their appearance in a dignified court hearing. Until a change of program is effected in the detention home, clean-up facilities for these boys coming from the jails should be provided.

An informal atmosphere prevails in the court. The judge sits at his desk, a chair is placed at his left facing him, for the child, behind whom sit the worker on the case and the chief probation officer. To the judge's right is the clerk's desk. Parents and witnesses sit behind the probation officer. There is a general feeling of friendliness. Certain procedures in the court, however, are suggestive of a trial rather than a hearing. Swearing of witnesses is a regular practice, and the clerk of the court takes stenographic notes during the hearing. It was noted that some children glanced furtively and self-consciously over their shoulders at this recording process.

Attorneys appear frequently in the court. Judge Long, widely known and respected among members of the bar, early in his term encouraged lawyers to come in so that they would understand juvenile court procedure. These lawyers now know that parent and child will be accorded full and

fair hearing. Many of them are no doubt convinced from their experience with the court that their legal services are an unnecessary tax upon the parents involved. It is suggested that from this point on, except for cases involving legal issues, they be encouraged to appear only when they are friends of the family and to go into court more in that capacity to give information to the judge than as legal advisers or defense attorneys.

Constructive hearings are characterized by carefully marshalled information prepared in the preliminary investigation, by a thoughtful dispassionate consideration of the facts in the case and the tentative plan of treatment evolved in accordance with the findings. Careful case supervision will result in the presentation of well arranged reports replete with information, and in the formulation of a tentative plan for the child. A pre-hearing consultation between judge, case supervisor and staff worker makes the judge, who has read and digested the report, better prepared to understand the situation. Courtroom time is not then consumed in reading reports and unnecessary repetition of facts. The judge is not then compelled either to draw up plans during the hearing or to postpone or continue cases because of incomplete information and lack of plan.

The cases of two boys, H _____ and M _____, observed during the study, illustrate some of the difficulties of inadequate preparation. A joint hearing, with both families and witnesses present simultaneously with students and workers from other agencies, was characterized by resentful petulance on the part of the probation officer who lacked understanding and insight, who had not made a satisfactory investigation and who had not done effective case work with the boys. The boys obviously felt also an unfriendly attitude on the part of the judge. The probation

officer had no understanding of the viewpoint of these adolescents, had no program for their adjustment and indulged in an indignant byplay with the judge, attacking the boys and criticizing the parents. It seemed evident that one boy, unusually promising, needed a change of environment, the painstaking efforts of a friendly worker not impressed with his authority, who could penetrate the superficial shell he had thrown about himself. Psychological and medical examinations were obviously required. The boy had goals, needed opportunity for creative expression and counsel on problems caused by his immaturity. At the close of the hearing the judge, dissatisfied with the tone and trend of the hearing, called for a round-table discussion, asking criticism and suggestions. Later in the day he called the boy to his chambers for a friendly personal conference.

In another instance the probation officer (not the one in the case previously cited) displayed failure to follow through on the most routine of all investigation processes, securing a report from an interested agency reported by the Social Service Exchange. It was necessary to continue this case which otherwise might have been disposed of promptly.

Multiple hearings involving several children in the same case are conducted en masse in many courts. A better way is to continue the group hearing only until all necessary testimony of police and others regarding the offense has been given. From that point the cases may be considered individually. On one occasion during the study a total of twenty-three persons, including several families, were present in the courtroom while three boys were being heard on a delinquency petition. The physical setting of the courtroom and the outer offices are such that arrangements for separate hearings could be effected without difficulty.

Keen insight and a patient tolerant attitude make court hearings a constructive process. Most children in court are inarticulate. Anxious and uncertain over their immediate situation, they are likely to answer questions with a simple yes or no and must be encouraged to talk freely. Sarcasm on the part of anyone connected with the court has a withering effect. Failure in attitude or approach to the child is destructive to the confidence and good-will which need to be maintained with both the child and his parents.

Judge Long, in the opinion of the investigators and all outsiders genuinely interested in the work of the court, handles many cases extremely well. Suggestions as to improved procedures have earnestly been solicited by him. More consistent exclusion of witnesses is advisable. It was observed that some people stayed through a hearing and sometimes were present during the hearing preceding the one in which they were concerned. The judge does sometimes talk with children alone. He will have time to do this oftener when the whole routine of the hearings is better organized. Parents also can and should talk more freely away from the child who is a problem to them. This is true not only when the parents are to be criticized (a point about which the judge is careful) but also when freer comment on the child's reactions and the inability of parents to control the situation is needed.

Cases Heard Table I furnishes comparative statistics of children brought to court between 1911 and 1939. The totals by year cover both formal and informal hearings and the grand total for the twenty-eight years is 46,928. It is probable that the total hearings in the years from 1905 to 1911 for which no reports are available would

TABLE I

COMPARATIVE STATISTICS OF CHILDREN BROUGHT TO COURT, 1911 - 1939¹

YEAR	1911	1912	1913	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924	Subtotal
<u>Delinquent</u>															
Boys	611	641	684	639	576	536	443	335	503	841	765	913	957	838	9,282
Girls	160	198	190	158	133	81	108	105	115	145	232	225	232	246	2,328
Total	771	839	874	797	709	617	551	440	618	986	997	1138	1189	1084	11,610
<u>Dependent</u>															
Boys	211	152	185	230	252	241	149	90	146	221	179	188	193	247	2,684
Girls	125	158	127	220	223	229	122	113	133	224	169	319	227	263	2,652
Total	336	310	312	450	475	470	271	203	279	445	348	507	420	510	5,336
Total Boys	822	793	869	869	828	777	592	425	649	1062	944	1101	1150	1085	11,966
Total Girls	285	356	317	378	356	310	230	218	248	369	401	544	459	509	4,780
Grand Total	1107	1149	1186	1247	1184	1087	822	643	897	1431	1345	1645	1609	1594	16,946
Per cent of In- formal cases ²	49	57	67	47	39	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	54	---
YEAR	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	Total
<u>Delinquent</u>															
Boys	979	1146	1256	1355	1612	1555	1274	1043	1152	1019	913	766	992	1000	25,344
Girls	331	326	322	388	385	371	344	344	288	285	261	292	290	225	6,780
Total	1310	1472	1578	1743	1997	1926	1618	1387	1440	1304	1174	1058	1282	1225	32,124
<u>Dependent</u>															
Boys	381	289	240	399	396	366	411	267	325	280	247	335	381	331	7,332
Girls	364	313	289	327	421	365	348	318	327	326	264	379	393	386	7,472
Total	745	602	529	726	817	731	759	585	652	606	511	714	774	717	14,804
Total Boys	1360	1435	1496	1754	2008	1921	1685	1310	1477	1299	1160	1101	1373	1331	32,676
Total Girls	695	639	611	715	806	736	692	662	615	611	525	671	683	611	14,252
Grand Total	2055	2074	2107	2469	2814	2657	2377	1972	2092	1910	1685	1772	2056	1942	46,928
Per cent of In- formal cases ²	47	55	--	50	--	--	49	50	56	52	46	43	49	52	---

¹Taken from available annual reports 1911-1930 inclusive, annual statistical reports 1931-1938 inclusive.

²Incomplete, as not all annual reports included this figure. Percentages 1931-1938 inclusive were secured from dispositions "Parents and Children Advised," "Returned to Institutions," and "Sent to Other Jurisdictions," presumably the majority of informal cases in each of these years. Informal cases do not come before the judge.

swell the figure to approximately 50,000. The accuracy of these figures will not be defended, nor will the listed percentages of informal cases, though it seems that they are reasonably correct. It is interesting to note that 1918 (a war year) presented the fewest cases, 425 boys, and 218 girls, and that 1929 (the boom and crash year) presented the most cases, 2,008 boys and 806 girls. These figures are not to be construed as individual or new cases. They represent hearings not children. Informal hearings are those held by the probation officers, not by the judge.

Dispositions Table III, made up from the docket of the court, gives a rough picture of dispositions in hearing held from January 4 to February 3, 1939. It is to be understood that the total hearings, 126, do not represent all new cases, some being held over from a previous month or having repeated hearings during the month.

This table offers some support for the statement made earlier in this section concerning continuation of hearings for lack of full information and case plan. In almost thirty per cent of the hearings an immediate disposition was not made as may be seen from totals of columns "Under Consideration," "Continued Subject to Call," and "Continued."

Illustrative of the limited use of outright probation is the total of 9 cases, as against 18 cases wherein probation is ordered after an institutional commitment is made and suspended. It is significant that of these 18 cases 17 were boys. Custom, perhaps an echo from adult courts, rather than the intent to give an added punch to probation, is the usual reason for suspending commitments. Little good purpose may be found in the practice, and indeed values detrimental to both child and officer may ensue from many such dispositions.

TABLE II

DISPOSITIONS
Court Docket, January 4 - February 3, 1939

DATE OF HEARING	TOTAL HEARINGS	Under Consideration		Continued Subject to Call		Continued		Commitment ¹		PROBATION				Other		Total Hearings	
										With Suspended Commitment ²		Without Suspended Commitment					
		Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
January 4	6			1		4								1		6	
6	10		1			4	1	3	1							7	3
9	6							1	1	3					1	4	2
11	6							1	1	2			1		1	3	3
13	8				2		2	1	1						2	1	7
16	12			1		1	2		1	3				1	3	6	6
18	11	3				4	1							1	2	8	3
20	9	1				1	1	2						3	1	7	2
23	5									4		1				5	
25	6			1		1		2		1		1				6	
27	15				1		4				1	2	2	3	2	5	10
30	11					4		4	1					1	1	9	2
February 1	12					1	1	1	2	2		1			4	5	7
3	9								1	2			1	4	1	6	3
TOTAL HEARINGS	126 ³	4	1	3	3	20	12	15	9	17	1	5	4	14	18	78	48

¹ Includes nine commitments of boys and girls to the State Custodial School

² In most instances probation supervision can be assumed

³ Not all new cases, many continued several times

Interesting too, though also of limited value, is Table III, showing dispositions in formal hearings for the year 1938. Delinquents and dependents are not shown separately. When questioned about the table the chief said, "In one hearing there might be four children involved and four different dispositions might be made, while to take another angle, one child within the course of a year might have been sent to Ryther Center, committed to and released from the parental school, and then committed to the State Training School." Four hundred and eight children were placed in institutions. Asterisks indicate probable placements for delinquents.

Other dispositions total 523. "Probationary Supervision," numbering 277, presumably includes both delinquents and dependents, and probation with and without suspended commitment. "Individual Supervision" places responsibility upon an individual in the child's own or a foster home, or upon someone who has signified a willingness to sponsor the child. This disposition was made in 75 hearings. One may assume safely that many of these children required close case work supervision and treatment either by court or outside agency case workers, not just the friendly oversight of an untrained person. "Continued Indefinitely," accounting for 69 hearings, is similar to "Continued Subject to Call," both connoting no supervision of the child but the possibility of reopening the hearings at any time. A total then of 144 cases disposed of in these two ways suggests the need for taking fuller responsibility for the welfare of these children or disavowing it entirely. "Next Friend," totaling 16, is a term applied to the person given authority by the court to consent to the adoption of a child, obviously in a dependency situation. Finally the

TABLE III

OFFICIAL HEARINGS
King County Juvenile Court, 1938

Dispositions¹

Children placed in institutions.	408
Washington Children's Home.	59
Catholic Charities.	11
Welfare Department.	92
Custodial School.	35
Briscoe School.	1
Hospitals -- County	11
Firland.	14
*State Training School	62
*Parental School	50
*House of Good Shepherd.	21
*Ruth School	7
*Florence Crittenden Home.	6
Seattle Children's Home	13
Missionary Sisters.	5
*Ryther Child Center	13
Theodora Home	2
Deaf School	1
*Pacific Protective Society.	5
Other dispositions	523
Next friend	16
Probationary supervision.	277
Individual supervision.	75
Continued indefinitely.	69
Dismissed	86
Total disposition.	931

¹ The present statistical method does not furnish separately dispositions in delinquency and dependency hearings. Asterisks indicate probable delinquency dispositions by institution.

number of cases dismissed after hearing was 86.

This table, which baffles exact interpretation and makes hazardous definite statements or conclusions because exact data were unobtainable without extended research, furnishes concrete evidence of a need, discussed later in the report, for a complete revision of statistical procedures.

One conclusion, however, is inescapable, that with careful intake designed to bring only appropriate cases before the court, with improved preliminary investigation and presentation of tentative case plans, and with closer supervision of the child assured, the judge will find his calendar less crowded, will feel more secure in making dispositions, and undoubtedly will be inclined to grant outright probation with much more frequency.

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

The chief probation officer is the chief executive officer of the juvenile court. In general his duties and powers are of three kinds: to assist the judge in disposing of cases, to direct the probation force, and to maintain relationships with outside agencies. In his first capacity, which is quasi-judicial, he passes upon all complaints and petitions, sifts out cases for the court, presents cases at the court's hearings, advises the judge as to their disposition, hears and adjusts cases in the first instance as a referee, and executes the court's order. In his second capacity he organizes and supervises the probation staff, divides the work among the assistant probation officers, assigns cases to them for supervision, . . . passes upon all cases of violating probation and discharging from probation, trains probation officers and volunteers, presides over staff conferences, and is responsible for the entire administrative work of the court. In his third capacity he maintains cooperative . . . relationships with outside public or private agencies or institutions. He often exercises general supervision over the detention home and the clinic, if they are attached to the court. He often has the additional work of keeping in touch, by visiting or by some other means, with the institutions to which children are sent, who are still wards of the court. He has to maintain a close relation with all social agencies to acquaint himself with available resources of the community. From this multiplicity of duties and powers no one can fail to see the importance of the office of the chief probation officer.¹

In many cities the judge of the juvenile court regards the chief probation officer as the administrator of the probation department and all social services in the court. At the present time the organization of the Seattle court staff is such that the judge, who is pressed for time, has three department heads reporting directly to him with no one person wholly responsible for the administration of the total program. (See Chart I)

The chief is responsible to the court for the organization and administration of the probation department consisting of boys' and girls'

¹ Lou, Herbert H., Juvenile Courts in the U. S., pp. 90-91

CHART I

PRESENT ORGANIZATION OF JUVENILE COURT

KING COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT

County Clerk ----- Juvenile Division ----- County Commissioners
Legal Records William G. Long, Judge Budget

PROBATION DEPARTMENT

Chief Probation Officer (Mr. Kelly)

<u>Investigation</u>	<u>Boys' Dept.</u>	<u>Girls' Dept.</u>	<u>Clerical</u>
Miss Ball	Mr. Miller Mr. McCurdy	Mrs. Castberg Miss Hughes Miss Logan	Miss Dawson ¹ Mrs. Nelson ² Miss Jacobson ³

DETENTION HOME

Superintendent (Mrs. Maring)

Night and Ass't. Supt.	(Mrs. Houghton)
Boys' Attendant	(Mrs. Wamsley)
Girls' "	(Mrs. Woods)
Assistant "	(Mrs. Colwell)
Kitchen "	(Mrs. Charles)
Building "	(Mr. Houghton)
	(Mr. Houghton, Jr.) ⁴

COORDINATING COUNCILS

Coordinator (Mr. Wilson)

¹Stenographer for chief, two men case workers, files

²Stenographer for investigator, collections

³Stenographer for three women case workers, switchboard and reception duties

⁴Assistant building attendant (maintenance only)

work, investigations and clerical services. The superintendent of the detention home maintains a courteous relationship with the probation department but is responsible only to the court for the conduct of the home. The council coordinator constitutes the third separate unit, with no direct relationship with the chief. He reports to and is responsible only to the judge.

So loosely integrated an organization presents confusing aspects to the community and fails of the coordinated performance which must come if the juvenile court is to produce an effective, efficient program in pursuance of its work. Perforce it imposes a difficult burden of responsibility without real authority upon the chief probation officer who should be the only executive head. Judge Long inherited the present organization (except for the coordination project) and, aware of the problems involved, has been anxious to effect a constructive change.

As the result of the study a complete reorganization plan for administration is proposed. (See Chart II) Under this plan full responsibility for the staff operations and program is centered in the chief probation officer. Staff additions are suggested, the discontinuance of one post is urged, and certain replacements, discussed elsewhere in this report, are recommended.

As shown in the chart of proposed organization, the chief probation officer will have directly responsible to him two department heads. The case supervisor (a staff addition) will be in charge of case work. In effect the supervisor will be a deputy chief probation officer, although not an assistant general executive. In the detention home the superintendent in charge will be subordinate to the chief and with him will coordinate

CHART II

PROPOSED ORGANIZATION OF JUVENILE COURT

KING COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT

County Clerk --- Juvenile Division --- County Commissioners
 Legal Records William G. Long, Judge Budget

Chief Probation Officer

PROBATION DEPARTMENT

*Case Supervisor

<u>Intake</u> ¹	<u>Boys' Dept.</u>	<u>Girls' Dept.</u>	<u>Investigation</u>
	Case Worker	Case Worker	Case Worker ²
	Case Worker	Case Worker	
	*Case Worker	Case Worker	

*Statistician-Accountant

DETENTION HOME

Superintendent

Night and Ass't. Supt.
 Boys' Attendant
 Girls' "
 Assistant "
 Kitchen "
 Building "

Council Coordinator³

CLERICAL SERVICES

Stenographer
 Stenographer
 *Stenographer
 *Stenographer
 Exchange Operator,
 Receptionist, Typist

*New positions suggested for 1939-40 budget
 Consult text for amplification of the following:

¹A separate functional unit, part time services of one case worker during reorganization

²Retained during period of reorganization

³It is recommended that this position be discontinued. If, by decision of the court, it is temporarily retained, good organization requires this placement under the chief.

detention closely with the work of the probation staff. The chief will supervise directly the statistician-accountant (a suggested staff addition) and will be responsible for the proper conduct of clerical services. If the council coordinator is temporarily retained, it would be desirable to have him clear his contemplated program through and be guided by the chief probation officer.

In the probation department the case supervisor will be responsible for the proper administration of four separate units, the intake, boys' department, girls' department, and investigation, the latter to be retained as a separate function only if it proves practicable after a period of study. It necessarily follows that the case supervisor and the superintendent of the detention home will have the closest of relationships in order that the work of the two departments be properly coordinated. It follows also that there should be a close relationship between the case supervisor and the statistician-accountant. The latter, partly engaged in the collection of support money on court orders, should know the particular case situation before undertaking collection work. The statistician should also evolve with the case supervisor the simplest yet clearest methods of assembling really worthwhile statistics. The case supervisor should assume responsibility for giving case summaries to other agencies, a function now carried by one of the stenographers who gives such information over the telephone. The chief, responsible for the assignment of all cases, will determine the proper distribution of stenographic service so that workers will have full opportunity to record their findings on investigation, and their chronological case histories of the progress of case treatment.

The addition of a case supervisor to the staff will serve not only to bring the performance of the case workers to a higher level but also to relieve the chief of much detail work he now performs, and free him for larger administrative matters. No recommendation is made for the establishment of a separate intake unit at this time. During the course of reorganization the part time services of one case worker may be devoted to intake under the direction of the case supervisor. Later the results of the new intake procedure can be evaluated and if justified the position of intake worker can be established. It is to be noted that an additional case worker is suggested for the boys' department.

The position of statistician-accountant has been proposed. The statistics which have been secured up to this time are not sufficiently meaningful or complete for interpretation or evaluation of the court services. In fact there are no proper record data from which to draw dependable or discriminating statistics. Only a person trained in this field can properly do a statistician's job. As the position would not absorb full time, however, the work now being done on collections could be added to the duties of the statistician. Collections might be appreciably increased beyond their present high point if a trained person were employed to attend to that detail.

When better case work is done more stenographic help will be needed. The present stenographic force, each of whom has many other duties beside that of taking dictation, should be augmented by the employment of two more stenographers. The chief might analyze to good advantage certain work done on petitions and other legal forms by his secretary and a stenographer with a view to having some of this work accomplished by the clerk of the court.

The telephone operator-receptionist should not be given dictation on case records but should help on typing cards, or other simple work. The present combination is unworkable from several angles.

It is believed that this new administrative setup for organization of the court will bring definite improvement in technique and performance in case work, in investigations and in case records, in statistics, in collections on court orders, and in coordination between the probation department and the detention home.

Reorganization should clarify and strengthen the administrative authority of the chief both in the latter's relation to the judge and in chief-staff relationships. Relieved of case work responsibility by the case supervisor and strengthened in authority by the judge, the chief will be able to bring about a more orderly administrative policy and more uniform staff performance within defined limits and under specific regulations.

The case supervisor should assume the position of acting chief in the chief's absence. In the past one of the men workers has so acted. During such absences of the chief there has been no staff direction and much work has accumulated for the chief's return despite the fact that the acting chief has been on the staff for about seventeen years.

The chief should participate closely with the judge in matters of staff selection. This is vital in the present situation. Definite care must be exercised by judge and chief together in staff additions if a well balanced and harmonious personnel is to carry out an enlarged and improved program. In this connection the chief should develop personnel records for staff members who may be retained, and should secure professional

histories of those who may be added. Selection of new staff members should be made on the basis of a competitive examination. This would be an excellent move so far as the community is concerned because it would point the way to support for higher standards in personnel. Those qualifying on a written examination could then be given an oral examination which in its essence is an evaluation of personality, training and experience. There is no better answer to claims for political preferment than machinery of this sort for appointments. It insures an eligible list of really qualified people. After selection a probationary period of 3 to 6 months may be established so that the new worker can be observed actually on the job and in his relationships to the chief and others. After this time the worker would be assured of a permanent position.

Policies concerning vacations, leaves of absence and sick leaves should be clearly established. Time sheets, serving the dual purpose of keeping account of illness or absence and reporting the workers' whereabouts in the field on a daily schedule, should be maintained. The development of daily work sheets for the staff would make possible the preparation of accurate and valuable monthly reports which would yield much data on the activities and program of the department. Staff meetings, held monthly until January 1939, when they were discontinued, should be resumed as vital to staff training.

Procedures In the increasing trend toward the handling of dependency cases by welfare departments and other social agencies, recourse to the court becomes necessary only for adjudication of legal questions of custody or support order. Thus the court, the probation department and the detention home may concentrate on cases of delinquency.

Intake services, if they are initiated during reorganization, will effect better clearance in dependency cases. It goes without saying that the chief and the case supervisor will have to study the problem of intake carefully. They will gradually formulate in cooperation with other agencies a definite policy, which then should be made known to all present sources of referral. It will take concerted action on the part of all agencies, both public and private, including the juvenile court, to define policies of intake and referral of children's cases.

Assignment of cases for investigation and supervision is a function of the chief probation officer or the case supervisor. This may be conveniently done on a district basis, but the lines cannot be too exactly drawn as cases may be assigned to some extent according to the special abilities of the worker. Some values are achieved by territorial or area districting from the standpoint of conservation of travel and familiarity with local resources. A change of residence for the probationer need not mean a change of worker - in fact, reassignment of cases should be kept to a minimum. Nevertheless real care needs to be taken in new case assignments as well as in evaluation of present district case loads. There is not now a definite policy of assignment and many cases seem to be given to officers in a routine way by a clerical worker.

Competent and comprehensive current records will indicate accurately the number of investigations assigned to an officer and the total active load of supervision cases. Equitable distribution can be maintained when the load of each officer is exactly known. Equalization will assure fuller preparation of cases for hearing so that they may be carried through to conclusion without frequent continuance for lack of information and plan.

Another real issue lies in the making of wardships which are declared over-freely in court hearings and often without real necessity. Subsequently they constitute real problems in administration and case work. The juvenile court may take jurisdiction over a child without declaring that child a ward. For the most part wardship need be declared only when it is demonstrable that the child's parents are incapable or absent, when there is viciousness in the home or when the child must be removed from its own home. Illustrative of the free use of wardships was a case observed during the study, of a child seven years old referred to the court on a petition charging theft from the mails. Investigation disclosed that the boy came from a good home, that he was ignorant of the nature of his act and obviously took the letters as a childish prank. A wardship, wholly unnecessary under the circumstances, was declared.

Cases placed under supervision without declaration of wardship may readily be closed when it is determined that case treatment has adjusted them satisfactorily. More care in intake procedure and in making wards will avert attempts by other agencies to refer unsuitable cases back to the court merely because they are still technically active as wardships even though no case work has been done on them by court workers for months if not years. The present unwieldy active case file system can be markedly reduced by elimination of many wardships.

Study should be given cases in which wardships have already been declared to determine real need for continuing wardship beyond the point where it seems the court has fulfilled its function. Certainly when supervision has long been discontinued there seems little value in retaining wardship which then becomes an empty legalistic mummery. If staff

addition and reorganization make possible supervision of children over the age of eighteen years, there would be more point to retaining wardships for older adolescents still needing case treatment. In other cases, however, wardships might well be discharged.

SPECIAL FUNCTION OF THE COURT

It is inevitable, it seems, that a conscientious judge of the juvenile court in his unique position as a leader of child welfare services in any community should view with real concern the many and difficult problems encountered by children who reside in underprivileged areas. It is inevitable too that he view unhappily the fact that his and his staff's efforts are ameliorative to those children only who come into direct contact with the court, while but scattered and unorganized efforts are made to prevent or reduce the relentless toll that is taken when basic childish urges for play and fun and happiness are dislocated. It is inevitable that he should cast about vigorously in the hope of setting in motion through an aroused community, added means of making deprived neighborhoods happier and better places in which children may develop orderly and useful lives.

Judge Long, conscious of the need for such community action, met with a small group of interested citizens in 1934 to discuss appropriate measures. Coordinating councils, initiated in California in 1919, had developed a type of organized community program through neighborhood groups designed to aid unadjusted children and to provide constructive recreation for children in deprived areas characterized by harmful conditions which were found to have a direct connection with high delinquency rates. The committee undertook a study of such councils with a view to their application to Seattle.

A Coordinating council was established in the university district in 1934, and soon the joint efforts of the American Legion, the Parent-Teacher

Association and others, sparked by the judge who assumed general chairmanship, resulted in the forming of other councils. In January 1936 a young college man who had specialized in physical education and recreation work was added to the court staff as council coordinator. At first he gave only part time to the formation of neighborhood councils but later, when relieved of other work in the probation department, he gave this work full time.

An advisory council, consisting of fifty to sixty leaders from educational, law enforcement, professional and lay fields, was developed. This group, which also included chairmen of local councils, met at monthly intervals to discuss plans for development of neighborhood and citywide projects. As a result of their meetings two principal citywide projects were put through, one a bicycle licensing ordinance designed to curb bicycle thefts which then were at a high point, the second a scheme of Halloween parties conducted under supervision to cut down the mischief caused by young celebrants. A toy loan project is now being undertaken.

Over a period of five years nineteen councils have been established, eleven in the city and eight in the county, each located in an area known to be high in delinquency rate. The areas covered were outlined as the result of early basic factfinding studies conducted by the councils. Maps were developed furnishing location by residence of delinquents known to the police and the juvenile court, and indicating the absence of recreational and leisure time activities, provision of which might reduce the incidence of juvenile misbehavior.

Each local council has undertaken its own program, some with studies, others with projects, and almost all have circulated detailed questionnaires

to procure various data. The coordinator is present at the monthly meeting of each local council and reports their activities and program periodically to the advisory committee. He prepares for issuance by the advisory board a coordinating council bulletin which contains accounts of neighborhood projects, reports of meetings and announcements of value to local groups. He aids in the preparation of council questionnaires and compiles statistics with aid from the National Youth Administration. At no time does he direct the program of neighborhood councils and for practical purposes his role might be termed that of liaison person. He reports on court and council activities to committees of the Welfare Council.

No real purpose can be served by the continuance of this position on the staff of the juvenile court since it cannot be contended that one of the purposes of the court is to act as a community organization agent. Its capacity on the other hand as a reagent in the chemistry of community planning is undoubted. The judge is convinced that through the coordinating council program Seattle has become progressively aware of the situation of the underprivileged child, particularly in the deteriorated areas of the city. A pamphlet, "Heading Off Crime at the Source," in the writing of which he collaborated, has been an effective educational device. Leadership has been developed in local councils and through the advisory board to the point where he feels it possible and desirable to relinquish his direction. This he has been doing gradually as his keen interest and activity in the development of strong character building social agency programs has increased.

The purpose of coordinating councils has broadened considerably in the past few years and the prevention of juvenile delinquency has become

but one of many aims in the well organized and oriented council. With this expansion in program, coupled with the impending reorganization of his department, the judge is of the opinion that it is well to withdraw from leadership in the program, retaining of course an active interest in the councils. He feels that a constructive step might be taken by the Welfare Council in effecting a close relationship with coordinating councils. The Youth Service Committee of the Welfare Council has a neighborhood council at present known as the Warren Avenue project. The judge is hopeful that the new chest and council executive will, as soon as it is possible, study such an integration of the coordinating councils as a division of the existing community organization. To this end he has been meeting with the executives and the board of the Council offering his assistance.

It is his plan to retain temporarily on his staff the council coordinator in order that the councils will not suffer loss of interest and morale from the withdrawal of liaison services, and that the benefits of a recent citywide survey financed jointly by King county and the WPA will not be lost. This project was initiated by the judge and was directed jointly with Dr. Norman S. Hayner of the sociology department of the University of Washington.

The court can still furnish data valuable for community planning in child welfare and the judge and probation staff should continue active cooperation with the various councils. The judge's efforts to keep active the interest of many lay people in the juvenile court and in juvenile delinquency in the community can thus be effectively continued.

CASE WORK TECHNIQUES

Informal Cases Simply defined, an informal case is one which is brought to the attention of the probation department, usually by the police, the school, or parents, but which does not seem sufficiently serious for the making of a formal petition for hearing before the court. Informal cases constitute a large part of the work of any good probation department. Not infrequently the informal case requires a good deal of time, perhaps even more time than some of the formal cases. Frequently excellent results can be secured by straight case work without legal hearing, suspended commitment, or any other judicial disposition. This means that real discrimination must be exercised by someone. Here again a good intake procedure is very important. Some of the informal cases coming to the probation department in this way should be routed to other agencies, after investigation if not immediately. Some are neighborhood squabbles or very trivial misdemeanors which do not justify further action by any agency. Still others may be of serious import and call for a very careful investigation, interviews with parents and others and frequently a continuing informal kind of supervision. It takes both experience and skill to determine at what point an informal case should be converted into a formal one and brought to the attention of the court.

The 1938 statistical report for King county, made up from very sketchy card records, shows a total of 1011 informal cases, 80 more than the total of formal cases for the year. One hundred and seventy-one were girls' cases and 840 were boys'. This is a very large number and a more critical study of the whole group would probably show that it could be

reduced considerably. Disposition in 902 of these cases is recorded simply as "parents and children advised." There is nothing to indicate in how many instances parents were referred to other community agencies.

Seven hundred and nineteen, or 71 per cent, appeared for the first time. This means that 29 per cent, or almost one third, have appeared at least twice. A good statistical system would show up the results of informal procedure and the significance of the total of repeated appearances. The first three months of 1939 show a considerable reduction of these informal cases but the reason for this is not clear. Up to April first there were 120, of which 91 were handled by the chief probation officer and the rest by one of the men officers.

The procedure in handling these cases in Seattle is shallow and dangerously superficial. The reason for this is that the staff for boys' work, which is the heavy end of the load, is inadequate both in number and in training. These cases may be handled by anyone who happens to be in the office at the time. They are not usually investigated and the procedure is simply an office interview, insufficient to bring out the facts of the situation. This may be a talk with the parents and child or may be an informal kind of hearing. Frequently it ends with giving the child a "talking to." Over and over on the simple card record appears the catch phrase, "advised and released." Only occasionally is clearance made with the Social Service Exchange and admittedly no supervision is given these cases.

A few cards were taken at random for examination.

J _____ G _____ in 1929 when he was six years old was brought in by the police with an older boy on a charge of stealing. He was "advised and released". Three years later, at the age of nine, he was brought in

by a school officer; advised and released. Again a few months later he was brought in by the police for profanity; advised and released. There was then an interval of one year when he was not heard from. In August 1933 the police brought him in for prowling through buildings. At this time J _____, who was ten years old, was again "advised and released to his father." The advice did not effect a reform, however, and two months later the police brought him in for stealing radiator caps. Once more he was advised and released. In March 1935 he was brought in by a post office inspector for stealing from mail boxes. Again the old remedy was applied.

The record does not state what eventually happened to him. The barrenness of this record speaks for itself. No investigation, no study of the child, no attempt to contact schools or other agencies who might have something to contribute to the solution of a boy's behavior problems. Handling a case in this way is obviously a waste of everybody's time, including that of the unfortunate little delinquent.

Another boy, J _____ C _____, who was eight years old at the time of his first appearance, was brought to the juvenile court on three separate occasions, in 1934, 1936, and 1937, on charges successively of dishonesty, disobedience, running away, and finally burglary. The same prescription was given in his case each time, "advised and released," but trouble continued. In the spring of 1938 he was brought in once as a runaway and a little later by the police for stealing. At this time more drastic action was taken and he was placed under suspended commitment to the Luther Burbank School. Meantime another agency had become interested in the case and the court record ceases. In the absence of any real information about this boy, other than that his father was dead and he was frequently in trouble, it is still evident that nothing was accomplished for him by the juvenile court.

These cases are good illustrations of the need for enlarging and improving the probation staff so that informal cases may have the thoughtful attention and careful follow-up which will prevent their developing into serious delinquency situations.

Out of Town All out of town inquiries are supposed to pass through
Inquiries the hands of the chief probation officer. Most of them

are turned over to the Intercity Bureau of the Public Welfare Department. Those retained by the chief probation officer are assigned to the staff for investigation. These amount to about fifty to seventy-five for the whole year. It is recommended that a chronological ledger listing be made of these requests and the disposition made, so that they may be checked up periodically.

Formal Cases The work done by the probation staff in formal cases, that is, the investigations and the supervision of children's cases, is so closely tied up with the characterization of staff personnel that it has been pretty well covered in the preceding section. The two replacements of women workers did not go into effect until the close of the study so there was neither opportunity nor occasion to review their work. The work of the investigator and of the one probation officer remaining on the staff on the girls' side has already been covered in the description of their qualifications.

Attention should be called, however, to the fact that one of the secretaries is assisting the investigator to a point beyond her proper function. She is really acting as assistant case worker, has occasional interviews both in person and on the telephone, and does some home visiting. Her work on collections also verges upon case work. This is a good illustration of the need of approaching this problem of collections from a case work angle. It should not be left to an inexperienced though intelligent and conscientious worker. It may be noted here that boys' cases have not had the benefit of thorough investigation before hearing. If the function of investigator is retained in the reorganization the work should include boys' as well as girls' cases.

Something more may be said of the work done in boys' cases by the two men officers. No branch of social work demands more of the worker than supervision of delinquent boys. The responsibility on the shoulders of the probation officer is a heavy one. When a boy fails on probation and has to be committed to an institution this is frequently the failure of the probation officer rather than of the child who is caught in a network of circumstance from which he can be extricated only by a skilled worker.

What does a probation officer do in working out what he calls "a plan of treatment" for a boy like this? He wants first of all to know the boy well, to understand what influences in his life have contributed to his present predicament, to help him change his point of view, develop his personality, and learn to like and to want things which will bring him more real satisfaction than he has had in misbehaving.

Probation does not mean just releasing a child with a reprimand or suspended sentence. Nor does it mean merely requiring him to report at stated intervals. It means untangling and straightening out the elements in the boy's experience which got him into trouble, and aiding him in returning to a normal child's life. This is the method of social case work, identical with that of a family welfare or other case working agency, except that the juvenile court has legal responsibility for its young wards.

A case taken from the juvenile court files illustrates a situation urgently calling for just such work on the part of the probation officer. This particular boy did not, however, get such help from either of the men on the probation staff, but by a fortunate chance two business men

became interested in his predicament and saw his possibilities for success.

W _____ G _____ was born in March 1921. He first got into trouble in May 1935 when he was picked up by the police for dishonesty. He was "advised and released" in an informal hearing, and no inquiry was made about him nor was any effort made to check up on him. He came again to the attention of the court the following October, when the school attendance department asked that a petition be drawn up presenting this case to the judge.

The letter from the school gave the following information about the boy who was in the eighth grade. He was of superior intelligence, was a leader among the other boys, was on the School Boy Patrol, and secretary of the Rangers. He was popular with the other boys and his principal described his friends as "a good group." He liked school and was never truant. He liked to be in the limelight.

W _____ had been living with his mother and stepfather in a houseboat. The stepfather, who worked in the Bremerton navy yard, was planning to get a divorce from his wife because she would not stay home, drank and liked other men too well. However, the mother deserted at this time and the boy had been taken in by a neighbor described as "educated, intelligent and tolerant." For a time he had been going to bed early, was regular in his paper route and was buying a bicycle with his money.

The particular episode for which the school reported the case to the court was "stealing a gun from a truck on the ferry while he was on an excursion with the Rangers." A few days later he turned on a saw in the shop in school and began to be troublesome in some of his classes.

A petition based on the facts reported by the school was prepared by one of the probation officers. In the petition the probation officer stated, "It does seem that W _____ is a victim of circumstances It is feared that he has come to loose habits, undependable and insecure, that it will take some such strict discipline as he would receive in the Luther Burbank School to bring him back to the straight and narrow way." (In other words, commitment to an institution was the only measure which the probation officer could conceive of for this challenging case.) The case was cleared with the Social Service Exchange but the return report listing other agencies acquainted with the family situation was not followed up.

Hearing of the case was continued because W _____ had taken matters into his own hands and run away. No effort was apparently made to locate him.

Two and one half years later W _____ appeared again, in more serious trouble. With four older boys he had stolen some sacks of wheat and sugar to sell. The juvenile court, not being active in the case, knew nothing of this, which was handled by a justice of the peace for the group as a whole, because the other boys were over eighteen. In August 1938 the boy was again before a justice of the peace for breaking and entering. He was referred to the juvenile court at this point. He was in jail for one month, in the middle of which the case was referred to the juvenile court.

An investigation was made by the other man probation officer who verified the situation and the offense.

The boy was living again with his mother in a shack on the shore of the river. He had been absent many days from high school, had been running out at night and his mother reported she had no control over him. Her husband meantime had deserted and she was on relief. The boy said he was working at a skating rink but this apparently was not verified.

In this investigation report, which is very brief, the probation officer states that W _____ is not a bad boy but got into difficulty for lack of supervision. (The same kind of problem which he had presented two and one half years earlier.) "It is the feeling of the writer that unless some restriction can be put on the boy or some other plan made whereby he would receive the proper supervision it is believed he would benefit by commitment to the Washington State Training School. Numerous people have come to the front for W _____ but at the present time no one has offered a constructive plan for this boy to again resume his place in the community." (It is to be noted that again the probation officer investigating this case had no suggestion for the boy except commitment to the state training school. Note the failure to assume responsibility for any other kind of plan in the phrase, "no one has offered a constructive plan.")

Fortunately for the boy, two business men came forward to help him. One promised him a job and a place to live, the other agreed to advance the necessary room and board money. They expressed their desire, if "given the privilege of helping W _____" to "do everything in their power to try to adjust him so that he will become a useful citizen."

The boy was found dependent at the final court hearing September 21, was made a ward of the court and placed under probationary supervision in the custody of Mr. A _____.

No attempt was made by the probation officer to do anything further, supervision being left entirely to the boy's friends outside the court. His employer reported later that not only

was his work satisfactory but he did more than was expected of him and showed "every indication of becoming a worthy and trusted employee." His evening time he applied to his studies. The record ends on this hopeful note.

There is no further entry in the case and it is unmistakably evident that the probation department not only failed to assume responsibility for the boy but never gave him any actual supervision. W _____ is now over eighteen and the record should be closed, although it was carried as active in the probation officer's listing of his cases at the time of the survey.

It is generally accepted that objectives in juvenile court work are fully attainable only when qualified personnel produces to fullest capacity under capable direction. A good case worker is "born that way," - that is, the personality for the job comes first; but capacity and skill in probation work can be developed by basic training in the social sciences and in social work, by additional special courses, reading in the professional field, attendance and participation in conference discussion groups, continual self evaluation and critical application to the job at hand. Length of practical experience, however, may mean little or nothing in development, if it is a matter merely of staying on the job year after year. What counts is a steady growth in understanding of children and their problems, and in the technique of handling them.

The juvenile court in Seattle needs more probation officers of this professional type for work with boys' cases. An expenditure of public funds for salaries of well qualified workers is an economy from the financial angle. When good work is done with boys at an early period in their delinquent careers, the development of much more serious tendencies leading to crime and to penitentiary sentences is checked. It is again a case of taking a stitch in time. A good probation officer's salary is saved many times over in this way. However, while the argument for economy is

sound and practical, it is after all less weighty than the argument for the welfare of the children, their families and the community as a whole. Here is where the work of a competent probation officer, who is not overburdened with more cases than he can carry, really tells.

RECORDS AND STATISTICS

The main requisites for a good filing system are a simple alphabetical card index to include all cases dealt with, containing identifying data only, as a guide to locating case records which in large departments are usually filed numerically; case record folders containing in separate divisions the legal and the social material; and cards for statistical data.

Card Index The alphabetical card file used in the Seattle court is divided into three sections: active, over-age, and institutional. The cards contain identifying data, previous court records, cause and petition, and the name of the officer handling the case. The active file contains cards for formal cases under active supervision, both dependent and delinquent; formal cases of children under the age of eighteen who are not under active supervision; and informal cases, active and inactive, without distinction. In other words the so-called active file contains cases which should have been closed. It is, as a matter of fact, impossible to state the total number of cards in this active file but by estimate there are between 8,000 and 10,000. There is no way of determining the actual total case load of the department except by a laborious process of checking these thousands of cards, one by one.

The over-age file contains the cards of boys and girls between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one who are technically wards of the court though not under active supervision. This file is maintained for the convenience of court workers, agencies and institutions.

The institutional file contains cards for wards of the court who

have been placed in the several institutions in the state. The file clerk is aided in keeping these up to date by receipt from the institution of slips indicating release, parole or discharge.

Once a year the active and over-age files are combed and cards are transferred at that time from the active to the over-age file. Cards of children who have reached the age of twenty-one are removed, boxed and stored in the basement as closed. The basis of this change from one file to another is age only, which is but one reason for closing a case. In fact there is no such process in the case work of the department as the definite closing of a record when supervision or contact with the court is discontinued, so the term "closed file" is used here in a limited sense.

The first major division for any card index is for active and closed cases. A case should be closed when by conference of the worker and the chief, or the worker and the case supervisor, it is determined that supervision or contact is no longer necessary. Routine continuation of a wardship does not mean that the case is active in the accepted sense of the term. The case of any child committed to an institution should be closed.

The closed index file should be as accessible as the active file, as it may be needed at any time for reference or for reopening a case. A subdivision can easily be made for cases of children over twenty-one, if this seems practical. Cards of different colors facilitate handling. They may be used to distinguish boys' cases from girls', formal from informal. If a different color is used to distinguish formal from informal it is necessary to recard the case if the informal case becomes a formal one. Separate index files may be kept for formal and informal if this is preferred to the use of cards of different colors. Once

established a good card file can be easily kept up to date by monthly reports from case workers as to the status of cases.

A standard 3 x 5 index card prepared by the National Probation Association reads as follows:

_____		No. _____
(Name)		Cross reference no. _____
Birthdate	Color	Sex
Address		
Father	Mother	
Wife or husband		
Date first contact	P. O.	Date terminated
Date reopened		

This card is designed to serve solely as a guide in locating the case record in the files. It has little or no value for statistical purposes. Space is provided for dates of reopening as a case becomes active or inactive.

Forms The legal forms used in the department, i. e., petitions, summonses, motions, orders, warrants, and commitments, conform to the usual practice. The first sheet of the form for recording preliminary investigations is old in type and should be discontinued.

In discussing case records we run easily into the subject of case work, since the case record serves to a considerable extent as a gauge of the case work itself. At this point, however, we are limiting ourselves to the forms, and have considered content in the section of the report covering case work.

Face sheets are an elementary requirement for good social case records. They are not used at all in the Seattle court. A face sheet sets forth in

summarized form the relatively permanent data about a child which constitute a sort of framework for the record. This face sheet is properly the first page of a social case history which contains also such additional material as the preliminary investigation report; the social service exchange clearance slip; school, clinic and other special reports; the chronological supervision history; periodic summaries and analyses; and correspondence. All this material is in a case folder with the name and number clearly indicated.

Inserted in this section of the survey report is a standard face sheet prepared by a case record committee of the National Probation Association. This is the result of very careful study by a well qualified group. With the face sheet is also a guide for the recording of a preliminary investigation, worked out by the same committee. Instead of presenting a topical outline, this guide attempts to indicate the important facts, attitudes and relationships which characterize the child in his present situation. Suggestions are in no way exhaustive but should be expanded for the individual case. This report is not prepared for the court alone but in the interest of the child, as the basis of any plan for his care. These forms are available for the use of any court.

In the Seattle juvenile court the legal material on a case, the petitions, orders, citations, etc., are kept together in case folders in the clerk's office. The social records are kept in looseleaf notebooks in the desks of the workers. This division is partially explained no doubt by the mandatory clause in the juvenile court act which provides that case records shall be open for the inspection of the children themselves, of parents, attorneys, and others on authority of the court. Keeping the

confidential material in notebooks protects it from such indiscriminate reading. However, it would seem perfectly practical to keep all material within one folder, divided into two sections, one for the legal data and one for the social record. The legal papers could then be easily removable for study. If the case records are so consolidated it is convenient to keep the active ones in a locked filing cabinet in the private office of the worker. When a case is closed it can then be placed in the general files in the clerk's office.

Statistics Attention has already been called to the inadequacy and inaccuracy of the statistical material of the King county juvenile court. There is no need to present arguments here for a competent statistical plan which will summarize for the court and the community the character and progress of its work. It is impossible for a probation department to interpret its own job without reliable monthly and annual statistics. They are a guide administratively as well as from a sociological angle.

Some of the things which a proper statistical system will make clear are: the number of cases in the different categories (dependent and delinquent, formal and informal, boys and girls, etc.) at any one time; the movement of cases monthly and yearly (continued from the previous month or year, new cases, closed cases, reopened cases); hearings (total number, re-hearings, continuations, new offenses, violations); institutional commitments; and evaluation of the outcome of the case.

It is suggested that in the process of reorganization of the probation department a study be made of the statistical plan of the U. S. Children's Bureau. This is an admirable scheme for assembling dependable statistics, which has been tested over a period of years. It is based on 5" by 8".

cards which can be easily checked by the clerk and the probation officer. The King county juvenile court should be one of the courts reporting to the Children's Bureau under this plan and making its statistics a part of the national yearly report.

Annual Report Good statistics form the basis of an annual report. They should not, however, consist merely of figures which by themselves mean little to the general public. They should be interpreted in a vivid style so that the work of the court will seem vital to the reader.

An annual report should contain also a narrative section on the history and progress of the court since the last report was issued, an interpretive general discussion of the aims and methods of the court with illustrative case material, etc., and a section enlarging upon the needs of the court and showing what is not being accomplished for lack of various facilities. A report like this is one of the best types of publicity and should have wide circulation.

RELATIONSHIPS WITH OTHER AGENCIES

In reading this discussion of agency relationships it should be borne in mind that the Association has not made a community study, and therefore no attempt is made to evaluate or criticize activities and programs of other private and public agencies.

The effectiveness of the juvenile court beyond the courtroom, the probation department and the detention home, may be gauged by the extent and nature of its relationships with other agencies and institutions, public and private. This is particularly true when applied to the police and the schools, the two chief sources of cases coming before the court.

It will be recalled that Judge A. W. Frater in 1911 sought to institute a cordial and cooperative relationship with the police, and as a result a man and a woman on the police force were "assigned to the care of complaints against children." The report of that year does not give the number of children referred to the court from that source. There has been a development over the years and now the police department has a juvenile division with a headquarters staff and officers assigned by precincts for work with boys, and a women's division at headquarters which also works with girls. Police officers state that they refer about one fourth of their cases to the court. According to the 1938 statistical report of the court the police referred a total of 1106 cases.

It is understood that the juvenile officers in the precinct offices investigate complaints against boys, release some with admonition and hold others on an informal supervision basis without referral to the court. Those boys who are repeatedly complained of or against whom a complaint is

fairly serious are referred to the headquarters staff. The usual procedure in view of the limited staff there is to refer the boys with a copy of the complaint and a brief investigation report to the juvenile court for action. Seven hundred and sixty-four boys' cases so referred were handled informally by the probation staff in 1938. The police made 157 formal petitions in boys' cases in the same year. Among informal cases the girls figured far less in referrals from the police, totaling only 114; the police were petitioners in 71 formal girls' cases.

After reorganization of the court the chief will have opportunity to confer with those in charge of the juvenile and women's divisions to clarify and establish effective procedures in cases initially brought to the attention of the police, particularly those held in the jails for questioning by detectives, and to effect an even closer and more constructive relationship between police and court.

The relation of the public schools and the juvenile court in every city should be close and meaningful. Strengths between the two lie in complete agreement as to scope of authority, treatment facilities and point of referral to the court. The use of the court by the school as a weapon to enforce its discipline is a tendency ever to be avoided.

The public schools of Seattle are provided with an attendance department and a child guidance clinic to meet problems of truancy, misbehavior and maladjustment. The supervisor of the attendance department, which by agreement files all petitions for the schools, acts as liaison officer to the court and is present on most hearing days. In the absence of figures as to total cases handled exclusively in the schools by the attendance department it is not possible to estimate the per cent of

cases referred to the court. We do know that the department was petitioner in 44 formal and 28 informal cases during 1938, a number which seems reasonable. The court statistical report does not disclose the nature of these cases as to delinquency or dependency, nor does it show the total school problem in terms of commitments to the boys' and girls' parental schools which are maintained by the school system.

A joint study of cases, particularly informal ones, by the chief and the liaison officer might result in an agreement that the schools attempt additional case work treatment before referring the problem to the court. An incident illustrative of this was observed during the course of the study. A fifteen year old boy was lodged in the detention home over night and brought before the chief the following day by an attendance officer on a complaint of truancy. Markedly reticent, the child evaded for some time all efforts to plumb the nature of his difficulties. Eventually the facts were secured and the case was turned back to the attendance officer. The boy exhibited no delinquent trends but he was a typical maladjustment case in the home and school scene.

The Child Guidance Clinic provides the court with records of psychological examination of children, and at the request of the probation staff makes examinations of those not previously or recently tested. The examination report yields the I. Q. of the child but beyond that does not furnish much other data with respect to aptitudes, abilities, blocs, etc. The chief should devote time to a study of the psychological, psychiatric, and medical resources of the city and plan a much more comprehensive program for care of juvenile court cases.

The Luther Burbank School for Boys (the boys' parental school),

located on Mercer Island, accepts boys between the ages of nine and sixteen years with I. Q.'s of 69 or over on commitment from juvenile courts. Many boys are accepted from other counties in the state. Thirty-six boys were placed there by the Seattle court in 1938. The average stay is estimated by the superintendent at about eleven months, although it is said that some boys have stayed for long periods of time. An agency executive called our attention to the case of one boy who had spent off and on a total of eight years in the school. Boys are released on parole of one year under supervision of the school attendance department. For infractions of parole conditions boys are brought in for court hearing. Many of these are then committed to the State Training School. The present statistical methods do not reveal the number thus brought to the court.

The Martha Washington School for Girls (girls' parental school), located at Fifty-seventh and Holly Streets, is also maintained by the Seattle schools. Girls are received by commitment from the court, and in 1938 fourteen girls were so admitted. About fifty per cent of the population comes from King county, the remainder from eleven other counties in the state. The average stay here is more than double that of the boys' school, being approximately two years. In neither school is there any case work service.

It is gratifying to know that the supervisor of the attendance department and the chief probation officer who participate in parole clinics are beginning a joint study of the problem of parole and in particular of disposition of parole violators. More thorough pre-parole investigation, preparation of the child for parole and of the home to

receive the child, together with close parole supervision, should result in fewer violations, returns to the court, and commitments to other institutions. This study, along with another being made jointly by the attendance department and the child guidance clinic of their relationship to and cooperation with the program of the parental schools, may well tighten and improve techniques and case work services all along the line.

The relationship of the court to the King County Department of Public Welfare has been especially close and good. A liaison person from the latter agency has at all times maintained regular contact with the probation staff and has been present at most hearings involving dependency petitions. That such a liaison worker is needed is clearly indicated by the huge total of dependency cases which have been coming into the court:

<u>DEPENDENCY</u>				
YEAR	1936	1937	1938	TOTAL
Boys	241	290	279	810
Girls	323	319	320	962
TOTAL	564	609	599	1772

Unfortunately there is no way of determining how many of these cases are even nominally under the supervision of a worker in the probation department and how many are the case work responsibility of other agencies. The question of dependency cases in the juvenile court is a pressing one and the Department of Public Welfare has cooperated in the trend toward withdrawal of these cases from supervision of the probation department.

The State Superior Court Judges Association in July 1937 agreed that care of and payment for dependent children was a proper responsibility of county welfare departments rather than the juvenile courts and constituted

an administrative rather than a judicial function. We should expect the figures for 1938 to be lower, especially as mothers' pension cases were withdrawn from the court in 1937, but again the difficulty is our dependence on statistical figures which are neither clear nor exact.

During the course of the study the judge, the chief, and representatives of the welfare agencies sought to crystallize, for the community and its agencies in the chest and council, thinking on the urgent problem of the dependent child. A meeting attended by representatives of ten child caring agencies, both public and private, was held and a committee was formed to gather statistics on the whole dependent child situation. The judge voiced his hopes that the chest agencies, by a new plan and additional funds, and the public agency might relieve the detention home of its dependent child population so that more attention might be given the delinquent child. The public agency stressed the problem it faces through limitation of funds and placement possibilities.

It is generally accepted that dependency cases should be handled initially and for supervision by the public and private welfare agencies, leaving for the court only matters of legal adjudication and certain selected cases where delinquency and dependency are combined in one situation. The detention home is not properly used for small children but may be used for emergency shelter of older dependents, although even here other community resources might be developed for this purpose. It is reported that the last few months have seen a marked decrease in dependency cases referred to the court because of a better understanding with other agencies. Reorganization of the probation department, bringing in a sound intake procedure and fuller interpretation of the true function of the court to

the community, should help at this point.

Relationships with other agencies and institutions, local and state, do not call for individualized comment. They are, broadly speaking, cordial and cooperative.

DETENTION

The combination building housing the juvenile court, probation offices, and the detention home was a pioneer idea when the King county juvenile court erected such a structure in 1914 in a residential section of the city, away from all connection with adult courts or with the business part of town. This is one of three major types of detention home which have developed in the forty years of the juvenile court in the United States, the other two being the detention home entirely detached from the court, and family boarding homes, the most recent trend. There are some clear advantages to the combination building. It is obviously a timesaver for the court and probation personnel and it may be advantageously used for clinical study. It is possible in a setup like this to eliminate jail detention entirely, as sufficiently secure detention rooms for unruly older adolescents can easily be provided. In this respect it has the advantage over the outlying residence type of home and also of the boarding home plan, where such segregation is not so easy.

Detention of children for the juvenile court begins with selection by a sound intake policy; the detention period is kept to a minimum by concerted action of the court and the detention home management; the days in the detention home are used to study the child mentally, physically and emotionally, and to occupy his time constructively. In other words, the period of detention is vitally important as the first step in the re-education of a delinquent boy or girl.

Common difficulties encountered in detention include confusion as to the purposes of the home itself, carelessness in using the place for long

time parking for the convenience of the probation staff or other agency, emphasis on locks and keys which psychologically impresses the child as not far different from jail practice, the use of detention as a short time disciplinary commitment, and the complications due to admitting delinquent children with dependents of all ages. A detention home may be converted into a nursery by the pressure of demand from outside sources for emergency care of dependent children, with disastrous result to the program for the delinquent older child for whom the home was chiefly designed.

Physical Layout and Equipment It is unnecessary in this report to go into a detailed description of the plan of the detention home. Briefly we may say that it occupies the upper floors and rear part of the juvenile court building, which is a T shaped structure. It connects directly with the courtroom and with the general waiting room. The boys' and girls' sections are completely separated, the first floor including, besides the small detention home office, the living and dining rooms and the kitchen which goes across the entire rear of the building. On the second floor are the sleeping quarters, two small school rooms, one for boys and one for girls, rooms for the superintendent and the matrons, a small clinic room used also unfortunately for sewing, dormitories, lavatories, and single rooms. On the third floor there is a kind of unfinished attic space which could be effectively used for play space but now has six beds on each side. There are no attendants' rooms on this floor. The home accommodates about seventeen boys and seventeen girls, although some shifts are made in arrangements as the proportions vary, particularly when babies have to be cared for. The basement houses the janitor, called the building

attendant, and his family; it has the usual boiler and laundry rooms and other equipment.

The rooms are sunny and pleasant enough in their general aspect, although the furnishings are ugly, dreary and worn. The backyard, an excellent space for outdoor play, is cut in two by a high fence following out the policy of complete separation of the sexes.

Undoubtedly changes should be made in the structure of the detention home but these should be considered only after a period of direction of the detention program in the hands of an able social work administrator.

Staff Far more important than the physical aspects in any institution for children are the personalities of those in authority and the program and practices of the administration. The superintendent was appointed in 1918. She is a woman of intelligence and good cultural background, of kindly personality and genuinely interested in her work. She is now seventy-three years old and is contemplating retirement. The direction of a detention home is a position of serious responsibility which demands vigorous health and energy as well as flexibility to entertain and act upon new ideas.

The present staff were all appointed by the superintendent who has always had complete responsibility for the administration of the home. She has chosen her own contemporaries as assistants so that at present the average ages of those in charge of the children (omitting the cook and the janitor) is seventy years. No man has ever been employed except as janitor. The administration of the home has thus been over-feminized and the boys have never had a man as supervisor - a real loss.

It seems unnecessary to discuss the present staff in detail or even individually in view of the fact that they are clearly unfitted by age and infirmities for such work. Some general observations should be made, however. Assignment of work within the home is variable because of the irregularities of population and other factors. One woman seventy-three years old acts as "boys' attendant," having general supervision of boys' activities, including their recreation period in the yard. Another woman acts as girls' attendant. She is handicapped by almost total deafness and yet she has been in charge at night of the babies and small children as well as the older girls. The janitor (called the building attendant) has no contact with the children. He is sixty-eight years old and feeble. Much of the active janitorial work in the detention home and the courtrooms is done by his son, who has a room in the basement and gets his meals with his parents but has no salary. The wife of the janitor is responsible for night admissions. She assists also in the office and acts as substitute for the others. An assistant attendant helps about the home wherever she is needed. Primarily she has charge of dependency cases. The kitchen worker has no contact with the children except for the assistance which they give in preparing the meals.

All workers are resident and are allowed full maintenance. The salary of the superintendent is \$1800, of the janitor \$1200, and of each of the five others \$900. Two weeks vacation with pay is given every staff member.

The superintendent has been granted and has assumed for many years some functions not properly within the administration of the home itself. Not long after her appointment Judge Dykeman conferred upon her the title "advisor to the court in girls' cases." This function was not very clearly

defined but it gradually developed into a kind of case work done without the necessary background of training and experience in social work. The head of a detention home can be very helpful to both the court and probation staff in advising on the behavior of a particular child during the period of detention and his response to the experience. But a detention home executive should not go intensively into any case as this is the function of the social workers on the court staff. The superintendent has specialized in interviewing girls who come into the home. This means that they tell her their stories in detail just as they must also tell them to the woman probation officer who has the responsibility for the case. Establishing an emotional kind of confidential relationship between a young girl and the worker who has only temporary charge of her is unwise. A skilful institution head will keep a warm and pleasant relationship with the children under her care but will not attempt to probe into the causes or circumstances which brought them into the home.

The attempt at case work within the home goes further than this. The superintendent is not qualified as an investigator and does not go outside the home in making investigations, but does interview parents, school attendance officers, the police and others as to cause and disposition of children's cases, particularly of girls. Sometimes the superintendent is not in accord with the disposition recommended by the probation officer.

Advice in cases not even resident in the home is also given by the superintendent. During the course of the study a father and mother came in for advice about their daughter, fourteen, mentally retarded and beyond control. They were advised immediately as to their course in han-

dling the child by the superintendent, who invited them to return for further help if the prescription did not work. Real harm may be done by hurried case work of this sort.

The concept of detention as a temporary period of care must be kept constantly in view by the person in charge, who can from this point cooperate with other workers who have a long time responsibility for the child.

Intake and Discharge It has been the general policy of the superintendent of the detention home to receive cases from various sources without question. The exception, discussed elsewhere, is that older or unruly boys are refused admittance or are transferred to the jail if they become difficult. Gradually over the years the detention home population has shifted to younger and younger children, so that at the time the home was studied in the spring of 1939 it was the practice to care for babies, even as young as two or three months, and for many dependent children under school age, including some who are seriously retarded or epileptic. On April 10, 1939 when a count was made, there were in the home six dependent and four delinquent boys, nine dependent and four delinquent girls. The youngest child on this particular day was five years of age. One sixteen year old delinquent girl, held as a witness, had on a previous occasion been transferred to the jail by the superintendent for "insubordination."

The detention home has not fulfilled its function in the care of delinquent children and it is questionable whether it should be used at all for dependents. The distinction between these two groups is frequently hard to make, however, and good judgment together with a well-drawn intake policy for the work of the court as a whole could easily determine what

children should be admitted.

It is impossible, without a careful case study for which time was not available, to arrive at judgments as to the extent of unnecessary detention under current practice, but the investigators believe that the ~~detained~~ group could be markedly reduced by more ~~critical~~ care in acceptance of children. A conveniently located institution is a temptation to all who may want to place children in temporary care. But when the home is used casually as a parking place, detention may accomplish nothing except the convenience of probation officers or other social workers and the child had better be left in his own home pending disposition.

Two or three situations, however, call for detention in any court:

- (1) children whose home conditions are an immediate menace to their welfare;
- (2) children who are runaways from other communities and who must be held pending investigation elsewhere;
- (3) children whose offenses are of so serious a nature that the public welfare is involved;
- (4) children who are needed as witnesses.

Frequently children are held too long in detention awaiting trial of adults in whose cases they are involved. Foster home placement is often more satisfactory in such cases than any kind of institutional care. Over-caution in regard to tampering with child witnesses is very common.

The juvenile court has at its command the necessary machinery to enforce appearance at any time, so that detention merely to secure the child's presence on a particular date need not be considered important.

Since the beginning of this study and at the instigation of the investigator considerable progress has been made in eliminating the detention of small dependent children held for other agencies. A confer-

ence on this matter resulted in some simple procedural improvements.

The average attendance at the home has not varied much over a long period of years. There are usually from eighteen to twenty children in detention. For 1938 the daily average made up from the records in the home was 18.8, the average detention period 5.8 days. Some children are held for long periods. A casual check of detention periods for the first four months of 1939 shows that of the 445 children admitted and discharged during that time 33 were held two weeks or more. In addition to the group admitted and discharged within the three month period, there were eighteen children held over from previous months, among them two girls detained for nearly five months; two boys held for over three months and still in detention when the count was taken; and three others held for two months or more. In 1938, 820 boys were detained, many of them for only a day's care or even less, and 465 girls, or a total of 1,285 children. It is impossible to say how this number would be affected by a change in intake policy. A year under a different administration would indicate clearly whether the present detention facilities are adequate and what further changes should be made in the physical plant to meet apparent needs.

It is important that parents be notified immediately when children are taken to a detention home, but according to the chief probation officer there seems to be some uncertainty about this responsibility in the Seattle institution. When children are admitted by the schools the attendance department always informs the parents. The police are not always careful to do this. The detention home staff does not make a practice of consistently checking on this and in many cases the responsibility falls to the juvenile court. When the superintendent is away her aides have not

known just what to do.

The superintendent sometimes takes responsibility for discharging children from the home. In girls' cases she requests a report by letter on the child's progress and she states that the girls rarely fail to let her know how things are going. Boys are not often released to parents or others, but this occasionally happens. If they are brought to the detention home for slight offenses, such as breaking windows, the superintendent may release them to their parents with a card to present later to the chief probation officer.

Daily Schedule It is not important to detail the daily routine of activities in the home, as this procedure is in no way unique. Breakfast is at eight o'clock, dinner at twelve and supper at five. School for the boys runs from nine o'clock to eleven thirty and for the girls from one to three thirty. Visiting hours are on Tuesday and Thursday from two to four.

Children must be in their rooms at seven and lights are out at eight o'clock. Older boys and girls need evening occupation and eight o'clock is too early for sleep. When the chief probation officer called to see two fourteen year old boys at five o'clock one Sunday afternoon he found that they had been put to bed, not for discipline but because the attendant in charge wanted to rest.

Children help with the housework and the girls particularly may learn something of the preparation and serving of food while they are in the home. Boys are allowed to do the spading necessary in the small garden and the girls help about the flower beds.

There is no possibility that "boy meets girl" here. The sexes are

rigidly separated. They meet only for Thanksgiving and Christmas dinners. A while ago some boys with unusual initiative bored a hole in the wall connecting the two third floor dormitories so that they could communicate with the girls on the other side. The beds were moved following this abortive adventure. It is perfectly possible to have boys and girls together part of the day under supervision in any detention home, although care must be taken to all times. Meals with boys and girls together can be made agreeable social occasions with opportunity for unobtrusive instruction. Evening reading hours can also be held for mixed groups occasionally.

Locks and keys need not be so much in evidence. It is possible to run a detention home almost without locks and the constant jangling and exhibition of keys, the locking and unlocking of every door is at variance with that standard of detention which calls for a home-like and not a jail-like atmosphere.

An interesting example of a maximum of freedom in a detention home can be cited from the experience of the juvenile court of Toledo, Ohio. In the reorganization of the detention home it was decided to change the attitude about locks, the children were frankly told that escape was easy, and an attempt was made to build up a sense of responsibility in the boys and girls themselves. They have even been permitted to leave the institution unattended to go to the movies, football games or other places on their promise to be back at a certain hour. The plan works admirably. In one instance when two boys did escape they were brought back by two volunteers from the same group. These boys have even formed a "safety council" which continues to function in spite of the changes within the group. One of the objectives of the council is, in their own words, "to teach delinquent boys to stand on the side of the law and to be helpful to law officers."

Night supervision, according to the superintendent, is limited to a check-up at midnight, which she makes herself. No attendant sleeps on the third floor.

It would be possible to vary the monotony of detention routine for children who are held for more than a day or so by taking them into town as a reward for good behavior. This is occasionally done in girls' cases by interested probation officers.

No attempt is made to have religious services or instruction for children during the detention period nor are they taken to church or Sunday school.

Medical Care No examinations are made of boys admitted to the detention home. A doctor is called in case a child appears ill but the opportunity of the detention period is not used to determine the child's general physical health and the possibility that defects or other bodily conditions may be contributing to his behavior problem.

Girls may be given a very superficial medical examination by a woman physician who is on call on a fee basis. A typical report of such examination, selected at random, contains only the following items filled in on a general outline blank:

PHYSICAL AND MENTAL REPORT

Name of child .R. R. April 28,
Age 17 Birth date Feb. 10, 1921 Date of examination 1 9 3 8

PHYSICAL CONDITION:

Weight ___ lbs. Height ___ ft. ___ in. Age at pubertal onset 12 years
Skin _____ Last menstrual period April 18
Growth and nourishment _____
Posture _____
Naso-pharynx _____ Tonsils need attention
Vision _____ Audition _____
Heart _____ Negative Lungs _____ Negative
Nervous system _____
Genitalia The hymen is ruptured; there is no evidence of recent rupture.

Note in this report the absence of such important items as vaginal smear, Wassermann, blood count, blood pressure, urinalysis, nutrition, height, weight, etc.

In "suspicious" cases a smear is taken for gonorrhoea but Wassermann tests have never been given although they could be arranged very simply through the public health authorities. Where gonorrhoea is discovered girls are sent to the psychopathic section of King county hospital, a locked ward. Occasionally such girls may be sent to the House of the Good Shepherd or to the Washington Girls' Home at Everett.

With proper precautions venereal treatments might very well be given in the detention home for those who are not bed patients. This would call for additional care on the part of those in charge, but the detention home might serve a very good purpose in the temporary care of girls having these diseases. They could be taken by the attendant to a clinic if necessary but it would seem quite possible to provide clinical service in the home.

School A teacher is paid by the public schools of Seattle to teach in the detention home. The boys are taught in the morning and the girls in the afternoon. One teacher has done this work for years and finds it particularly congenial. It is impossible of course to make much academic progress during a detention period but it is important that the children be kept up to grade as far as possible and they may even be helped with special problems by a skilful teacher.

Recreation Children are allowed to be in the yards in pleasant weather for a short time daily. However, there is very little in

the way of play equipment and only one or two group games, of which the children quickly tire, are played. The outdoor space is admirably fitted for croquet and other simple games with inexpensive equipment. Children do not become destructive when they have play apparatus or gymnasium equipment if they are supervised.

Much of the time the living rooms are used for recreation periods which are exceedingly quiet and dull. One of the women attendants sits in the room while the children play a few old table games or read. The supply of books is limited and could well be enlarged by more active cooperation with the public library. Several of the workers in the home mentioned the need of more recreation activity.

Recreation is one of the best avenues of control of a group in detention. Withdrawal from a play group is a logical and wise method of discipline. Recreation is also obviously one of the best ways of "letting off steam" so that disciplinary problems are greatly reduced. It must, however, be carried on by workers experienced in this field who know how to stimulate real comradeship and standards of fair conduct through play. Boys in detention should have a man as leader.

Discipline The superintendent and the staff are not at all hard-boiled but are friendly and devoted in their supervision of the children. However, their solution to a real disciplinary problem is to send an "insubordinate" child to the county jail, a procedure which of course is an admission of failure. Confinement in rooms is frequently used, - a good method if it is not overdone.

Fire Hazards It is unnecessary to go into detail about protection

of these children from the hazard of fire but a note should be included in this report regarding it. The Seattle fire department made two inspections of the home this spring, the first shortly before the study began and the second at the request of Judge Long during the course of the study. Recommendations of the department included several minor building alterations which have been referred to the superintendent in charge of county buildings. Other recommendations included freeing access to the fire escapes (the girls' side was partially blocked by a bed and the boys' side by a locker), removing inflammable rubbish from the basement and improving the key and padlock system. The necessary precautions undoubtedly will be taken from now on.

Jail Detention The juvenile court of King county has legal responsibility for the care of delinquent children under the age of eighteen. Keeping children out of jail was one of the first principles of the original juvenile court established in Cook county, Illinois, in 1899 under a law which served as a pattern for the Seattle court. Nonetheless the practice of holding children in jail, even those under sixteen for whom such detention is expressly forbidden in the juvenile court statute, has been in effect in King county for many years and it is directly related to a lack of appreciation of the basic function of a detention home on the part of those in charge. The home was planned as a progressive measure for the care of troublesome adolescents awaiting disposition by the court. It was not intended as a kind of children's home for very young and tractable boys and girls.

County Jail A study was made of the complete records of the King county jail for the year 1938 to ascertain the number of children under

eighteen held there. There is a noticeable gap in these records of the seven weeks from January 23 to March 16, when no children were held in the jail. The explanation is that repairs were under way which made it impossible to hold children in a separate ward. These repairs were made necessary partly because of destructive conduct of the boys in the juvenile ward which resulted in damage to the plumbing and flooding of the jail office. Here is a clear reflection of the need for constructive wholesome occupation and more careful supervision for boys who must be in detention. The period actually covered in the figures taken from the jail records is thus a little less than ten and one-half months.

During that time the total number of days of jail detention of children under eighteen was 1,225. The number of children held was 154. The average detention period was eight days, the longest stay being 104 days and the shortest one day. One child was not counted in obtaining this average as the date of discharge was missing from the record.

The following table shows the age and sex of the children detained during 1938:

	AGE	17	16	15	14	13	TOTAL
Boys		65	69	15	0	2	151
Girls		1	2	0	0	0	3
TOTAL		66	71	15	0	2	154

Most of these children were held for the juvenile court. Frequently they were received directly from the probation department or the detention home. A considerable number were held for the state school at Chehalis. There is no reason why boys newly committed to Chehalis or returning there, if they are still of juvenile court age, should not be held in the deten-

tion home even if their place of residence may be in another county. Jail experience is by common agreement a vicious and degrading one. It can do no good to a boy whose behavior is already serious enough to justify commitment to a correctional school. Provision for proper security can be made in any detention home of the type of the King county one, and if the administration is receptive to the care of such boys no damage will result either to the children or the public welfare.

A few children were held for the immigration authorities. As the Federal Government is very sympathetic toward delinquent children it would probably not be difficult to arrange with the immigration authorities for the care of these children in the detention home, if the suggestion was made and the home itself was ready to receive such cases.

It is interesting to note in the survey of the jail that at least two justices of the peace have been handling juvenile cases over which they have no proper jurisdiction. In three instances these justices during this year sentenced boys to jail terms as punishment. The record clearly shows release because their time had expired. One boy of seventeen was admitted to the jail on December 8, sentenced on December 20 and released, after ninety days incarceration, on March 19.

A sixteen year old boy and a seventeen year old boy were held in jail from December 15 to March 25 and March 30 respectively, at which time they were sentenced to the Washington State Reformatory, one of them for fifteen years. The name of the committing magistrate in this case is not shown in the jail record.

A separate count was made of boys fifteen years of age held in the county jail during the month of January 1939. There were nine in all

scattered through this month. No explanation for this large number of very young boys is apparent.

As stated previously, the law expressly prohibits detention of boys and girls under sixteen in the county jail, and the sheriffs and deputies in charge strongly disapprove of having any boys, even in the sixteen to eighteen group, held there. Yet the number so held is very large, and it is safe to say that the 154 children, an average of over fourteen a month, could all have been cared for in the detention home under a different type of administration. Exceptions would be so infrequent as to be negligible, although it is admitted that in very rare cases, possibly one or two in a year, the use of a separate room in the jail for a brief period might be necessary.

City Jail The city jail, which may be described by understatement as even less suitable for the detention of children than the county jail, also houses a large number of children for brief periods. A check was made of the detention of boys and girls under eighteen in the city jail for the month of January 1939 as a sample. The following table shows the number, sex and age:

	AGE	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	5 years and under	TOTAL
Boys		13	13	16	16	5	1	2	0	66
Girls		4	0	2	0	0	1	0	6	13
TOTAL		177	13	18	16	5	2	2	6	79

Of these children the record shows that 19 were transferred to the county jail and 39 to the detention home, usually the next day.

Some children held in the city jail are simply dependents whom it should never be necessary to book at all. Police taking care of these

children in emergencies should have direct contact with whatever social agency accepts responsibility for them. In this one month three such children, one five, one three and one five months old, were twice brought by the police to the city jail for safekeeping and transferred from there to the detention home.

The police as well as the deputy sheriffs for the county report difficulty about getting children into the detention home at night. Apparently the night bell is frequently unanswered and they have finally adopted the practice of holding children in the jail when they are taken at night. Police and deputy sheriffs are discouraged about taking older boys to the detention home at any time, because they have met with refusal to care for unruly boys or older more serious delinquents. The county jail is accustomed to receiving from the court boys who have proved troublesome in the home. It is the common practice of both sheriffs and police to hold children in either jail until the detectives are through questioning them.

INTERPRETATION OF WORK TO THE COMMUNITY

Judge Long, aware that an enlightened community attitude is vital to an understanding of the work of the court and to the support of its program, has utilized the coordinating council movement which he and other interested persons initiated four years ago to disseminate information concerning juvenile delinquency, the lack in community facilities, resources at hand, and the efforts of the juvenile court to cope with the problem. In this connection he has made many speeches before civic, social, parental, and professional groups. He is a member of the Welfare Council Board, a position with good possibilities for interpretation. The chief and staff members sit in on committees of the council.

The judge is to be commended for his firm stand in protecting from publicity children brought before the court. He has made this a practice since assuming office and the press, understanding his motive, has cooperated fully with his desire. He departs from this rule only in cases of lost children. His visits at various institutions in which he places children also have excellent educational value, not only in terms of relationships but also in clarifying for institution heads the program the court has for children.

Other members of the juvenile court staff give talks to various groups. Staff conferences should have as one of their objectives the training of personnel as interpretive agents of the court program. All requests for speaking engagements by staff members should clear through the chief, particularly when matters of policy between agencies may be discussed. Unfortunate incidents which have occurred in the past as

the result of unauthorized pronouncements by staff members may thus be avoided.

Some juvenile courts have found a series of newspaper articles or timely releases an excellent medium of education; others use radio and speaking engagements. Plays and radio skits are employed with considerable success. Almost all regard annual reports, which describe the work and plans of the court as well as its finances and collections, as a standard educational method. All of these methods may be used.

Probation committees composed of lay and professional persons who meet periodically with judge and chief spread understanding of the court through the community. The members of the committee carry back to their social, professional, and agency groups information as to its work and plans. Worth while too are arrangements for visits of representatives of various civic and educational organizations to the building where they may have explained to them at first hand the operation of the court program. This might well supplant the present practice discussed earlier, of attendance by civic groups at court hearings.

A more professionalized interpretation comes from participation by the judge on boards of other social agencies, through attendance by the chief or his representatives at various committee meetings of the local council of social agencies and by periodic meetings with the staffs of other social agencies to keep them informed of the court program and plans or changes that are contemplated. Still another means of interpretation is through participation by judges and staff members at national, regional, state or local conferences of related groups.

A novel and highly successful interpretive project has been worked

out in Phoenix, Arizona, where the community chest for the past two summers has sponsored a Juvenile Court Week. Juvenile court, child welfare and crime prevention services joined hands in a program featuring news articles, radio and public speeches, plays, concerts and visits to centers of activity in juvenile work. An unusual annual report containing many striking pictures and interesting statistics was distributed widely. A motion picture planned by the chief probation officer showing the history of a case from apprehension to discharge after probation treatment was shown with great effect before civic and service organizations. The net result has been an intensification of community concern in the building of a sound juvenile court program.

The juvenile court in Seattle might make use of some of these additional avenues of interpreting the work of the court and the needs of the probation department to the general public. Community support is much more vigorous when the public is frequently reminded of the existence of the court, its objectives, and the inadequacy of its equipment to achieve its full function. The present survey and plans for reorganization would be excellent material, if properly selected, for newspaper and other publicity. Here is an opportunity offering timely news interest.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations of the study are implicit in the several sections of the text. The most important of these are briefly restated here.

1. Legal In order that the juvenile court may fully discharge its proper function careful study should be given to the preparation of legislation for an improved juvenile court law drawn in accordance with the standard law developed by the National Probation Association.

2. Hearings Attendance at hearings should be restricted to those having a direct interest in the case. An exception may be made in the case of carefully selected students of the school of social work who are at the court for the purpose of training.

Hearings, particularly those involving several children, should be individualized after legal evidence is given. Stenographic notetaking may well be reduced, certainly in uncontested cases. The swearing of witnesses should be reduced to a minimum. The services of lawyers to represent children and parents coming before the court are unnecessary.

3. Administration A complete reorganization of administration should be effected bringing all social services of the court under full authority of the chief probation officer. The detention home superintendent will then be responsible to the chief. An integration of probation and detention should be effected. A case supervisor should be added to the staff and placed in charge of case work. Choice should be made of a social worker experienced in this type of work who is not now on the staff of the court. Policies of intake and referral in the case work field should be established. A trained statistician-accountant, a boys'

case worker, and two stenographers should also be added. Two officers now on the staff should be replaced by professionally qualified workers. The position of council coordinator should be discontinued as soon as community plans develop for the integration of coordinating councils with the Welfare Council. Policies concerning vacations, leaves of absence and sick leaves should be clearly established.

4. Case work technique Great improvement of case work will follow if the proposed staff reorganization is effected. The chief should study the psychological, psychiatric and medical resources of the community and attempt a more comprehensive program for these aspects in the case of juvenile court cases.

A closer tie-up with the social work in the schools is desirable to make sure that children in the parental schools have the benefit of such service during their time in the institutions and after their release. A division of function can be made according to the resources of the court and the schools, in those cases where the problem is sufficiently serious to bring the child within the care of the court.

5. Records and statistics Complete renovation of card index files and of record keeping should be instituted. A statistical system should be installed. Annual reports should be resumed.

6. Detention Changes in intake, medical examination and care, program and daily schedule will follow changes in the staff which are now pending.¹ Fire hazards should be avoided. Plans should be made for care in the detention home of the children now held in city and county

¹The staff of the detention home is cooperative and in agreement with the need for a new program. At the time of writing this report the superintendent submitted to the judge resignations of the entire staff. This was done in a friendly and helpful spirit.

jails. Changes in the building and its equipment can be determined after a new program is established.

7. Interpretation of work to the community Additional avenues of interpretation of the work of the court to the community should be explored, and every practical method of community education adopted.