

To the assembled members of the Judiciary, dignitaries from the other branches of the government, esteemed members of the bar, and other welcomed guests, I am Judge Ronald Adrine, and it is my honor to currently serve as the Administrative and Presiding Judge of the Cleveland Municipal Court. On behalf of my colleagues and the hard-working staff of our court I bring you greetings.

Before starting my presentation this afternoon, I take great pleasure in introducing to some and present to others the greatest Municipal Court bench in the country.

I will call their names in alphabetical order and ask those of my colleagues who were able to join us today to rise and be recognized. They are:

Judge Marilyn Cassidy
Judge Pinky Carr
Judge Michelle Earley
Judge Emanuella Groves
Judge Anita Laster Mays
Judge Lauren Moore
Judge Charles Patton
Judge Raymond Pianka
Judge Michael Ryan
Judge Angela Stokes
Judge Pauline Tarver
Judge Joseph Zone

The judges would also like to recognize Mr. Earle B. Turner, our Clerk of court.

In addition, some of our staff have taken time from their lunch hour to participate in this event. I ask that all employees of the court's General, Housing and Clerk Divisions who are present please stand and be recognized.

A wise person once said that, "If you don't know where you've been, it's hard to know where you are and impossible to know where you are going. In this, our court's 100th year, I believe that that statement could not be truer. So, those of us who now serve on the court decided to take this time to pause and consider and honor our past, examine our present and to reflect upon our future.

During the next few minutes, we'd like to share with you some of what we've learned about where our court has been, where we are now, and our shared vision for the court's future.

As we begin, we take the opportunity to celebrate the outstanding individual achievements and accomplishments of the men and women, who served before us, and to tout the many groundbreaking ideas and efforts that they germinated over the years, here in the fertile intellectual soil of the Cleveland Municipal Court, and then spread across the land.

From 1810 until 1910, Cleveland's population grew from 57 to 560,663 making it the 6th largest city in the nation. The burgeoning metropolis outgrew the archaic and often corrupt practice of using Justices of the Peace to administer the law. A major city needed a more learned and professional approach to its expanding administration of the judicial function.

The Cleveland Municipal Court came into existence, then, as a major reform of Cleveland's judicial system. It opened its doors for the first time at 9:30 am on the morning of January 2, 1912. That year just under 7,000 were filed for the six new judges of the young court to handle. Those case included such heinous offenses as spitting on the floor of a car and violation of the milk bottle ordinance.

Unlike the Justices of the Peace, the judges of the new municipal court were required to be legally trained and were elected by the people, rather than appointed by politicians. Importantly, unlike

the Justices of the Peace, their compensation did not depend on the fines they levied on those that they found guilty.

The initial group of jurists who reached our bench were an impressive lot. Take for instance, Samuel E. Kramer, who served as a Cleveland Municipal Court Judge from January 1, 1912 to December 31, 1918

Judge Kramer attended Western Reserve University and was admitted to the Ohio Bar in 1903. His public service began in 1908 when he represented the Twenty-Second Ward in Cleveland City Council. He was elected Cleveland Municipal Court Judge in the court's first election in 1911. In 1918 he ascended to the bench of the Common Pleas Court where he served until his retirement in 1955. During his tenure, Judge Kramer assisted with establishment of the Domestic Relations Bureau and the first Psychiatric Clinic.

Judge Kramer was joined in that first election by Manuel V. Levine. Judge Levine was born in Russia and came to Cleveland in 1887. He graduated from Western Reserve University and was admitted to the Ohio Bar in 1902. He was appointed Assistant Police Prosecutor and taught immigrants English in classes held at Hiram House. Judge Levine only served on the Cleveland Municipal court for two years, from January 1, 1912 to December 2, 1914, when he was elevated to the Court of Common Pleas where he served for nine years. In 1923, Judge Levine took a seat on the Court of Appeals. During his tenure with our court, he was also instrumental in the creation of the court's Domestic Relations Bureau, a Conciliation Court and the state's first probation department.

In the years that followed its inception, the Cleveland Municipal Court became known as a judicial innovator and for the quality of the judges who took to its bench.

Some of the most notable included:

Mary B. Grossman, who passed the Ohio Bar and was granted her license to practice law in 1912. In 1918, she became one of the first two women admitted to the American Bar Association. With her election to the Cleveland Municipal Court in 1923, she became the first woman in the nation to be elected to the position of judge. Judge Grossman served as a Cleveland Municipal Court Judge for thirty-six years, until her retirement in 1959 at the age of 80. During her time with us, she established the "morals Court", which heard cases involving prostitution, domestic violence and gambling.

Another trailblazing member of our bench was the Honorable Perry B. Jackson, the First African American ever elected to be a Judge in the State of Ohio. Judge Jackson was born in Zanesville, Ohio. In 1919 he graduated from Adelbert College of Western Reserve University and in 1922 he graduated from western Reserve's Law School. That same year, he was admitted to the bar in Ohio. In 1928, Judge Jackson was elected to the Ohio general assembly. In August of 1942, Judge Jackson was appointed to a judgeship on the Cleveland Municipal Court, but lost the election for his seat in 1943. Not easily deterred, he ran again in 1945, and won a 6 year term on our bench. He was reelected in 1951 and 1957. In 1960 he was elected to the New Domestic Relations Division of Common Pleas Court and in 1964 was elected to the General Division of Common Pleas Court, and was reelected in 1967. He retired from the bench in 1973, but continued to work every day on that bench as an appointed visiting judge until he was required to take mandatory full retirement at the age of 80, in 1981.

Another Trailblazer who graced our bench was Lillian Walker Burke. Judge Burke was the First African American female ever to serve as a judge in the State of Ohio. She was born in Thomaston, Georgia, and received her bachelor of science degree in education from THE Ohio State University in 1947. In 1951, she received her law degree from the Cleveland Marshall College

of Law and was admitted to the Ohio Bar. In 1969, she was appointed to our court by then-Governor James A. Rhodes, where she served until her retirement in 1987, becoming the first African American female to sit on any bench in the State of Ohio. Judge Burke died in 2012, the centennial year of the Cleveland Municipal court, the court that she helped to shape during her 18 years of service.

Frank Lausche is another noteworthy alum of the Cleveland Municipal Court. After serving in the U.S. Army during World War I, he returned to law school, graduating from the John Marshall School of Law in 1920. Lausche served as Municipal Court judge from 1932 to 1937 and Common Pleas Court judge from 1937 to 1941, before winning election as Mayor of Cleveland in 1941. He served until 1944, when he first won election as Governor of Ohio, becoming the state's first Catholic governor. Lausche served as governor from 1945 to 1947, when he narrowly lost to Thomas J. Herbert. Lausche defeated Herbert in a 1948 rematch, however, serving from 1949 to 1957. He was reelected as Governor in 1952, defeating Cincinnati Mayor Charles Phelps Taft II, and 1954, defeating state Auditor Jim Rhodes, who later became Governor himself. Lausche resigned in early 1957, having won election to the United States Senate in 1956, unseating incumbent Republican George Bender.

Frank D. Celebrezze, Sr. was the patriarch of the renown Celebrezze Clan of Cleveland Jurists. He attended Notre Dame University and received a Bachelor of Laws degree (LL.B.) in 1925. He was admitted to the bar in 1926 and went into private practice. Democratic party politics attracted Celebrezze, and he was appointed assistant county prosecutor in 1929. While in the prosecutor's office, he spearheaded a successful drive to break up racket operations in Cleveland, assisting Judge FRANK LAUSCHE† in closing the large gambling clubs. He went to Italy to try Angelo Amato in connection with the Sly-Fanner murder case. Amato was sentenced to prison for thirty years. Celebrezze served as parks director before being appointed safety director in 1942, replacing ELIOT NESS†. He remained there until 1947, with a

brief stint in the Army during WORLD WAR II. He was elected judge of the Cleveland Municipal Court in 1947 and was reelected in 1951, where he served until his death in 1953.

C. Ellen Connally attended and graduated from Bowling Green State University. She obtained her law degree from Cleveland-Marshall Law School of Cleveland State University. Upon graduation from law school, she was employed as a law clerk in Ohio's 8th District Court of Appeals. Subsequently, she was employed as a Magistrate in the Cuyahoga County Common Pleas Court, in the Probate Division. In November 1979 was elected to the Cleveland Municipal Court, where she became the first Black female to be elected to the position of judge in the state of Ohio without being appointed first. During her tenure, from 1980 to 2003, she served a term as Administrative Judge of the court. Following her retirement, she was elected in 2010 to serve on Cuyahoga County's newly formed County Council and was elected by her peers to serve as the Council's first President.

The most charismatic individual to serve on our bench was Carl B. Stokes. Elected to the Ohio House of Representatives in 1962, Stokes narrowly lost a bid for mayor of Cleveland in 1965. His victory two years later drew national attention, as he was the first African-American mayor of one of the ten biggest cities in the United States.

As mayor, Stokes opened city hall jobs to blacks and women. Stokes was reelected in 1969.

From 1983 to 1994, he served as municipal judge in Cleveland where he developed a reputation as a fair judge with a common sense approach to the law. President Bill Clinton then appointed him U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Seychelles. He was awarded 12 honorary degrees, numerous civic awards, and represented the United States on numerous goodwill trips abroad by request of the White House.

Probably one of the most electric people ever to serve on the Cleveland Municipal Court was Stephanie Tubbs Jones. Tubbs Jones was elected judge of the Cleveland Municipal Court in 1981 where she served a little less than a year before being appointed to serve on the Court of Common Pleas of Cuyahoga County. She served on that bench from 1983–91.

In 1990, she ran for Justice of the Supreme Court of Ohio replacing Mary Cacioppo, the winner of the Democratic Primary, who withdrew for health reasons. She narrowly lost that race to Republican incumbent J. Craig Wright.^[6]

She served as the Cuyahoga County Prosecutor from 1991 until 1999. In 1998, Tubbs Jones won the Democratic nomination for the 11th District after 30-year incumbent Louis Stokes announced his retirement. She was reelected four times with no substantive opposition.

In addition to these fine jurists, two other notable served part of their careers in the employ of the Cleveland Municipal Court. They are former councilman, former mayor and current U.S. Representative Dennis J. Kucinich, as well as, former councilman and current Mayor Frank G. Jackson, both of whom worked in the office of the Clerk of Court.

As you can see, our court is grounded in a strong tradition of excellence; that tradition served us well during the last 3 ½ years, as we've faced some tough times.

Today, we are the largest municipal court, by volume, in the state of Ohio. Last year approximately 120,000 cases were filed our court. Our territorial jurisdiction includes the City of Cleveland and the Village of Bratenahl.

We dispose of both traffic and misdemeanor violations committed within the boundaries of that jurisdiction. In addition, we set bonds and conduct initial appearances and preliminary hearings on felony cases committed within the City of Cleveland. The court also has subject matter jurisdiction over civil matters occur

within our boundaries. The Small Claims Division of the Court can decide cases where the amount in controversy does not exceed \$3,000.00. The General Division of the Court, meanwhile, can determine civil matters where the amount in controversy does not exceed \$15,000.00. These civil cases can include, but are not limited to, actions for the recovery of property, injunctions, contracts, personal injury, collection proceedings, and transferred judgments.

The court's functions are divided among its three divisions: the Office of the Clerk of Court, the Housing Division and the General Division. The judges are ultimately responsible for all of the court's case management and administrative operations.

As a result of the "Great Recession," like all other public institutions, the Cleveland Municipal Court experienced significant challenges. Greater Cleveland is experiencing a decline in its population, as employers increasingly move to the south and the west of the country, taking with them better-paying jobs manufacturing jobs and a significant portion of the city's tax base with them. The core city that makes up our jurisdiction is especially hard hit.

Between the end of 2008 and the end of 2011 the General Division, alone, saw its approved annual budget allocation from the City's General Fund shrink by approximately \$2,000,000, from more than \$24,000,000 to just under \$22, 000,000. At its lowest point, 37 people were eliminated from the Division's payroll, going from 306 employees to 269. The Clerk and the Housing division took similar budget reductions.

As a result of this forced austerity, we learned to be more efficient. The court developed a more focused approach and the judges accepted a set of governing principles. Those principles are:

1. To enhance the general perception of the Cleveland Municipal Court; To have it seen as a as a well-run,

innovative, collegial institution; To have people think of it as an institution of high integrity, one that is a desirable professional workplace and user-friendly.

2. To homogenize our court's operations and administration; to maximize our limited resources and to equalize the way that those resources are distributed for our use, through the elimination of any abuses of power, either real or perceived; To function as one court, although we are each separately elected.

3. To make the administrative operations of the Cleveland Municipal Court more transparent to the members of the bench, to our staff, to the other professionals whose agencies interface with the court and to the general public as a whole. We are entrusted with doing the people's business, so, to the degree possible, we should conduct that business in the clear light of day.

4. To increase the level of respect commanded by the employees of the court, while at the same time requiring increased levels of individual accountability from each employee, regarding their work responsibilities

5. To eliminate unnecessary, burdensome and artificial impediments to good job performance by simplifying our business processes whenever possible.

6. To move the judges of the court toward their true role as the appointing authority and policy-setters of the court, and away from their involvement in the day-to-day administrative functions; to provide the court's administrative managers with more latitude in their day-to-day operations of the court's business, but to hold them more strictly responsible for results.

7. To prioritize the deployment of state-of-the-art technology solutions and case management systems to facilitate the conduct of the court's business.

We made progress on all of those fronts during the last 3 ½ years. Surveys conducted with our users indicate general satisfaction with the level of service that the court delivers. Within the last year, changes to our business practices resulted in significant reductions in the amount of time that those visiting the court are required to spend before disposition of the matter that brings them to court. Particularly, replacing magistrates with judges during initial appearance misdemeanors dockets resulted in significantly greater numbers of minor and lower-level misdemeanor matters disposed without the necessity for a second court appearance. Modifications to our business practices virtually eliminated the onerous practice of jailing those charged with non-jailable minor misdemeanor offenses. The institution of other new business practices concerning probable cause determination for every person arrested reduced unnecessary jail stays from as much as five days to no more than 36 to 48 hours.

We pay closer attention to our limited resources. The court initiated Individual Judicial Resource Accounts so that individual judges can better manage their expenditures on such things as fees for called-but-unused jurors, drug testing, and educational and conference travel.

We trained all of our staff on the importance of ethical behavior and had each department review and revise its section of the court's personnel manual to insure that ethical behavior is highlighted. The process by which we evaluate the performance of our employees was completely revisited to make it more of a collaborative effort between all supervisors and their direct reports, to agree on goals and areas of needed improvement.

We now hold periodic court-wide meetings to inform all staff of important events and changes that effect the conduct of the court's business. We upgraded the court's presence on the

internet by replacing our static, out-of-date website with a totally revamped, dynamic, highly-interactive, and intuitive alternative that includes an effective intranet component. Additionally, we also regularly distribute a newsletter to staff, focused on the achievements and accomplishment of our talented employees.

We initiated regular weekly meetings between the chief administrators of all three divisions of the court to identify and eliminate bureaucratic impediments to progress. These meetings are so successful that monthly meetings between the Presiding Judge, the Administrative judge of the Housing Division and the Clerk are now scheduled to take this outstanding collaboration to the next level.

More and more of the court's administrative responsibilities are assumed by its management staff. The court concerns itself with its policy role and increasingly leaves the details of implementation to its managers.

Finally, this year, the court brought to a close the implementation phase of its new case management system. This proved not to be the beginning of the end, but, rather, the end of the beginning as the court now steps up to take responsibility for its vision of the court's future technology for recordkeeping and service delivery.

The Cleveland Municipal Court prides itself on a long history of forging progressive paths toward a legal system that is truly just. Today, our extensive referral programs are in many ways the heart of what we do. Rather than merely move defendants through the system, applying band aids over the social problems that culminated with appearances in court, the court seeks to create customized remedies that go to the underlying causes of this behavior.

We're part of a movement known as problem-solving courts. These courts actively grapple with the reality that simply sending offenders to jail or making them pay fines does not solve the

larger social problems and issues. It does not deal with the causes, but rather the symptoms of criminal and anti-social behavior. And frankly, in far too many cases, disproportionate punishment creates more problems than it sounds.

At the Cleveland Municipal Court, much of our problem-solving is implemented through our specialized dockets—Drug Court, the Mental Health Docket, the Dedicated Domestic Violence Docket and the Veterans Treatment docket. Specialized dockets are uniquely tailored to helping specific populations within the court system, by offering a therapeutically oriented judicial approach with court supervision and appropriate treatment options. Problem-solving courts typically share the following characteristics. They:

- Focus on outcomes
- Work toward systemic changes
- Collaborate with external parties
- Take non-traditional roles
- Use professional screenings and assessments
- Try to make early identification of potential candidates

Ohio has been a national leader in this area, establishing the first Drug Court in 1995. Cleveland Municipal Court followed closely behind, with the establishment of the Greater Cleveland Drug Court three years later.

Naturally, judges of the Cleveland Municipal Court **do** send offenders to jail and fine them, where appropriate. But we also remind ourselves that that is never enough. Our deeper work must be to change lives and minds, one at a time.

And that is the perfect segue to how we at the Cleveland Municipal Court view of the future. While no one can say with any degree of certainty what the future of the Cleveland

Municipal Court will bring, there are some things we can say with apparent certainty.

One of those things that we will have to find additional revenue streams to supplement the tax dollars that we receive if we are to continue to engage in the innovative practices that set us apart. We accepted that policy and do far in 2012 we raised almost 1.5 million dollars in grant funding to further the court's programmatic goals.

We also know that it is unlikely that Cleveland will soon experience again the meteoric growth that it did at the time our court was founded, and, therefore it is necessary to adjust to the current reality.

To do that successfully the court will need to rely on two things:

Technology and Collaboration.

We are moving to do just that. Over the last decade we struggled to update our case management system. But as we complete the implementation phase of that endeavor we realized that this is not the beginning of the end but, rather, the end of the beginning. As the information age continues to rush forward at a breakneck pace it is evident that dependence upon technology will increase exponentially, and the court is moving to position itself on the cutting edge of that technology. We are expanding our use of video conferencing as a resource not only to capture court proceedings but also to communicate with agencies and individual who need our services. By the year 2017, the court intends to be entirely paperless, streamlining our internal operations and making external and public access to appropriate information seamlessly and securely available.

The continued diminution of fiscal and other resources foretells the need for our institution to explore with others how to get the most out of what we do have. Recognizing that as a given, the Cleveland Municipal Court is taking steps to initiate

collaborations. We reached out to other municipal courts in the county to form a partnership to share some of our programmatic trusts such as drug court, veterans' treatment court, the Domestic Violence Education and Training program. We are working with the municipal court and the General, Domestic Relations and Juvenile Divisions of the Common Pleas Court to develop a uniform Protection Order Registry. We are in conversation with the Juvenile Court and the Cleveland Municipal School District to develop an effective way to address Cleveland's minor curfew problem which aggravates the problem of low school attendance and the attendant low academic performance. Initiatives like these save money and leverage performance for greater numbers of individual who need it within our jurisdiction and without with little or no additional cost.

In 2005 of Court developed a **Strategic Plan** that produced the following **Mission Statement**:

"The mission of the Cleveland Municipal Court is to ensure the rule of law, administer justice and to improve the public safety by providing a forum where persons obtain the orderly resolution of disputes and released services; all done in a fair, impartial, professional, courteous and timely manner."

Our motto is **Public Service with Pride**. When you come to the CMC, we strive to make that visit a pleasant one, where you will be treated with respect and dignity and when you leave here, **justice will be served**. That's essentially what this Court is all about.

Thank for your time and your consideration.