

# Pretrial Practices Data Oversight Board

## Preliminary Implementation Plan

July 1, 2022

## PRETRIAL DATA OVERSIGHT BOARD MEMBERSHIP

<p><b>Marcia M. Meis</b> Director Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts</p>	<p><b>Candice Adams</b> Circuit Court Clerk 18<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit</p>
<p><b>Tod Dillard</b> IPCSA President Morgan County Court Services Department</p>	<p><b>Jeremy Jewell, Ph.D., L.C.P., L.S.</b> Professor, Department of Psychology Southern Illinois University – Edwardsville</p>
<p><b>Jim Kaitschuk</b> Executive Director Illinois Sheriff’s Association</p>	<p><b>Timothy Lavery, Ph.D.</b> Associate Director, Research &amp; Analysis Unit Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority</p>
<p><b>Annie McGowan</b> Senior Research Associate The Civic Federation</p>	<p><b>Hon. Joseph McGraw</b> Chair, Supreme Court Committee on Equality Criminal Justice Center</p>
<p><b>Andrea Miller, Ph.D.</b> Senior Court Research Associate National Center for State Courts</p>	<p><b>David Olson, Ph.D.</b> Professor, Criminal Justice and Criminology Dept. Loyola University Chicago</p>
<p><b>Jonathan Pilsner</b> Assistant Appellate Defender Office of the State Appellate Defender</p>	<p><b>Mark Powers</b> Research Director Illinois Sentencing Policy Advisory Council</p>
<p><b>Jim Rowe</b> Kankakee County State’s Attorney Kankakee County State’s Attorney’s Office</p>	<p><b>Nick Sayner</b> President of the Board of Directors National Association of Pretrial Services Agencies</p>
<p><b>Floyd Stafford III</b> Program Officer Stearns Family Foundation</p>	<p><b>Cara LeFevour Smith</b> Director Office of Statewide Pretrial Services</p>

### ADVISORS FROM AOIC/OSPS

<p><b>Joanne Olson</b> Chief of Staff Office of Statewide Pretrial Services</p>	<p><b>Sharjeel Rizvi</b> Pretrial Administrator Office of Statewide Pretrial Services</p>
<p><b>Wendy Venvertloh</b> Deputy Director of Performance Management Office of Statewide Pretrial Services</p>	<p><b>Katie Blakeman</b> Senior Data and Innovation Manager Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts</p>
<p><b>Scott Block</b> Statewide Behavioral Health Administrator Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts</p>	<p><b>Jennifer Haegele-Ryterski</b> Data Manager, Probation Services Division Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts</p>
<p><b>Daniel Hunt</b> Deputy Director, Probation Services Division Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts</p>	

## **Formation of the Pretrial Practices Data Oversight Board**

The Pretrial Practices Data Oversight Board (Board) was created with the signing of Public Act 101-0652 (the “SAFE-T Act”, or Act) in February 2021. The goal of the Board’s creation was “to oversee the collection and analysis of data regarding pretrial practices in circuit court systems” (20 ILCS 3930/7.7).

The Administrative Director of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC) convened the Board in July of 2021 and held the inaugural meeting of the group in August of 2021. Since that time the Board has met monthly to complete the work defined in the Act.

## **Pretrial Practices Data Oversight Board Charges**

Through the creation of PA 101-0652 (the “SAFE-T Act”, or Act), the Pretrial Practices Data Oversight Board (Board) was provided with four distinct charges:

1. Identify existing pretrial data collection processes in local jurisdictions.
2. Define, gather and maintain records of pretrial data from applicable criminal justice system agencies.
3. Identify resources necessary to systematically collect and report data as defined in the Act.
4. Develop a plan to implement data collection processes sufficient to collect data as defined in the Act starting July 1, 2022.

These charges are defined in greater detail as follows:

### **1. Identify existing pretrial data collection processes in local jurisdictions.**

Prior to the formation of the Board, in the fall of 2020, the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Pretrial Practices Implementation Task Force (Task Force) convened a working group (Data Subcommittee) to identify the pretrial data collection practices in place in local jurisdictions.

The Data Subcommittee chose 12<sup>1</sup> of Illinois’ 102 counties, distributed throughout the State and including 4 large, 4 medium and 4 small, based upon the county’s population. This sample was further stratified to counties with established pretrial services and those without, or with newly emerging pretrial services. The committee was able to interview justice system representatives from 11 of the 12 counties through Zoom. The interview consisted of identifying the computer software used in each county agency to track pretrial defendants and discussing whether any data analysis of pretrial practices had been previously conducted in each county. The interview also went over 48 key pretrial data elements to determine whether those data elements were captured in unique fields. Data elements recorded in unique fields rather than in general text fields are crucial to efficiently collect and analyze the data elements from the separate systems without having to do extensive recoding or data cleaning. In most counties, the Pretrial/Probation Department, Sheriff’s Office and Circuit Clerk’s Office participated in the interviews. In some jurisdictions, other stakeholders such as Judges, Public Defenders, State’s Attorneys and IT professionals also participated. Finally, all 102-county pretrial/probation departments were contacted and asked basic operational questions related to pretrial services.

---

<sup>1</sup> The twelve counties were: Champaign, Kankakee, Kendall, Lake, Lee, Livingston, McDonough (9<sup>th</sup> Circuit), Morgan, St. Clair, Tazewell, Winnebago, Williamson.

The work of the Data Subcommittee produced the following key findings:

- Most counties have never systematically performed data analyses to examine their pretrial system or practices. The lack of systematic analyses occurs for many reasons, including:
  - Stakeholders' case management systems do not easily allow data entry or extraction. Often, if data are collected by Pretrial Departments, it is recorded in an Excel spreadsheet separate from their information system.
  - If the data are in the case management systems, often there are not existing reports that can be generated to summarize pretrial data for management or strategic planning purposes.
  - Most counties do not have dedicated IT professionals to extract the data needed for such analyses, or to combine the data that may reside in separate information systems across different agencies to perform these analyses.
  - Most do not feel they know what specific analyses should be performed or how to perform those analyses, acknowledging they are not data analysts/researchers.
  - If a case management system is capable of producing reports, there are extra costs associated with the creation of the reports.
- Of the 48 key pretrial data elements identified in the Pretrial Implementation Task Force's Data Subcommittee, most (66%) are collected by county systems (Pretrial/Probation, Sheriff, Circuit Clerk) as dedicated, type-appropriate fields rather than free form text fields in existing information systems. However, at this point it is not possible to determine how completely and consistently these data elements are actually recorded in the existing information systems.
- The greater majority of the 48 data elements are collected in the information systems maintained by County Sheriff's Offices and Circuit Clerk's Offices. Pretrial/Probation Departments capture most of the key pretrial data elements, but only for those cases they directly serve, not the entirety of the pretrial population. In most of Illinois' counties, a very small proportion of individuals who go through the pretrial process are served directly by Pretrial/Probation Departments.
- Electronic monitoring (EM) is managed differently in nearly every jurisdiction. Therefore, data elements related to electronic monitoring are not collected consistently or regularly by county justice agencies. For example, some counties contract with a third-party vendor for the EM operations and those vendors collect and maintain the EM data separate from county systems. In other counties the Sheriff's Office, State's Attorney's Office, Probation/Pretrial Department or some combination of these offices manage the EM program.
- If present, data elements needed to measure pretrial success rates, including failure to appear occurrences and new criminal offenses, are not in a format or specifically tied to other case indicators that would allow for easy calculation of these success rates.
  - Defendant attendance at each individual court date is only collected as a unique data field in half of the counties interviewed.
  - Record checks for new criminal offenses only occur by court personnel checking the local Circuit Clerk's system to determine if new charges were filed and by performing a check of the Illinois State Police's Criminal History Record Information (i.e., LEADS) and the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) to determine if new arrests or charges occurred in other jurisdictions. Currently, this must be done manually for each individual defendant, as there is no automatically triggered mechanism for statewide or nationwide record checks for pretrial defendants.

- Booking and releasing defendants through municipal lockups complicates data collection, as these defendants are not recorded in the county systems until the defendant has a court appearance through the county court system. A survey of Sheriff's Offices developed and distributed by the Pretrial Practices Data Oversight Board suggests that in many of Illinois' largest counties, a substantial number of individuals arrested are released directly from municipal lockups rather than county jails.
- Improving consistency and availability of key pretrial data elements will not be an easy process. It is likely to require extensive agreements, memorandums of understanding (MOU), Administrative Orders from Chief Circuit Judges, and significant funding to counties to support the necessary upgrades in their case management systems.
- Many stakeholders worry about the cost of data extraction, processing and sharing that they fear will most likely be borne by the counties.
- The AOIC has spent several months identifying data elements that will be collected as part of a comprehensive data collection and online reporting program. The elements that will be collected from court case management systems include primarily those elements that are already reported as part of the automated disposition reporting system (ADR), quarterly or annual statistical reporting, and financial reporting. Since data entry and business practices vary widely from county to county, it is not yet known how many elements will be immediately collectable. However, AOIC will work with each court's case management system (CMS) vendor to identify gaps and recommend field development where needed.

**2. Define, gather and maintain records of pretrial data relating to the topics listed in 20 ILCS 3930/7.7(c) from circuit clerks' offices, sheriff's departments, law enforcement agencies, jails, pretrial departments, probation departments, state's attorneys' offices, public defenders' offices and other applicable criminal justice system agencies.**

In the winter of 2020/2021, prior to the passage of PA 101-0652 and 20 ILCS 3930/7.7(c), the AOIC formed a pretrial data working group, including national and state experts, with the goal of developing a comprehensive set of pretrial data elements that would need to be collected from county circuit clerks, pretrial and probation departments and county jails operated by sheriff's offices. That work was completed early in 2021. Since that time the AOIC has continued to work with experts in the field to expand and refine the set of data elements and build those into the Judicial Branch's middleware, which is software that will eventually integrate each individual circuit court case management system with the AOIC's system. The Board convened a working group to review the pretrial measures and compare it to the required pretrial data topics identified in 20 ILCS 3930/7.7(c) for comprehensiveness. Based upon this review, a comprehensive list of data elements has been developed and is being integrated into the middleware of the Judicial Branch. As stated previously, the vast majority of the data elements will come from Circuit Clerks, Sheriff's Offices (Jails) and Pretrial/Probation Departments in Illinois.

While 20 ILCS 3930/7.7 directs that data collection begin July 1, 2022, collection of county-level data is not yet possible due to the many data infrastructure and funding limitations listed in the previous section. A significant amount of work and resources are still needed across each of the 102 counties to ensure that the data management systems used by each individual Circuit Clerk, Sheriff/Jail and Pretrial/Probation Department capture the needed data elements in a consistent/usable format, before data can be transmitted to, and analyzed by, AOIC.

**3. Identify resources necessary to systematically collect and report data related to the topics listed in 20 ILCS 3930/7.7(c).**

Though a specific cost estimate is not available, the Board has identified there will be substantial costs incurred by local county Circuit Clerks, Sheriffs/Jails and Pretrial/Probation Departments to integrate their case management software with the Judicial Branch's data collection and reporting platform, Socrata. Further, this will require additional data elements to be added into the case management software of the local departments and for staff to be trained and then begin collecting the additional elements. The legislation did not identify a funding source for these costs incurred by counties.

**4. Develop a plan to implement data collection processes sufficient to collect data on the topics listed in (c)- data collection to start July 1, 2022.**

The Pretrial Data Oversight Board recognizes how critical quality data collection is to further transparency, informed policy decision-making, and meaningful criminal justice system analysis. Therefore, considerable effort must be made to standardize data collection, transitioning from manual, including paper based, report preparation to direct transmission. Standardized and automated reporting will aid in minimizing errors and misinterpretation and reduce the burden of individual courts in responding to data requests. However, such statewide systemic change cannot take place overnight. In Illinois, there are currently 14 court case management systems, and a myriad of probation, pretrial and jail case management systems. While the Illinois Supreme Court, through the AOIC, does collect some data from all Illinois counties, none of the existing systems are integrated, and reports are submitted manually. Thorough, complete, and accurate data collection and reporting will require system-wide change, which the Illinois Supreme Court is prepared to lead.

In that vein, the AOIC has developed a multi-step plan to facilitate data collection and reporting. The Judicial Branch has contracted with Tyler Technologies for the use of Socrata, its data and insights product. AOIC is working with Socrata to integrate with local court case management systems, expanding existing APIs (application programming interface) where possible, and building new integrations with probation and pretrial departments. The AOIC has already begun inputting historical, aggregate data into the reporting platform, which provides some capacity for longitudinal analyses. The focus of the AOIC in the near term will be integrating with internal Judicial Branch stakeholders (Circuit Clerks and Probation/Pretrial Departments). While that work is underway integrations will be sought with non-Judicial Branch stakeholders, such as Sheriff's Departments/county jails. After these steps are completed and county-level data is integrated with the AOIC, it is the intention of the AOIC to aggregate the data on public dashboards.

In the near term, an integration with circuit court case management systems is being built to capture data elements that must be collected by Circuit Clerks. This integration will leverage an existing API to minimize costs and streamline collection. It is expected it will take at least a year to begin reporting case-level data, but is dependent on funding for the project, and the ability of counties to shift business practices to collect some elements.

The Office of Statewide Pretrial Services (OSPS) is presently building operations to provide pretrial services in 69 Illinois counties. The Office is currently seeking case management software, to include data collection and integration with the Judicial Branch's middleware, through an RFP (request for proposal) process. It is estimated this software will be operational within one year of contract execution.

The remaining counties in Illinois will be served by local Pretrial/Probation Departments. It is estimated these counties will be able to provide data by July 1, 2023, but this time frame is dependent on funding.

Finally, it is least clear how long it will take for county jails to provide data to the Judicial Branch's middleware. As a first step to understanding the data management systems used by jails in Illinois, the Pretrial Data Oversight Board conducted a survey of all county jails in Illinois. Among other findings, the survey found the information technology systems used by jails across the state vary widely, and not all of the systems capture case-level identifiers such as State Identification or court case numbers, which are important to the ability to link court cases across systems. See Exhibit A for the survey results.

### **Moving Forward**

The Pretrial Practices Data Oversight Board is committed to continuing to meet quarterly to support further advancements in the collection of pretrial data as articulated in 20 ILCS 3930/7.7(c). Updates regarding this process will be provided periodically on the Illinois Supreme Court's Website ([illinoiscourts.gov](http://illinoiscourts.gov)).

## **Results of the Pretrial Practices Data Oversight Board Survey of Illinois Sheriffs (2022)**

### **Introduction and Methodology**

Pursuant to 20 ILCS 3930/7.7, which required the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC) to establish a Pretrial Practices Data Oversight Board (PPDOB) and identify existing pretrial data collection processes in local jurisdictions, a survey of county sheriff's offices in Illinois was designed and administered by the PPDOB. The survey sought to obtain information from the county sheriff's offices to assess their ability and capacity to provide data that AOIC is required to collect per Public Act (PA) 101-0652 (enacted February 22, 2021 and referred to as the Pretrial Fairness Act, or PFA). The survey also sought to better understand the role of county sheriff's offices in processing of arrestees, how pretrial detainees are transported to court, and the use/capacity for jails to conduct video conferencing for court hearings. In addition to establishing the Pretrial Practices Data Oversight Board, 20 ILCS 3930/7.7 also requires AOIC to collect and maintain pretrial data from county justice agencies, determine the resources needed to achieve these goals, and regularly produce and publish analyses of these data.

The original request to complete the on-line survey (see below for a copy of the survey) was sent to all 102 of Illinois' elected sheriffs on 1/27/2022 by the Executive Director of the Illinois Sheriff's Association, an appointed member of the PPDOB. Two subsequent requests were sent to those Sheriff's Offices that had not responded on 2/18/22 and 3/7/22. As a result of these efforts, the PPDOB received 79 completed surveys. Of the 23 Sheriff's Offices that did not respond, 11 did not operate a jail. The Sheriff's Offices that did respond to the survey represent roughly 95% of all pretrial jail bookings and average daily population of jails in Illinois during 2021.

### **Findings**

Of the counties that responded to the survey, most (96%) operated a jail. From other data sources in Illinois, it is known that 11 of Illinois' 102 counties (11%) do not operate their own jail, thus the respondents to the survey were primarily those that operated jails. For most of the remaining analyses, only those counties operating jails are included. When all responses, including those that do not operate a jail, are included in the analyses that will be noted.

#### *Central Booking Facility*

Of the counties that operate jails and responded to the survey, 92% indicated that the jail serves as the central booking facility for the county. In other words, all adults subject to a custodial arrest (i.e., fingerprinted) are processed through the county jail facility.

#### *Jail Proximity to Courthouse(s)*

The survey also sought to determine the proximity of the jail(s) in each county to the courthouse, and how pretrial detainees are physically transported to court. For most (63%) counties, the jail is adjacent to the courthouse and detainees are walked to court from the jail. In one-third (33%)

of the counties, the jail is not adjacent to the courthouse, requiring detainees to be transported by vehicle to court. In a small number (4%) of the counties that responded to the survey, there are multiple courthouses in the county, resulting in both transport by vehicle as well as being walked to the adjacent courthouse(s).

### *Pretrial Detainees Held from Other Counties*

To understand the potential logistics of having pretrial detainees held in jail in one county, but having court cases in other counties, the survey asked Sheriffs if their county jail regularly houses pretrial detainees from other Illinois counties. Two-thirds (66%) of counties indicated that they *do not* regularly house pretrial detainees from other counties, while one-third (34%) of counties did house pretrial detainees from other counties.

These patterns were confirmed through analyses of data collected through the Mid-year 2019 Census of County Jails by the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. That census found that roughly one-third (35%) of jails in Illinois were housing detainees from other counties, while 65% were not. Further, through the jail census data, of those housing other county jail detainees, most (77%) held 10 or fewer mid-year 2019.

Further, among those Sheriffs that reported housing pretrial detainees from other counties, just under one-half (44%) indicated that they transport those detainees to the courthouse in the county where they are being tried.

### *Capacity for Pretrial Detainees to Participate in Video-Conferencing of Court Hearings from Jail*

When asked if the county jail currently has space and camera or computer equipment that allows for detainees to participate in video-conferencing of court hearings, 91% indicated this was the case. Of those that reported having space and equipment for video-conferencing of court hearings, roughly three-quarters (72%) indicated that this was through a web-based connection, while the remaining 28% reported the connection was through a direct-feed.

Just over one-half (54%) of those reporting the use of video-conferencing of court hearings for jail detainees said this was implemented specifically because of COVID-19, while just under one-half (44%) reported the use of video-conferencing was not because of COVID-19. When asked if the use of video-conferencing would likely continue after COVID-19, among those reporting use of video-conferencing, roughly one-half (48%) did not answer yes or no, perhaps suggesting they are not sure or that the decision is not theirs to make. Of those that did answer the question, the vast majority—83%--said the use of video-conferencing would likely continue after COVID-19. Further, while most (77%) feel the space and equipment that allows for detainees to participate in video conferencing of court hearings is adequate, roughly one-quarter (23%) did not feel this was the case.

### *Jail Information Technology Systems*

Given that part of the goal of the survey was to gauge what will be needed in order for AOIC to comply with 20 ILCS 3930/7.7, the survey also asked questions about the specific information

technology (IT) systems used by the jails, the age of those systems, planned changes to the IT systems, and the degree to which specific information needed to link data from jail systems to other information systems maintained by the court system existed. When it came to the specific vendor/system used by the jails, there was considerable variation across the 76 Sheriffs that responded to the survey and operated jails. For example, 12 (16%) reported using one-specific system, 9 (12%) reported using another specific system, 8 (10%) reported using another specific system, 2 reported not having an IT system for the jail, and the remaining 45 reported using one of at least 20 different IT systems by private vendors or created by local county IT departments.

When it came to the length of time Sheriffs reported using their specific IT systems, roughly one-half (47%) reported using the current system for fewer than 10 years (27% reported less than 5 years plus 19% reporting 5 to 9 years). On the other hand, just over one-half (53%) reported using their current IT system for 10 years or more (42% for 10 to 19 years plus 11% for 20-plus years). Only 18% of the county Sheriffs reported that they planned to replace their existing jail management information system in the next three years, while 15% indicated “maybe”, and 67% indicated “no.”

The survey also asked respondents if specific individual/case-level identifiers were included in the jail information management system. Roughly one-half of respondents indicated that the state-police issued, fingerprint-based State Identification (SID) was captured in the jail information system, 64% reported that the court case number was captured, and 78% indicated that some type of locally generated identifier (e.g., inmate identification number, local defendant number) was included in their system. The availability of these identifiers will be critical given that the goal/expectation under 20 ILCS 3930/7.7 is to be able to link data/cases going through court (e.g., cases filed and disposed, cases going to a release conditions or detention hearing) to information regarding length of time in pretrial detention in jails. Further, while most counties reported including court case numbers in their jail information system, the degree to which these data fields are populated or formatted similar to that in the court systems remains to be determined.

In almost one-half (45) of the counties that responded to the survey, no other agency staff from outside of the Sheriff’s Office (e.g., local police departments, County State’s Attorney, or County Probation Department) are able to access the jails management information system to find information beyond what is maintained on a publically accessible web-site. When staff external to the Sheriff’s Office were able to access the jail’s information system, it was usually local police departments (44% of jails allowed the local police department staff to access their information system), the State’s Attorney’s Office (37% of jails allowed the State’s Attorney or State’s Attorney staff to access their information system), or local probation departments (24% of jails allowed the probation department staff to access their information system).

The survey also asked if the public is able to find information about individuals who are detained in each county’s jail through an internet-based portal (e.g., can they search by name, determine the charges against an individual and when they were admitted to the jail, etc.). Just under one-half (45%) of the Sheriff’s Offices that responded indicated this was possible, while 55% reported it was not.

# Survey of Illinois Sheriff's Offices Regarding Jail Data

---

## Survey Introduction

The purpose of this survey is to obtain information from the county sheriff's offices in Illinois to assess their ability and capacity to provide data that the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC) is required to collect per Public Act (PA) 101-0652 (enacted February 22, 2021 and referred to as the Pretrial Fairness Act, or PFA). Included in PA 101-0652 was the addition of 20 ILCS 3930/7.7, which requires AOIC to establish a Pretrial Practices Data Oversight Board, identify existing pretrial data collection processes in local jurisdictions, collect and maintain pretrial data from county justice agencies, determine the resources needed to achieve these goals, and regularly produce and publish analyses of these data.

To assist AOIC in meeting these statutory requirements, the Pretrial Practices Data Oversight Board is soliciting information from all 102 county sheriff's offices in Illinois to assess current data collection practices and management information system capacities as it relates to jail admissions, populations and exits.

Q1 What County Sheriff's Office are you completing this survey for?

---

Q2 Does your county currently operate a jail?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

*If "Yes" survey continues to Q3, If "no" survey continues to Q22*

Q3 Are all individuals subject to a custodial arrest (i.e. fingerprinted) in your county booked/processed through your county jail facility?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q4 Which of the following best describes how jail detainees in your county are transported to court?

- The jail is not adjacent to the courthouse and detainees are transported by vehicle (1)
- The jail is adjacent to the courthouse and detainees are walked to court (2)
- Our county has multiple courthouses. Some detainees are transported by vehicle and others are walked to the court (3)

Q5 Does your county jail regularly house pre-trial detainees from other Illinois counties?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

*If "Yes" survey continues to Q6, If "no" survey continues to Q7*

Q6 When your county jail houses pretrial detainees from other Illinois counties, does your office transport those detainees to the courthouse in the county where they are being tried for their hearings?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q7 Does your *county jail* currently have a space and camera or computer equipment that allows for detainees to participate in video-conferencing of court hearings?

Yes (1)

No (2)

*If "Yes" survey continues to Q8, If "no" survey continues to Q13*

Q8 Can outside agencies or individuals access these video conferences via a web-based connection or is it a "direct feed"?

Yes, it is a web-based connection that others could access (1)

No, it is a direct feed (2)

Q9 Was video-conferencing of court hearings for jail detainees implemented specifically because of COVID-19?

Yes (1)

No (2)

*If "Yes" survey continues to Q10, If "no" survey continues to Q11*

Q10 Is the video-conferencing of court hearings for jail detainees likely to continue after COVID-19 restrictions are lifted?

Yes, it's likely to continue (1)

No, it's not likely to continue (2)

Q11 Do you feel the space and equipment that allows for detainees to participate in video conferencing of court hearings is adequate?

Yes (1)

No (2)

*If "No" survey continues to Q12, If "no" survey continues to Q20*

Q12 What about the current space and equipment should be improved?

---

---

---

---

---

Q13 Does your county jail currently use a computerized jail management information system?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

*If "Yes" survey continues to Q14, If "no" survey continues to Final Question*

Q14 What is the name of system or vendor used by the county jail?

---

Q15 How long has the county jail been using this system or vendor?

- Less than 5 years (1)
- 5-9 years (2)
- 10-19 years (3)
- 20+ years (4)

Q16 Which of the following information is captured by the jail information management system used in your county? Please select all that apply

- State Police Issued State Identification Number (SID) (1)
- Document Control Number (DCN) assigned by the State Police to the arrest event (2)
- County Court Case Number (3)
- Unique identifier/number (other than a name or court case number) issued by the county for the defendant (4)
- None of the Above (5)

Q17 Are staff from other agencies in your county able to access your jail's management information system to find information about individuals detained in your jail through *secure, non-public* computer access? Please select all agencies that have staff with this access.

- Clerk of Circuit Court (1)
  - County State's Attorney's Office (2)
  - County Public Defender's Office (3)
  - County Probation and Court Services Department (4)
  - Office of the Chief Judge (5)
  - Local (municipal) Police Department (6)
  - Other (Please Specify Below) (7)
- 
- None of the Above. ONLY jail staff have access to the jail management information system. (8)

Q18 Is the *public* able to find information about individuals who are detained in your jail through an *internet-based* portal (e.g., can they search by name, determine the charges against an individual and when they were admitted to the jail, etc.)?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

*If "Yes" survey continues to Q19, If "no" survey continues to Q20*

Q19 Please enter the URL for the website the public can use to find information about individuals detained in your jail

---

End of Block: Public Information

---

Start of Block: Block 14

Q20 Is your county planning on replacing the existing jail management information system in the next three years?

- No (1)
- Maybe (2)
- Yes (3)

*If "Yes" or "Maybe" survey continues to Q21, If "no" or "maybe" survey continues to Final Question*

Q21 Do you know the name or vendor of the new jail management information system you will be replacing your current system with?

- Yes (please specify below) (1)

---

- No (2)

*Survey continues to Final Question from Here*

Q22 Are all individuals subject to a custodial arrest (i.e., fingerprinted) in your county fingerprinted or processed in a county jail facility in another county?

Yes (1)

No (2)

Q23 When an individual is arrested in your county but is detained in another county jail facility, is your county responsible for transporting those individuals to court in your county?

Yes (1)

No (2)

Q24 Where are individuals who are arrested in your county booked or processed?

---

---

---

---

---

*Survey continues to Final Question from Here*

---

Final Question

Email Thank you for completing the survey! Please provide the e-mail address of the person completing this survey in case there is a need to follow-up with any questions regarding specific responses.

---