2014 Annual Report of the Illinois Courts

STATE OF ILLINOIS

26.1818

Administrative Summary

THE JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS



Left to Right: Justice Anne M. Burke, Justice Thomas L. Kilbride, Justice Charles E. Freeman, Chief Justice Rita B. Garman, Justice Robert R. Thomas, Justice Lloyd A. Karmeier, Justice Mary Jane Theis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Letter of Transmittal
A Message from the Chief Justice2-5
Annual Report of the Chief Justice to the Ninety-Ninth General Assembly6-11
Court Funding12-13
Court Operations14-15
The Justices of the Supreme Court16-17
Supreme Court Support Staff18-19
Supreme Court Committees 20
Judicial Conference Committee Activities
Appellate Court
Circuit Courts
Administrative Office

Cover Design: "Law and Knowledge" — "Justice and Power" by Charles J. Mulligan (1866-1916) One of two statues face visitors as they enter the main (north) entrance of the Supreme Court Building in Springfield. The one on the right, "Law and Knowledge" [front cover] and the other statue to the left, [back cover] "Justice and Power" were completed sometime between 1908 and 1910. Sculptor Charles J. Mulligan was born in Ireland and arrived in Chicago in 1872 with his father James. His start as a sculptor began by modeling clay dug from the Illinois & Michigan Canal, and later as a marble-cutter in Chicago. He studied under Lorado Taft at the Art Institute of Chicago and Alexander Faleuiere in Paris, France. He succeeded Taft as the head of the Department of Sculpture at the Institute and served in that role until his death. Some of his other works appear in Garfield Park, Chicago (Lincoln as a Railsplitter and the John F. Finnerty statues); Riverview Park, Quincy (General George Rogers Clark statue); and Rosemond Grove Cemetery, Rosemond (Lincoln the Orator statue).

Photos provided by Artistic Portraits.

Printed by Authority of the State of Illinois 12-15/300/PR15-2211

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL



Michael J. Tardy Director

A m pleased to offer the 2014 Annual Report of the Illinois Courts. The Report contains a summary of the day-to-day operations of our court system and an overview of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts. Highlighted in the Report are some of the many initiatives undertaken and implemented by the Illinois Judicial Branch this past year. The Supreme Court and the dedicated employees of the Illinois court system continued the important work of the courts with an emphasis on technology, transparency and access to justice.

The Report contains two volumes: an Administrative Summary and a Statistical Summary. The Administrative Summary includes a message from Chief Justice Rita B. Garman and the 2014 Report to the Illinois General Assembly, as well as an overview of the state and local funding required for the operation of our court system. The Administrative Summary also provides information on the judicial officers and employees, who maintain operations for our court system. A second volume, the Statistical Summary, includes statistical data on the court case loads at the Supreme, Appellate, and Circuit court levels.

1

The Administrative Office gratefully acknowledges the Clerks of the Supreme, Appellate, and Circuit Courts for their continued support, commitment and cooperation in compiling and providing the case load statistics published in this Report. I also wish to thank the staff of the Administrative Office for their assistance in the preparation of this Report. On behalf of the Supreme Court, I wish to express my appreciation for the efforts and dedication of the honorable men and women who make up the Illinois Judiciary, as well as the non-judicial employees and court personnel who strive to advance fair, efficient and affordable justice to all in Illinois.

I hope that this Report serves as a valuable tool in understanding the work and function of our court system. I invite you to visit the Illinois Supreme Court's website at www.illinoiscourts.gov for the most current information concerning the Illinois court system and the judicial branch of government. The website is frequently updated in order to provide a current source of information to the citizens we serve.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Tardy, Director Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts



A MESSAGE FROM CHIEF JUSTICE RITA B. GARMAN

n behalf of my colleagues on the Illinois Supreme Court, I am honored to present the 2014 Annual Report of the Illinois Courts, outlining the initiatives undertaken and the goals achieved during the past year. I am especially pleased to have the opportunity to inform the citizens of Illinois of the Court's on-going efforts to promote judicial transparency, fiscal efficiency, and equal access to justice throughout our court system. The Illinois Supreme Court, assisted by the dedicated staff of our Administrative Office and the judges and staff members devoted to serving our unified court system, works tirelessly to uphold individual rights and liberties, to promote the impartial interpretation of the law, and to achieve efficient disposition of all matters brought before our courts.

This Report is presented in two volumes. The Administrative Summary contains the Supreme Court's Report to the General Assembly on the activities of the Illinois Judicial Conference, informs on state and local funding for the courts, and explains the operations of our unified court system. The Administrative Summary also serves to acquaint the public with the officers and employees of the Illinois Supreme, Appellate, and Circuit Courts in order to promote a better understanding of who we are and what we do. The second volume of this Report, the Statistical Summary, provides data on the numbers and types of cases filed and disposed of in the Supreme, Appellate, and Circuit Courts during 2014. Included are graphs presenting five-year trends in total caseloads and in specific types of cases.

I am pleased to note that the Report this year includes some new components relating to case clearance rates for our circuit courts. The clearance rate is one of several recognized court performance measures that offer feedback to courts on how they are performing and meeting goals, aid in decision-making about processes and resource allocation, and enhance transparency and accountability to the public. This year's Report also begins to break out circuit court data into the case categories utilized by the National Center for State Courts, thereby allowing for greater comparison of data across many of our nation's state courts that also report in the same manner.

Another new component to the 2014 Report is the inclusion of preliminary data related to access to justice initiatives. During 2014, the Court continued its active involvement in efforts to enhance access to justice in the Illinois courts and to improve the efficiency and transparency of the judicial system through the expanded use of technology. This past year, the Court also focused on meaningful change in the criminal pretrial structure and operations by conducting an operational review of pretrial services in Cook County.

I am also proud to report that the biennial Education Conference presented by the Education Committee of the Illinois Judicial Conference for all Illinois judges was held this year and was deemed a great success by all involved. The Education Conference covered a broad range of topics, so that our judges had access to the most current and most advanced information. Specifically, the 2014 Education Conference offered different sessions covering four 67 broad subject areas: Criminal Law; Civil Litigation; Ethics, Judicial Conduct and Professionalism; and Family Law, which were taught by 125 active Illinois judges. This conference and other judicial education programs illustrate how the Supreme Court, in its administrative authority over the judicial branch, works to improve the Illinois court system.

While, as always, there is more to be done, I am truly honored to highlight some of the major accomplishments achieved by the judicial branch of state government in 2014.

Review of Criminal Pretrial Services in Cook County

In 2013, the Court approved a comprehensive analysis of the Cook County pretrial services program, which was created by statute to provide guidance to judges setting bond for felony and misdemeanor defendants. In March 2014, the Court issued a report identifying systemic shortcomings in areas of technology, automation, leadership, and management. The report proposed 40 recommendations for improvements, including a reorganization of pretrial services management, supervision, and staffing. The recommendations - both broad-based and specifically targeted, depending on the goal - comprise a strategic plan to improve and support the pretrial process. The purpose of the report is to facilitate movement toward meaningful changes in pretrial structure and operations, including systemic improvements in information sharing, communication, and training. Since the report's release, the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts and Chief Judge Timothy Evans continue to collaborate to bring the report's 40 recommendations to fruition and to ensure sustainability of the reforms.

Court Interpreter Certification Program

In October 2014, the Court announced the creation of a certification program for court interpreters. This new program is designed to enhance access to justice in Illinois courts for those with limited English proficiency. It is axiomatic that when access to justice is limited, justice is not truly served. The certification program will provide uniform standards for interpreters in Illinois courtrooms. As such, the program will ensure that competent, ethical, and reliable interpreter services are available in our courtrooms so that parties and witnesses may fully realize the benefits of our system of justice. The Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts will develop training and testing protocols, consistent with national standards, to ensure that interpreters have the requisite skills, ethical knowledge, and fluency in English and the foreign language. The goal of the certification program is to develop and maintain a listing of certified interpreters that is sufficient to provide Illinois courts with a competent and reliable interpreter program statewide. Further, to support this goal, the Supreme Court, through the Administrative Office, provides financial reimbursement to the trial courts for their use of registered and certified interpreters.

Expansion of E-Filing in Criminal and Traffic Cases

In October 2014, the Court amended its standards and principles on electronic filing to allow trial courts in Illinois to accept

electronic filing of court documents in criminal and traffic cases. These amendments to the electronic filina standards will streamline the system and increase its efficiency by expanding the types of cases that can be e-filed, generating savings to the taxpayer and conserving environmental resources. This e-filing expansion benefits those counties implementing an e-Traffic Citation program participating counties because can eliminate transmission of the paper copy of the e-Citation, which makes up the highest volume of filed documents.

Creation of E-Business Policy Advisory Board

In November 2014, the Court created the e-Business Policy Advisory Board to analyze e-Business initiatives and recommend standards and policies to support and promote e-Business in the judicial branch. The Court also created the e-Business Technical Committee which works with the e-Business Policy Advisory Board to develop technical standards that support the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) and data exchange and transmission standards to foster the sharing of trial court information between counties and court partners. The Advisory Board, in conjunction with the Technical Committee, will provide recommendations, advice, and guidance to the Court regarding implementation and expansion of e-Business applications and data exchanges in the Illinois court system.

Cameras in the Courtroom Project

In 2012, the Court approved a pilot project to allow news media cameras and audio equipment in the Illinois trial courts. The policy, rolled out by approval on a countyby-county basis, provides the public with the ability to observe the operations of the Illinois court system, while addressing the legitimate concerns of jurors, parties, and witnesses. By the end of 2013, 35 counties in 13 judicial circuits had been approved to participate in the project. Response to the presence of cameras in courtrooms has been consistently positive, with no notable difficulties reported by judges, parties, or members of the media.

In February 2014, the Supreme Court announced that news cameras and microphones would be allowed in trial courtrooms in Peoria County, which becomes the 36th county in Illinois to participate in this successful pilot project. The remaining four counties in the Tenth Circuit will also join the pilot project in the upcoming months, which will bring the total participating counties to 40. The Court's order approving implementation by the Tenth Circuit requires that a judge who presides over a proceeding in which cameras or audio equipment are allowed must file a report with the chief judge of the circuit, the Chief Justice, and the Supreme Court Justice over the appellate district where the circuit court is located. The success, enthusiastic response, and continued growth of the extended media coverage pilot project confirm that it serves a very important purpose in bringing transparency to the court system.

In December 2014, the Court approved the Cook County Circuit Court to become a part of the pilot project, thus allowing the use of media cameras in some Cook County criminal courtrooms. This announcement is an important next step in the Court's efforts to bring greater transparency to the judicial process.

Creation of the AOIC Civil Justice Division

In early 2014, the Court created a Civil Justice Division within the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts. This new division is charged with supporting the Court's many initiatives to improve access to justice throughout the state. The creation of the Civil Justice Division formalizes the role of the Access to Justice Commission within the Court's administrative structure. By bringing this function within the Administrative Office, the Court has ensured that access to justice initiatives will be fully supported by all of the facilities and resources available to the Court and integrated into the Court's larger efforts. The expertise of Civil Justice Division staff has already netted great strides in the court interpreter program and the development of standardized court forms.

Restoration of the Historic Supreme Court Building

In June 2013, the Illinois Supreme Court Building in Springfield underwent a major restoration, including both structural alterations and the restoration of historic tapestries and murals. The project included restoration and preservation of the public spaces, courtrooms, library, and support spaces. Offices, storage spaces, and work areas were updated for improved efficiencies in the digital and electronic age. Mechanical, heating, cooling, plumbing, and ventilation systems were replaced provide consistent humidification to levels for the long-term maintenance of the historic elements within the building. Technology enhancements included three new High Definition cameras permanently installed in the Supreme Court Courtroom and connected to a commercial-grade production video switcher. The new video recording system will allow the Court's oral arguments and other events to be recorded in a standard HD format and to be accessible via download by the media and the public. The project was made possible by funding authorized by the Illinois General Assembly and is the first major remodeling of the building since it was opened in 1908.

During the renovation, the Court convened for oral arguments at the Michael A. Bilandic Building in Chicago. In May 2014, the Court announced that it would also hear oral arguments in the historic courthouse in Ottawa on May 21, 2014. Local educators, students, and state and local officials attended the event and an overflow crowd viewed the arguments which were livestreamed on the Internet. The Justices chose to "ride circuit" in Ottawa as part of the Court's initiative to bring its work to the people to increase transparency and to demonstrate the judicial process in action. This event marked what is believed to be only the second time that the Illinois Supreme Court has heard oral arguments outside of Springfield or Chicago since 1897, when the Court was consolidated in Springfield.

On August 27, 2014, the Illinois Supreme Court Building officially re-opened to the public. The October 7, 2014, rededication ceremony was attended by numerous state and local officials. A plaque commemorating the Supreme Court Building's restoration is permanently affixed next to the original dedication plaque commemorating the Building opening in 1908.

Conclusion

The rededication ceremony allowed a few moments to savor the many goals achieved by the Illinois courts in 2014. I invite you to review the 2014 Annual Report, which provides further information about the functions and activities of the judicial branch.

Finally, on behalf of my colleagues on the Illinois Supreme Court, I wish to extend sincere appreciation to all of the individuals who helped make 2014 such a productive year. Operating the Illinois court system so that it functions with the highest levels of integrity and efficiency requires a tremendous amount of dedication and hard work, and it would be impossible without the collective efforts and deep commitment of all judicial branch officers and employees. I look forward to another successful year of achievement for our courts.

Rica B. Garman

Rita B. Garman Chief Justice Illinois Supreme Court



2014 ANNUAL REPORT TO THE NINETY-NINTH ILLINOIS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

January 30, 2015

Honorable Michael J. Madigan Speaker of the House House of Representatives Springfield, IL 62706

Honorable Jim Durkin Minority Leader House of Representatives Springfield, IL 62706 Honorable John J. Cullerton President of the Senate State Senate Springfield, IL 62706

Honorable Christine Radogno Minority Leader State Senate Springfield, IL 62706

Dear Legislative Leaders:

I am pleased to provide an Annual Report of the activities of the 2014 Illinois Judicial Conference in keeping with Article VI, Section 17, of the Illinois Constitution of 1970. Pursuant to this constitutional provision, Illinois Supreme Court Rule 41 creates the Illinois Judicial Conference and charges the Conference with considering the work of the courts and suggesting improvements in the administration of justice. The past year has been a very productive one for the Conference.

The Conference consists of an Executive Committee and eight standing committees that address issues of: (1) alternative dispute resolution, (2) automation and technology, (3) complex litigation, (4) criminal justice, (5) discovery procedures, (6) judicial education, (7) juvenile justice and (8) strategic planning.

The annual meeting of the Judicial Conference was convened on October 23, 2014, with a focus on evaluating and improving public perception and trust in the Illinois court system. The format and agenda of the annual meeting were structured to promote active participation by all attendees to assist the Supreme Court to improve public perception of the Illinois Courts.

In addition, each of the eight standing committees of the Conference provided a written report to the Supreme Court, summarizing initiatives undertaken during Conference Year 2014 and proposing projects for 2015. In further compliance with Article VI, Section 17 of the Illinois Constitution of 1970, this Report includes a summary of the work performed by each of the committees.

The work of the Judicial Conference supports the Supreme Court's overall commitment to the efficient administration of justice and management of our court system, as well as the prudent stewardship of both human and financial resources. The Supreme Court will continue to set goals and develop plans to assure that the Illinois judicial branch provides equal justice to all and upholds the rule of law.

Respectfully,

T. B

Rita B. Garman Chief Justice

6

Annual Report to the General Assembly on the 2014 Judicial Conference

Article VI, section 17, of the Illinois Constitution mandates that the Illinois Supreme Court convene an annual judicial conference to consider the work of the courts and to suggest improvements in the administration of justice. Illinois Supreme Court Rule 41 implements this constitutional requirement by defining the duties and the membership of the Illinois Judicial Conference. The Conference is composed of judges from every level of the judiciary and represents Illinois' five judicial districts. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Illinois presides over the Conference, and the other Justices serve as members.

Pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rule 41, an Executive Committee acts on behalf of the Conference when it is not in session. The Executive Committee consists of fourteen judges, with six from the First Judicial District (Cook County) and two each from the Second, Third, Fourth, and Fifth Judicial Districts. The Executive Committee previews the written reports of the Conference committees and submits an annual meeting agenda for the Supreme Court's approval. During Conference Year 2014, the Executive Committee also helped frame the membership, charge and projects for a new Supreme Court Committee on Equality.

Eight standing committees carry out the work of the Conference throughout the year. These committees are: the Alternative Dispute Resolution Coordinating Committee, the Automation and Technology Committee, the Study Committee on Complex Litigation, the Criminal Justice Committee, the Committee on Discovery Procedures, the Committee on Education, the Juvenile Justice Committee, and the Committee on Strategic Planning. The committees' membership includes appellate, circuit, and associate judges, who also serve as members of the Judicial Conference. Their work is aided by judges, law professors, and attorneys appointed by the Supreme Court as advisors. Senior level staff of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts serve as liaisons to support the committees' activities.

On October 23, 2014, the Illinois Judicial Conference held its annual meeting in Lombard, Illinois. The meeting was concentrated into one full day to minimize the judges' time away from the bench and to reduce costs.

Chief Justice Rita B. Garman convened the meeting. In her opening remarks, Chief Justice Garman welcomed those in attendance, including the current Justices of the Supreme Court. Chief Justice Garman began her comments by noting that the topic for this year's Conference would take a slightly different approach. Usually, the Conference focuses on topics such as improvements to court procedures, implementation of new technologies, or alternative approaches to dispute resolution. While noting those are all important topics for the Court, Chief Justice Garman stated that this year's Conference would focus on how the public perceives the judicial system and ways to improve public perception and trust in the judicial process.

The Chief Justice stated that many litigants' understanding of the judicial process is based on their exposure to television shows and movies that give a false impression that judges are confrontational, lack self-restraint, and make rulings based on their subjective impressions of the people before the court. Misunderstandings about the judicial process may also result from inaccurate media reports. She also noted that members of the public may swap stories about their experiences with the legal system, resulting in the perpetuation of what has been described as "bar law," or things people tell each other in bars or in other causal encounters. Examples include the commonly held belief that a noncustodial parent does not have to pay child support if he or she does not exercise visitation rights, the person who thinks that a couple has a common-law marriage because they have lived together for seven years, or the litigant who believes that the outcome of a case will be influenced by writing a letter to a judge. Chief Justice Garman went on to state that these examples reveal just some of the many misconceptions the general public has about the judicial process, both with regard to the outcomes of well publicized cases and the role of the judiciary in our society.

The Chief Justice then emphasized the difficulties judges face with trying to correct these inaccuracies. The Judicial Canons prohibit individual judges from commenting on specific cases, writing a letter to the editor to explain why a reporter's report on a verdict was inaccurate, or calling a reporter to explain why certain evidence had to be excluded or why a mistrial had to be declared. However, it was her belief that, as a group, judges could do a much better job of educating the public about the work of the judiciary and judicial processes. Chief Justice Garman indicated that the first step to improving public perception of the judicial process is to learn what the public believes, so that strategies can be formulated to respond to those beliefs.

She presented data from a survey conducted by the National Center for State Courts which showed that while the public viewed the judiciary in a generally favorable manner, there were some areas of concern. The survey results revealed that eighty percent of the participants agreed that judges are generally honest and fair; eighty-five percent agreed that the courts protect a defendant's constitutional rights; and almost seventy-five percent agreed that court personnel are helpful and courteous. However, while these numbers seem positive, Chief Justice Garman then pointed out that only twenty-three percent of the survey participants expressed a great deal of trust or confidence in the judicial system as a whole. In addition, the survey revealed that only sixty percent of the respondents thought that the people involved in court cases understood court rulings.

Chief Justice Garman observed that parties' trust and confidence in the judicial process is the key to their acceptance of the legitimacy of the decisions. The Chief Justice stated that academics use the term "procedural justice" to describe this process. Participants in the judicial process, whether parties, witnesses, or jurors, are more likely to accept the process as legitimate if they feel that during their interaction with the court system, they have been treated with dignity, their stories were heard by objective decision makers, and the process was fair. She further noted that an individual who feels that he or she has been treated fairly, that their side of the dispute has been given due consideration, and that the judge making the decision was fair and impartial, will more likely accept the decision as legitimate and will more likely comply with the court's order. Thus, striving to deliver not only substantive justice, but procedural justice, is a crucial concern for judges in improving the public perception at the micro level.

Chief Justice Garman also detailed macro-level efforts by the Illinois Supreme Court designed to increase the public's perception of the Illinois judicial process by increasing accessibility and transparency. She noted that the Court's





website contains links to a wide variety of resources for both attorneys and members of the public. Via the website, any member of the public may view appellate and Illinois Supreme Court oral arguments, read opinions online, access the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission website to research an individual attorney's history, and read rules governing judicial conduct and the rules of professional responsibility. She also highlighted the vital role that the Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice plays in improving public understanding of the judicial process. Specifically, translation services for non-English speakers and simplification of certain routine proceedings, such as name changes, have increased access to justice and demonstrated that the court system is responsive to the needs of individuals.

In closing, Chief Justice Garman noted that the Supreme Court and the various committees of the Judicial Conference continue to look for ways to increase public understanding and trust in the judicial process. She stated, "We are open to ideas and suggestions. For only if members of the general public are well informed about the working of the court system and the role of judges in the trial court and in the appellate process, will there be public confidence in the work we do. That would be a great achievement." Chief Justice Garman then wished everyone a successful meeting and urged them to share personal experiences and to learn from each other, so that they would be able to return home with new ideas and a renewed commitment to serve the people of Illinois and to improve public perception of the court process.

Chief Justice Garman then introduced two nationally renowned court consultants from the National Center for State Courts who provided a presentation: *"Strategies to Gauge and Improve the Public Perception of the Illinois Court System."*

Each of the eight standing committees of the Illinois Judicial Conference provided written reports to the Supreme Court. Their reports are briefly summarized below.

Alternative Dispute Resolution Coordinating Committee

The Alternative Dispute Resolution Coordinating Committee monitors and assesses court-annexed mandatory arbitration and mediation programs approved by the Supreme Court. Along with the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts, the Committee tracks mandatory arbitration statistics to monitor program efficacy.

During this Conference year, the Committee finalized a comprehensive report to the Court regarding the results of a survey conducted to gauge the perceptions of judges and attorneys regarding civil mediation. The Committee drafted two surveys, one to judges and one to attorneys. The results of the judicial survey showed a positive attitude towards mandatory civil mediation. In particular, seventyeight percent (78%) of respondents had referred cases to mediation; fifty-six percent (56%) found mediation to be very helpful in achieving settlement of cases; and sixty percent (60%) found that mediation expedited resolution of cases. The results from the attorney survey also revealed a positive attitude towards civil mediation. Four hundred and fifteen (415) attorneys replied to the survey and, like the judges, generally expressed a positive attitude towards mediation. Forty-two percent (42%) of the respondents utilized mediation in civil cases with a value of more than fifty-thousand dollars (\$50,000.00), excluding mortgage foreclosure cases. Fifty-two percent (52%) found mediation to be somewhat helpful in achieving settlement, and the same percentage found that mediation expedited the resolution of cases.

Based on these survey results, the Committee anticipates examining Supreme Court Rule 99 (Mediation Programs) to determine if that rule needs expansion and/or clarification to standardize guidelines for requesting Supreme Court approval of new mediation programs and the day-to-day operation of existing mediation programs.

The Committee also collected forms used in civil mediation by the circuit courts. The purpose of this request was to determine the need to develop standardized forms for use in civil mediation. Analysis of these forms revealed disparities in the types and content of the forms currently in use. This topic requires further discussion by the Committee with resulting recommendations to the Court.

Automation and Technology Committee

During the 2014 Conference Year, the Automation and Technology Committee collaborated with the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts to recommend the creation of a centralized governance structure charged with reviewing both the policy and technical aspects of e-Business initiatives and data exchange programs and to make recommendations to the Court on standards, policies, and rules. Effective January 1, 2015, the Supreme Court created the e-Business Policy Advisory Board and Technical Committee. As a result, the Automation and Technology Committee will be sunset until further notice from the Supreme Court of Illinois.

The Committee continued to monitor electronic filing and access programs in the trial courts, worked through the Chief Circuit Judges to identify and document e-Business initiatives, recommended improvements in implementation, and evaluated their benefits. The Committee studied a request submitted by the Eighteenth Judicial Circuit to expand electronic filing to include criminal cases. A recommendation was submitted to the Supreme Court to revise the Court's Electronic Filing Standards and Principles.

The electronic citation program, and in particular, the capture and retention of electronic and original wet-ink signatures on court documents/citations was briefly discussed. The topic was linked, in part, with the recommended changes to the Court's e-Filing Standards and Principles allowing for the filing of criminal cases and included e-Citations. However, because of the complexity and scope in the e-Citation program and electronic signatures, thorough analysis was deferred and recommended for study by the new Supreme Court e-Business Policy Advisory Board.

Study Committee on Complex Litigation

The Study Committee on Complex Litigation continued revising, updating, and simplifying the Manual on Complex Criminal Litigation (Criminal Manual). The Criminal Manual has not been updated since 2005. Accordingly, the Committee reviewed and revised existing content and added new material and topics to the Criminal Manual. The finished product will be published in hard copy and CD-ROM format.

The Committee also tracked and identified changes to Illinois civil law and procedure that would necessitate updates or revisions to the Manual on Complex Civil Litigation (Civil Manual), revised most recently in 2011. The Committee revised and updated the Civil Manual accordingly and decided to publish the revisions and updates as a supplement to the Fourth Edition of the Civil Manual.

The Committee was notified that, after the conclusion of Conference Year 2014, it would be consolidated with the Committee on Discovery Procedures to form a new Civil Justice Committee. The Committee was therefore charged with determining an appropriate committee to house and revise both the Civil and Criminal Manuals going forward. The Committee believed that responsibility for upkeep of both Manuals should be undertaken by a single committee. Therefore, it determined that the Committee on Education was the most appropriate committee for the task. The Committee on Education is tasked with identifying the educational needs for the Illinois judiciary and designing educational programs that address those needs. In addition, the Committee on Education is currently charged with reviewing and updating all judicial benchbooks. The Study Committee on Complex Litigation believed this made the Committee on Education uniquely suited to undertake responsibility for the Civil and Criminal Manuals.

The Committee was also charged with coordinating with the Committee on Discovery Procedures to develop recommendations for membership and tasks for the Civil Justice Committee for Conference Year 2015. The Committee met both separately and jointly with the Committee on Discovery Procedures to discuss the issue and to finalize a proposal for the Civil Justice Committee. In addition, the Chair of the Committee met several times with the Chair of the Committee on Discovery Procedures to develop a proposed statement of purpose, general charge, and projects and priorities for the 2015 Conference Year, based on input received from each of the respective Committees. The resulting proposal was approved unanimously by both Committees and forwarded to the Court for its consideration. The proposed statement of purpose and general charge for the new Civil Justice Committee closely mirror the corresponding language of the Criminal Justice Committee's statement of purpose and general charge, with revisions to allow for a focus on civil justice, as opposed to criminal. The list of proposed projects and priorities for Conference Year 2015 was developed based on suggestions of the membership from both Committees, as well as input from the AOIC Director and staff.

Criminal Justice Committee

Conference Year 2014 began a new era for the Criminal Justice Committee. Since its inception, the Committee was known as the Criminal Law and Probation Administration Committee; however, starting with this Conference Year, the Committee is now named the Criminal Justice Committee, dedicated to addressing issues that directly impact the day-to-day operations of the criminal justice system in Illinois. During this Conference year, the Committee addressed the following topics.

The Committee developed a survey to assess the use of and attitude towards videoconference technology in criminal cases. Responses to a survey revealed that seventeen (17) circuits currently utilize videoconference technology in criminal cases and wish to continue its use. However, the Committee also learned that Cook County's use of videoconference technology in criminal cases was discontinued at the request of the Chief Judge due to concerns by the defense bar about a lack of privacy when speaking with the accused. The Committee emphasized that the purpose behind recommending a proposed video conferencing rule was for the utilization of video conference technology to be a chief judge's initiative implemented within guidelines established by the Court, and to mirror the existing statute relating to a defendant's appearance by closed circuit television and video conference.

The Committee considered whether an amendment to Supreme Court Rule 402(d) is required to address a potential increase in ineffective assistance of counsel claims based on the United States Supreme Court decisions of *Missouri v. Frye* and *Lafler v. Cooper*. After much debate, the Committee reached a consensus that an amendment to Supreme Court Rule 402 would not be recommended because it would give a defendant grounds for filing a postconviction petition in addition to those that currently exist, contrary to the purpose of such an amendment. However, the Committee will continue to discuss the possibility of developing a best practices guide on taking pleas in an effort to reduce the number of postconviction petitions that allege ineffective assistance of counsel.

The Committee also considered whether Supreme Court Rule 604(d) should be amended due to the decision of *People v. Tousignant*, 2014 IL 115329. The *Tousignant* decision reversed a plea agreement because the plea certification did not contain both the plea and the sentence. After debate on whether this decision would negatively impact the court process, the Committee decided the best way to avoid these circumstances in the future was to recommend amending Supreme Court Rule 604(d) to be consistent with the ruling in *Tousignant*.

Finally, the Committee considered whether Supreme Court Rule 411 should be amended to require discovery prior to a defendant's appearance in bond court. One question raised by the Committee was whether amending Rule 411 would be beneficial to the process. The Committee is in the process of drafting a proposed amendment to Rule 411 for discussion in 2015.

Committee on Discovery Procedures

During Conference Year 2014, the Committee discussed the issue of e-Discovery. The Committee considered proposed changes offered by the Supreme Court Rules Committee to the Discovery Committee's proposed e-Discovery amendments, which were referred to the Supreme Court in Conference Year 2013. The Committee agreed with those changes, which were suggested in light of comments made at a public hearing to consider the proposed amendments. The Supreme Court subsequently considered and adopted the proposed e-Discovery amendments, which became effective July 1, 2014.

In a related project, the Committee drafted a guide that would act as a reference tool for trial court judges faced with e-Discovery issues and disputes. The Reference Guide provides a summary of the e-Discovery amendments adopted by the Court and includes some definitions, links to organizations addressing e-Discovery, and citations to pertinent cases and articles. The Committee also considered proposals to amend Supreme Court Rules 205, 206, 207, 208 and 236 that were forwarded from the Supreme Court Rules Committee. As a final matter, the Committee, in coordination with the Study Committee on Complex Litigation, drafted a statement of purpose, charge and recommended projects for the new Civil Justice Committee, which will result from the consolidation of the two committees in Conference Year 2015.



Committee on Education

The Committee on Education is charged with identifying the ongoing educational needs of the Illinois judiciary and developing short-term and long-term plans to address those needs. For Conference Year 2014, the Supreme Court of Illinois gave the Committee on Education a charge to develop a "core" judicial education curriculum for Illinois judges and a model for a Judicial College. This charge to the Committee includes identifying emerging legal, sociological, cultural, and technical issues that may impact judicial decision making and court administration. Under this broad topic of judicial education and training, the Committee continues to consider and recommend topics and faculty for judicial education training events, including the annual Self-Represented Litigants and Access to Justice Training, the New Judge Seminar, the Faculty Development Workshop and the Seminar Series, which is comprised of multiple training events on emerging topics such as Public Health and the Law. In addition, the Committee plans the biennial training events: the Advanced Judicial Academy and the Education Conference.

Consistent with its overall charge, the Committee completed the 2013 Illinois Judicial Conference Benchbook projects; planned, delivered and evaluated Education Conference 2014, May 2014 *DUI/Traffic Seminar*, September 2014 *Faculty Development Workshop*, October 2014 Self-Represented *Litigants and Access to Justice Training*; planned the February 2015 *New Judge Seminar*, March 2015 *DUI/Traffic Seminar* and the June 2015 *Advanced Judicial Academy*.

The Committee has initiated planning for the next series of Judicial Benchbooks to be released in the fall of 2015 and for the biennial Education Conference scheduled for 2016. It is also reviewing models for a Judicial College.

Juvenile Justice Committee

During Conference Year 2014, the Juvenile Justice Committee addressed several projects. First, the Committee updated Volume II of the *Illinois Juvenile Law Benchbook*, which addresses proceedings brought in juvenile court that involve allegations of abused and neglected minors.

The Committee also made recommendations for changes to select provisions of the Juvenile Court Act and Sex Offender Registration Act with the purpose of providing judges with discretion to determine whether public safety requires that a juvenile register as a sex offender, after considering specific factors regarding the juvenile.

Next, the Committee studied the procedural and legal barriers to the sharing of information among schools, law enforcement, and the courts. The Committee considered whether school conduct should be shared with the courts and the appropriate links to records between schools and community law enforcement. A number of barriers and issues were identified, including inconsistency across the State and within Chicago in regards to access to school information, as well as what information is actually provided; privacy and due process concerns, particularly in regards to psychological reports and HIPAA laws; and concerns about how schools will use information they receive from law enforcement and the courts (such as a basis to suspend or expel a child). Significant procedural barriers to information sharing exist as the result of HIPPA laws, the Illinois School Code, law enforcement regulations, and the Juvenile Court Act. The Committee concluded that these procedural barriers need to be addressed by the legislature in order to effectuate any real change. Toward that end, a state-wide subcommittee is presently addressing these issues with the Illinois Juvenile Justice Leadership Council.

As a final matter, the Committee was charged with examining the Illinois Judicial Canons to consider amendments that would allow judges to more actively participate in developing community based programs for diversion and to participate more actively in statutorily created Juvenile Justice Councils. The Committee considered Rule 64, Canon 4, and opined that nothing in the language of the canon prohibits judges from actively participating in the development of community-based diversion programs and local Juvenile Justice Councils. However, as there appears to be some concern on the part of judges, the Committee suggested that a comment be adopted to provide further clarification.

Committee on Strategic Planning

The Committee on Strategic Planning continued its mission to assist the Supreme Court of Illinois in advancing the Court's goal of an impartial, accessible, and efficient justice system by identifying emerging trends and issues affecting the delivery of justice and developing specific objectives and actions to address each trend and issues. The Committee reviewed strategic action plans developed at the 2013 Future of the Courts Conference and the 2013 Illinois Judicial Conference Annual Meeting. Based on these strategic action plans, the Committee developed short-term and long-term strategies and goals.

As a short term strategy, the Committee developed a courtuser survey to assess the public's trust and confidence in the Illinois courts. The Committee is currently developing an implementation plan for the survey with a goal of the survey being conducted in all courthouses across the State. Once the survey is implemented across the State, the Committee will evaluate the results and develop strategic plans to address current problem areas.

As a long term strategy, the Committee determined that to ensure a fair and efficient court system, the Illinois court system must become more unified. To achieve greater unity, the Committee is developing strategic plans related to the structure, practices, and organization of the circuit court clerk system and court funding. The Committee is also exploring the option of conducting a study to assess the efficiency of the Illinois court system.

Conclusion

As evidenced by these Committee summaries, the scope of work undertaken by the Judicial Conference in 2014 was broad, ranging from recommendations for amendments to Supreme Court Rules, updating manuals and benchbooks, conducting surveys regarding court practices, and offering considerations on how to approach overall system improvement. Although many projects and initiatives were completed in the 2014 Conference Year, some will continue on into Conference Year 2015, and additional projects will be assigned in the coming year. Thus, the Judicial Conference will continue to honor its constitutional mandate and remain steadfast in its goal of improving the administration of justice in Illinois.

Supreme Court Decisions That the General Assembly May Wish to Consider

People v. Clark, 2014 IL 115776 (March 20, 2014).

In a child custody proceeding, a *pro* se defendant recorded courtroom and hallway conversations between himself, the plaintiff's attorney, and the judge, without their consent, and was subsequently charged under subsection (a)(1) of Illinois' eavesdropping statute, which criminalized the recording of any conversation without the consent of all parties. "Conversation" was defined by the statute as "any oral communication between two or more persons, regardless of whether any of the parties intended their communication to be private." (720 ILCS 5/14-2) The defendant challenged the constitutionality of the statute on first amendment and substantive due process grounds. The circuit court agreed and granted his motion to dismiss the indictment.

The Supreme Court held that, although the statute was contentneutral, it failed to survive intermediate scrutiny because it burdened substantially more speech than necessary to further the important governmental interests it was advancing. The Supreme Court agreed with the circuit court that the plain language and legislative history of the statute indicated that it was broadly designed to protect conversational privacy. Prior to 1994, however, Illinois' eavesdropping statute did not define "conversation." In 1994, the legislature amended the statute to make it apply to all communications, regardless of any expectation of privacy. Thus, after the 1994 amendment, all conversations were deemed private (and not subject to recording), even if the participants in fact had no privacy expectation.

The Supreme Court held that this was overly broad, as the statute, after the 1994 amendment, also covered wholly innocent conduct and criminalized the recording of a whole range of conversations that could not be deemed in any way to be private. This section of the statute went too far in its effort to protect individuals' interest in the privacy of their communications. Thus, it placed a substantially greater burden on speech than was necessary to further the governmental interest in protecting conversational privacy. *Circuit Court judgment affirmed*.

People v. Melongo, 2014 IL 114852 (March 20, 2014).

The defendant secretly recorded telephone conversations between herself and a court employee, and posted the recordings and transcripts on her website. She was subsequently charged with eavesdropping under subsection (a)(1) and publication of information obtained through eavesdropping under subsection (a)(3) of the eavesdropping law. She challenged both subsections on first amendment and substantive due process grounds. The circuit court agreed and invalidated the statute.

The Supreme Court decided this case on the same day it decided *People v. Clark*, 2014 IL 115776. As in *Clark*, the Court in this case held that subsection (a)(1) was overly broad, in that it criminalized recording of all conversations, regardless of the parties' expectation of privacy, which burdened substantially more speech than was necessary to serve any legitimate interest in protecting conversational privacy. The Court then went on to invalidate subsection (a)(3), holding that the "publication" provision of the statute criminalized publication of recordings that were not illegally obtained, in violation of existing U.S. Supreme Court case law which holds that the first amendment bars states from prohibiting disclosure of information regarding a matter of public importance if it was not obtained illegally. The Court held that the defendant could not constitutionally be prosecuted for divulging the conversations she recorded if the recordings themselves were not illegal. *Circuit Court judgment affirmed*.

Kanerva v. Weems, 2014 IL 115811 (July 3, 2014).

At issue in this appeal was the validity of Public Act 97-695 (eff. July 1, 2012), which amended section 10 of the State Employees Group Insurance Act of 1971 (Group Insurance Act) (5 ILCS 375/10 (West 2012)) by eliminating the statutory standards for the State's contributions to health insurance premiums for members of three of the State's retirement systems. In place of those standards, Public Act 97-695 requires the Director of the Illinois Department of Central Management Services to determine annually the amount of the health insurance premiums that will be charged to the State and to retired public employees. Plaintiffs include members of the State Employees' Retirement System (SERS), the State Universities Retirement System (SURS), and the Teachers' Retirement System of the State of Ilinois (TRS), which are the three state retirement systems that are affected by Public Act 97-695. On motion of defendants, the circuit court of Sangamon County dismissed all of the complaints.

The Supreme Court found that the State's subsidy of health insurance for its retired employees is a benefit of membership in a State pension system within the meaning of the pension protection clause of the Illinois Constitution of 1970; and where a 2012 enactment eliminated the statutory standards for the State's contributions to that health care coverage and substituted instead a new system for administrative determinations as to how much the State should pay, allegations that the challenged statute was void and unenforceable under the pension protection clause should not have been dismissed for failure to state a cause of action. *Circuit Court judgment reversed. Cause remanded with directions.*

People v. Patterson, 2014 IL 115102 (October 17, 2014).

Defendant was 15 years old when he was charged with three counts of aggravated criminal sexual assault. Pursuant to the mandatory automatic transfer statute of the Juvenile Court Act of 1987 (705 ILCS 405/5-130 (West 2008)), his case was transferred to criminal court, where defendant was tried as an adult, convicted by a jury of all three counts, and sentenced to a total of 36 years in prison. On appeal, the appellate court reversed defendant's convictions and remanded the cause for a new trial.

In pertinent part, the Supreme Court upheld the mandatory automatic transfer provision against the defendant's constitutional challenges based on the federal and state Due Process Clauses, the cruel and unusual punishment clause of the eighth amendment of the federal Constitution, and the proportionate penalties clause of the Ilinois Constitution, either alone or in conjunction with Illinois' mandatory consecutive sentencing scheme and "Truth in Sentencing" rules. He also contended that *People v. J.S.*, 103 II. 2d 395 (1984), upholding the transfer provision, was no longer valid law in light of the United States Supreme Court's recognition in *Roper v. Simmons*, 543 U.S. 551 (2005), *Graham v. Florida*, 560 U.S. 48 (2010), and *Miller v. Alabarna*, 567 U.S. ___, 132 S. Ct. 2455 (2012), that the unique characteristics of youthful offenders are inconsistent with mandatory automatic transfers.

The opinion noted that the United States Supreme Court has strictly limited the application of the rationale expressed in *Roper, Graham, and Miller,* invoking it only in the context of the most severe criminal penalties. The juvenile's sentence in this case did not fall into that category. The Court expressed concern, however, over the absence of any judicial discretion in the transfer provision in light of modern research recognizing the effect that juveniles' characteristics may have on their judgment and actions. The Court therefore urged the General Assembly to review the automatic transfer provision. *Appellate court judgment reversed. Cause remanded.*

Lake County Grading Company, LLC v. Village of Antioch, 2014 IL 115805 (October 17, 2014).

A grading subcontractor, who had not been paid by the general contractor for work done on two residential subdivisions of the Village of Antioch, brought a common law, third-party beneficiary, breach of contract action against the Village. The circuit court granted summary judgment for the subcontractor on the basis that the Village failed to ensure that the general contractor provide the surety bonds required by the Public Bond Construction Act. Specifically, the bonds provided by the general contractors. Thus, the bonds were merely "completion bonds," not "payment bonds," as required by the Act.

The appellate court affirmed, holding that the Village violated section 1 of the Public Construction Bond Act, 30 ILCS 550/1. The appellate court interpreted section 1 as mandating that the public entity require the general contractor to obtain a bond that contains language specifically guaranteeing payment of subcontractors.

The Supreme Court reversed, interpreting the Act to provide that bonds procured under the Act were deemed to contain both completion and payment provisions. Two members of the Court dissented. The legislature may wish to consider whether section 1 is or is not intended to implicitly incorporate a payment provision into any such bond. Appellate court judgment reversed. Circuit court judgment reversed. Cause remanded with directions.



Annual Report to the General Assembly

STATE AND LOCAL FUNDING FOR THE COURTS

Financing the state court system is a shared responsibility of the state and the 102 counties of the state. Revenue to provide court services to the people of the state comes from a variety of sources: the state income tax, county property taxes, case filing fees, court-imposed fines and assessments, and other fees.

State government pays for the salaries, benefits, and office expenses of supreme and appellate court judges, and salaries and benefits of circuit court judges. Effective July 1, 2014, judicial salaries, as determined by the legislature, were: Supreme Court justices, \$216,542; appellate court judges, \$203,806; circuit court judges, \$187,018; and associate judges, \$177,667. The state also pays for support staff of supreme and appellate court judges, staff in other units of the supreme and appellate courts, a small number of other personnel in the circuit courts, and mandatory arbitration staff in several counties. Part of the cost of operating the mandatory arbitration program is offset by fees paid by participants in the program. During Calendar Year 2014, the arbitration filing and rejection fees collected amounted to \$4,902,824.28.

State funding for probation and court services departments covers approximately 2,600 probation and court services personnel, for which the counties receive partial salary reimbursement on a monthly basis. State funding provided about 88% of eligible funding reimbursement. Significant cuts would jeopardize the provision of core probation services, and for the past few years, many of the departments struggle to preserve basic services as a result of budget and staff reductions.

County governments pay part of the cost of financing circuit court operations. Counties provide office and courtroom space, maintenance, and support staff to assist the circuit court judges. Circuit clerks collect money to help pay for their operations and some court operations. They also collect and disburse revenues to help fund local and state government programs, as summarized on the next page.

State Funding

Appropriations for State Agencies Fiscal Year 2015

The graph to the right, shows the Supreme Court's share of the total appropriations for Fiscal Year 2015 (July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015). The total appropriation was \$70,408,469,000. The appropriation for the courts was \$373,843,000.

Source: Table I-A: Operating Appropriations by Agency, Chapter 3



Local Funding

The circuit clerk's office in each county provides a variety of court recordkeeping and financial accounting services. Circuit clerks are elected for four-year terms by the voters in each county. Circuit clerks, with help from deputy clerks, attend sessions of the court, preserve court files and papers, and maintain complete records of all cases. Employees of the clerks' offices are appointed by and are accountable to the circuit clerk, with the county board having budgetary authority. During 2014, the total number of full-time employees in all 102 circuit clerk offices was 3,301, assisted by a total of 143 part-time employees. The cost of operating all circuit clerks' offices totaled \$202,591,306 in 2014.

Revenue to pay for these court-related services comes primarily from property taxes, filing fees, and courtordered fines and costs. Fines, fees and other costs collected by circuit clerks are governed primarily by statute and Supreme Court rule.

Revenue to Finance Local Improvements

Fees and court-ordered fines were collected in 2014 by circuit clerks and earmarked for improvements in the clerks' offices and to help defray the cost to the county of operating the courts at the local level.

Court Document Storage Fund: is used for any costs relative to the storage of court records. \$22,116,044

Court Automation Fund: is used to establish and maintain automated systems for keeping court records.

\$22,103,275

County Law Library Fund: helps defray the costs of maintaining a law library in the county for judges, attorneys, and the public. \$9,483,381

County Fund To Finance the Court System: is available from fees collected by circuit clerks to help finance the court system in the county. \$6,215,660

Circuit Court Clerk Operations and Administrative Fund: is used to offset costs incurred for collection and disbursement of State and local funds.

\$3,762,664

Uncollected Claims

The Administrative Office, the Supreme Court Clerk, the Supreme Court Library, and the Clerks of the five Appellate Districts are responsible for collecting certain fees. Outstanding accounts receivable are normally collected by the unit to which the account is owed. Additionally, a small number of accounts receivable are turned over to the State Comptroller's offset system. At the end of FY14, there were 90 claims due and payable, totaling \$16,206.06.

Revenue to Finance Other Programs

In addition to collecting fees for local improvements, circuit clerks receive, account for, and distribute millions of dollars to county governments, various local governmental entities, and various state funds. Some of the programs and dollars collected in 2014 by circuit clerks are listed below:

Child Support and Maintenance: Court ordered payments collected and distributed by Circuit Clerks and the State Disbursement Unit. \$1,165,842,309

Drug Treatment Fund: Court ordered drug assessments are used to pay for treatment programs for people addicted to alcohol, cannabis, or controlled substances.

\$3,496,495

Violent Crime Victims Assistance: Court ordered penalties in criminal and certain traffic cases are used to support victim and witness assistance centers throughout the state.

\$7,208,196

Trauma Center Fund: Fees collected in certain traffic, DUI, and criminal cases are used to support Illinois hospitals that are designated as trauma centers.

\$3,394,894

Traffic and Criminal Conviction Surcharge: An additional penalty imposed in traffic and criminal cases is used for training of law enforcement and correctional officers. \$2,173,225

2,113,223

Drivers Education Fund: Penalties and forfeitures in offenses reportable to the Secretary of State are used for driver education programs in high schools.

\$4,065,459



CASEFLOW

llinois has had a unified court system since 1964. In that year, voters approved an amendment to the 1870 Constitution which made major changes in the system.

Prior to 1964, the court system was fragmented. The courts of original jurisdiction had some concurrent and overlapping jurisdiction, and each court operated independently of the others. The old system had a circuit court with statewide original jurisdiction in all cases and some appellate jurisdiction; a Superior Court of Cook County having concurrent jurisdiction with the Circuit Court of Cook County; the Criminal Court of Cook County also having concurrent jurisdiction with the Circuit Court of Cook County but limited to criminal cases; a county court in each county with special jurisdiction that partially overlapped that of the circuit court; a probate court in certain counties with special jurisdiction; statutory municipal, city, town and village courts, with jurisdiction overlapping that of the circuit court; and justice of the peace and police magistrate courts with limited jurisdiction.

By 1962, Cook County alone had 208 courts: circuit court, superior court, family court, criminal court, probate court, county court, twenty-four city, village, town and municipal courts,

The path a case may follow in the process from start to finish can be complicated. The diagram, to the right, demonstrates, appeals from circuits and industrial in general terms, commission how cases proceed may review cases from administrative agencies through the state 8,015 new cases filed in 2014 court system.

> CIRCUIT COURT 24 circuits for 102 counties 1 to 12 counties per circuit 🔊 hears most cases < may review cases from administrative agencies 尔 2.93 million new cases filed in 2014

ARBITRATION PANELS

panels of 3 attorneys – impartial finders of fact and law law suits of \$30,000 or less in Cook

and \$50,000 or less in Boone, DuPage, Ford, Henry, Kane, Lake, Madison, McHenry, McLean, Mercer, Rock Island, St. Clair, Whiteside, Will and Winnebago Counties

CIRCUIT CLERK

COURT

尔 2,429 new cases filed in 2014

APPELLATE COURT

courts

five districts

one clerk per county (102) cases enter the court system in this office 尔 court's official record keeper < collects fines, fees and costs, distributing all amounts to various agencies

police magistrate courts. In addition, there were seven supreme court districts numbered from south to north and four appellate court districts numbered from north to south. For example, the First Supreme Court District was in a part of the Fourth Appellate Court District and the Seventh Supreme Court District was in a part of the First Appellate Court District. In today's system, as shown below, there are three levels of courts: circuit, appellate, and supreme, all operating within clearly defined geographical boundaries. The circuit court is a court of original jurisdiction which is divided into twenty-four circuits. Each circuit is located in one of five appellate court districts. Cases enter the circuit court via the circuit clerk's office in a county of the circuit. Cases may be appealed to the appellate court in the district containing the circuit court, or, in certain circumstances, directly to the Supreme Court. After an appellate court decision, parties to the case may seek discretionary review by the Supreme Court. Supreme SUPREME and appellate district and circuit maps are found in their respective sections 尔 certain cases from appellate court or circuit of this publication.

seventy-five justice of the peace courts, and 103

14

JUDICIAL BRANCH ADMINISTRATION

Supreme Court

The Supreme Court of Illinois, in addition to being the state's highest court, is responsible for the state's unified trial court, one appellate court with five districts, and several supporting units. General administrative and supervisory authority over the court system is vested in the Supreme Court. Several advisory bodies assist with this mission by making recommendations to the court. These include the Judicial Conference of Illinois and the various committees of the court. More information about committees can be found in the following sections. The Supreme Court also makes appointments to other committees, commissions, and boards as listed at the right. The chief justice is responsible for exercising the court's general administrative and supervisory authority in accordance with the court's rules. The Supreme Court appoints an administrative director to assist the chief justice in her duties. The staff of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts supports this function. Key support personnel exist at each level of the court to assist judges with the administration of justice. At the Supreme Court level, this includes the clerk, research director, marshal, librarian and their staffs. Each support unit is described on page nineteen.

Appellate Court

At the appellate court level, the presiding judge and judges of each appellate district are assisted by a clerk of the appellate court and research director and their staffs appointed by the appellate judges. Appeals enter the clerk's office, where deputy clerks assign them filing schedules and actively monitor and review cases as they progress through record preparation, motions, briefing, and oral arguments. Problems such as late filings, jurisdictional defects, inadequate records or noncompliant briefs are referred to the court's decision and tracks all post-decision activity. The clerk's office also manages the court's computerized and manual recordkeeping systems and oversees the maintenance of physical facilities. The clerk responds to requests and questions concerning the court's cases and procedures. The research director oversees a staff of attorneys and secretaries providing centralized legal research services to judges.

Circuit Court

Each circuit is administered by a chief judge who is selected by the circuit court judges of the circuit. The chief judge is assisted by an administrative assistant and/or trial court administrator and other support staff. The number of counties in each circuit currently ranges from one to twelve. In each county, voters elect a circuit clerk for a four-year term. Circuit clerks, with help from deputy clerks hired by the circuit clerk, attend sessions of the court, preserve court files and documents, maintain complete records of all cases, and maintain records of money received and disbursed.

Judicial Inquiry Board

The Supreme Court appoints two circuit judges to the Board, the governor also appoints four non-lawyers and three lawyers, which receives and investigates complaints against judges and prosecutes the validated complaint before the Illinois Courts Commission.

Illinois Courts Commission

The Commission consists of a supreme court justice, two circuit judges selected by the Supreme Court, two appellate court judges selected by the appellate court, and two citizen members selected by the governor. The Commission hears complaints brought by the Judicial Inquiry Board and can discipline a judge or remove a judge from office.

Board of Admissions to the Bar

The Supreme Court establishes rules and standards for the education, testing, and admission of law school graduates to the practice of law in the state and appoints seven attorneys to sit on the Board. The Board oversees the process of admitting law school graduates to the practice of law.

Committee on Character and Fitness

The Supreme Court appoints attorneys to a committee in each of the five judicial districts to evaluate the moral character and general fitness of applicants to practice law.

Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission

The Supreme Court establishes rules for the registration and discipline of attorneys and appoints four lawyers and three nonlawyers to the Commission which oversees the registration and disciplinary process.

State Appellate Defender

The Supreme Court appoints the State Appellate Defender and two members to the State Appellate Defender Commission. Each appellate court district appoints one member to the Commission and the governor appoints two members.

Board of Trustees of the Judges Retirement System

The Supreme Court appoints three judges to the Board of Trustees of the Judges Retirement System and the chief justice is an *ex-officio* member, as is the state treasurer.



THE JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT

The Supreme Court is the state's highest court; it also supervises and administers the state's judicial system. The state is divided into five judicial districts, with three justices elected from the first district (Cook County) and one justice elected from each of the other four districts. Justices are elected in partisan elections for ten years and may be retained in office for additional terms of ten years. A chief justice is elected by the other justices for a term of three years.



Charles E. Freeman



Robert R. Thomas



Thomas L. Kilbride

Justice Freeman received a Juris Doctor degree from The John Marshall Law School, Chicago. Early in his career he served as an Assistant Attorney General, Assistant State's Attorney, and an attorney for the Board of Election Commissioners. He served as a commissioner on the Illinois Commerce Commission from 1973 to 1976. He was in the private practice of law from 1962 to 1976. In 1976, he was elected a Circuit Judge in Cook County where he served for ten years. He was elected to the Appellate Court in 1986 and to the Illinois Supreme Court on November 6, 1990, as the first African-American to serve on the Court. On May 12, 1997, he was selected as Chief Justice and served in that capacity until January 1, 2000.

Justice Thomas was born on August 7,1952, in Rochester, NY. He received his B.A. degree in Government from the University of Notre Dame in 1974, and was named an Academic All-American in that same year. He received his J.D. degree from Loyola University School of Law in 1981. He was elected Circuit Court Judge in DuPage County in 1988. There, he presided over civil jury trials and was the Acting Chief Judge from 1989 to 1994. In 1994, Justice Thomas was elected to the Appellate Court Second District. On December 4, 2000, Justice Thomas was sworn in as the Illinois Supreme Court Justice for the Second District. In April 1996, Justice Thomas was inducted into the Academic All-American Hall of Fame, and in January 1999, he received the prestigious NCAA Silver Anniversary Award. Justice Thomas is a member of the DuPage County Bar Association. He was selected as Chief Justice during the 2005 September Term of the Supreme Court and served in that capacity until September 5, 2008.

Justice Kilbride received his law degree from Antioch School of Law in Washington, D.C., in 1981. He practiced law for 20 years in Rock Island, engaging in the general practice of law, including appeals, environmental law, labor law, employment matters, and other general civil and criminal matters. He was admitted to practice in the United States District Court of Central Illinois and the United States Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals. Justice Kilbride was elected to the Supreme Court of Illinois for the Third District in 2000 and selected Chief Justice of the Supreme Court in October 2010. Justice Kilbride served as Chief Justice of the Illinois Supreme Court from October 2010 until October 2013.

Supreme Court



Rita B. Garman Chief Justice

Chief Justice Garman received a Juris Doctor degree from the University of Iowa College of Law in 1968. She was an Assistant State's Attorney in Vermilion County from 1969 to 1973. She then engaged in private practice with Sebat, Swanson, Banks, Lessen & Garman and was an Associate Judge for 12 years. She served as Circuit Judge in the Fifth Judicial Circuit (1986-95) and Presiding Circuit Judge (1987-95). She was assigned to the Appellate Court, Fourth District, in July 1995, and was elected to the position in November 1996. Chief Justice Garman was appointed to the Supreme Court on February 1, 2001 and subsequently elected to the Supreme Court on December 2, 2002. She was selected as the Chief Justice of the Illinois Supreme Court in October 2013.

Justice Karmeier received his law degree from the University of Illinois. From 1964 through 1986, he engaged in private law practice, clerked for Illinois Supreme Court Justice Byron 0. House and United States District Court Judge James L. Foreman, and served as Washington County State's Attorney. Justice Karmeier has served on the Illinois Supreme Court Committee on Pattern Jury Instructions in Criminal Cases, presiding as Chair of the Committee from 2003 to 2004. He served as Resident Circuit Judge of Washington County from 1986 through 2004 when he was elected to the Supreme Court.

Justice Burke was born on Feb. 3, 1944, in Chicago. She received her B.A. degree in education from DePaul University in 1976 and her J.D. degree from IIT/Chicago-Kent College of Law in 1983. She was admitted to the Federal Court, Northern District of Illinois, in 1983, the United States Court of Appeals for the 7th Circuit in 1985, and certified for the Trial Bar, Federal District Court in 1987. In August 1995, she was appointed to the Appellate Court, First District. In 1996, she was elected to the Appellate Court, First District, for a full term. Justice Burke, the third woman to sit on the state's highest tribunal, was appointed to the Illinois Supreme Court for the First District on July 6, 2006.

Justice Theis, born February 27, 1949, in Chicago, graduated from Loyola University Chicago in 1971 and the University of San Francisco School of Law in 1974. During her career she served as an Assistant Public Defender, Associate Judge and Circuit Judge in Cook County until her appointment to the Appellate Court in 1993. Justice Theis has chaired both the Committee on Education and the Committee on Judicial Conduct of the Illinois Judicial Conference; served as a member of the Supreme Court Rules Committee; served as President of the Appellate Lawyers Association and the Illinois Judges Association; and has served as a member of various Bar Associations. She is the recipient of multiple awards including the Lifetime Achievement Award, Catholic Lawyer of the Year, Celtic Lawyer of the Year, the Mary Heftel Hooten Award and the Access to Justice Theis was appointed to the Supreme Court of Illinois on October 26, 2010.



Lloyd A. Karmeier



Anne M. Burke







17

Supreme Court

2014 Annual Report • SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS • Administrative Summary

SUPREME COURT SUPPORT STAFF



here are several support units which assist the Supreme Court with its work as the state's highest court. These units are located in Springfield, Bloomington, and Chicago.

Clerk of the Supreme Court Carolyn Taft Grosboll

The Clerk of the Supreme Court is appointed by the Court, reports to the Court and serves at the Court's pleasure. The Clerk is the Court's principal case processing and records manager who operates the office through a staff of specialized deputies, and by planning, developing, and implementing policies and procedures necessary to execute the responsibilities of the office. The office has existed since circa 1818 and supports the Court in the exercise of its statewide jurisdiction, authority to regulate the practice of law in Illinois, and supervisory authority over the courts in the state.

In its case management capacity, the Clerk's Office maintains four distinct automated dockets, executing all associated processes, to ensure compliance with Supreme Court Rules and to ensure that cases are effectively monitored and scheduled, from initiation to issuance of mandates and final orders as appropriate. The general docket unit of the office supports the Court's primary docket. The miscellaneous record docket consists primarily The miscellaneous docket of attorney matters. consists of conviction-related cases filed by pro se incarcerated litigants and provides a forum without compromising standard filing requirements. The proposed rule docket was developed and functions consistent with the mandate of Supreme Court Rule 3. E-filing of Court documents began in 2012 on a pilot basis for certain cases on the general docket and was expanded in 2013 to permit e-filing in all cases on the Court's general and miscellaneous record dockets. While e-filing is not mandatory, the

number of attorneys and pro se litigants using the Court's e-filing system grew in 2014.

In its record management capacity, the Clerk's Office maintains the Court's active and closed files and permanent records, dating to 1818, including historically significant documents which are housed and preserved in the State Archives by agreement, and through an agreement with State Archives oversees the conversion of paper documents to microfilm, a more stable medium.

The Clerk's Office registers and renews professional service corporations and associations, and limited liability companies and partnerships engaged in the practice of law. In October 2012, the Supreme Court announced an e-renewal process beginning with the 2013 renewal year, that gave law firm entities the option to electronically renew their annual registration and pay the \$40 renewal fee electronically. In the second year of this e-initiative, the number of entities renewing electronically for 2014 has doubled from the 2013 renewal year. The Clerk's Office is also responsible for maintaining the roll of attorneys, which includes the licensing process, and issuance of law licenses; files judicial financial disclosure statements required of state court judges. The office compiles, analyzes, and reports statistics on the Supreme Court's caseload and other activity, as reflected in the accompanying statistical summary and narrative for 2014.

The Clerk's Office provides information to the public at large and the practicing bar and has working relationships with other courts and judicial branch offices, Supreme Court agencies, and state and county departments.

SUPREME COURT DIRECTORY

Springfield (62701)

Supreme Court Building TDD (217) 524-8132 Clerk (217) 782-2035 Librarian (217) 782-2424 Marshal (217) 782-7821

Chicago (60601) Michael A. Bilandic Building 160 North LaSalle Street TDD (312) 793-6185

Clerk (312) 793-1332

Bloomington (61702) 207 W. Jefferson Street, Suite 309 Reporter of Decisions (309) 827-8513 FAX (309) 828-4651

Marshal of the Supreme Court Bob Shay

The Marshal attends all sessions of the Court held in September, November, January, March, and May. In addition, the Marshal directs a staff which maintains the Supreme Court Building and grounds, provides security for justices and employees, and conducts tours of the building.

Supreme Court Chief Internal Auditor John Bracco

The Supreme Court Chief Internal Auditor and staff perform audits of the state-funded activities of the judicial branch. In addition, the Internal Auditor annually assesses the adequacy of internal controls for state-funded activities.

Supreme Court Research Director Doug Smith

The Supreme Court Research Director supervises a staff of attorneys who provide legal research and writing assistance to the Court.

Supreme Court Librarian Geoffrey P. Pelzek

The Supreme Court Librarian directs a staff who provide legal reference services to the courts, state agencies, and citizens of the state. The Supreme Court libraries include a 100,000 volume public law library in Springfield, a 40,000 volume private branch library in Chicago, and four private judicial libraries across the state. The Librarian oversees all aspects of library administration including budget and program planning, materials and equipment acquisition, cataloging and collection development, and library reference and research services.

Reporter of Decisions Amy Tomaszewski

The Reporter of Decisions directs a staff which publishes opinions of the supreme and appellate courts in the Official Reports. Employees also verify case citations, compose head notes, attorney lines, tables of cases, topical summaries, and other materials appearing in the Official Reports; and edit opinions for style and grammar.



Supreme Court Caseload	Filed	Disposed
2014	2,429	2,443
2013	2,671	2,627
2012	2,697	2,793
2011	2,906	3,104
2010	3,014	2,922

Supreme Court

SUPREME COURT COMMITTEES

Standing committees of the Court and chairpersons during 2014

- Appellate Court Administrative Committee Justice Mary Jane Thesis, liaison officer.
- Attorney Registration & Disciplinary Commission

Joan M. Eagle, Esq., Chair; James R. Mendillo, Esq., Vice-Chair; Justice Lloyd A. Karmeier, liaison officer. Review Board – Gordon B. Nash, Jr., Esq., Chair.

• Board of Admissions to the Bar Lawrence N. Hill, Esq., President; Justice Anne M. Burke, liaison officer.

• Committee on Character and Fitness

Philip L. Bronstein, Esq., Chair; Monica G. Somerville, Esq., Vice-Chair (First Judicial District); Bradley N. Pollock, Esq., Chair; Robert L. Smith, Esq., Vice-Chair (Second Judicial District); Douglas A. Gift, Esq., Chair; Jodi K. Obrecht Fisk, Esq., Vice-Chair (Third Judicial District); Frederick H. Underhill, Jr., Esq., Chair; Thomas L. Van Hook, Esq., Vice-Chair (Fourth Judicial District); John A. Clark, Esq., Chair; Mark C. Scoggins, Esq., Vice-Chair (Fifth Judicial District); Justice Robert R. Thomas, liaison officer.

- Committee on Jury Instructions in Civil Cases James L. DeAno, Esq., Chair; John P. Goggin, Esq., Vice-Chair; Professor Nancy S. Marder, Reporter; Justice Mary Jane Thesis, liaison officer.
- Committee on Jury Instructions in Criminal Cases

Judge Kathleen Pantle, Chair; Professor John F. Erbes, Professor-Reporter; Justice Lloyd A. Karmeier, liaison officer.

- Committee on Professional Responsibility Richard A. Redmond, Esq., Chair; Judge Cheryl D. Cesario, Vice-Chair; Professor Vivien C. Gross, Professor-Reporter; Justice Anne M. Burke, liaison officer.
- Judge Elizabeth A. Robb, Status Member (Chairperson of Chief Judges' Conference); Judge Joseph G. McGraw, Status Member (Vice-Chairperson of Chief Judges' Conference).
- Legislative Committee of the Illinois Supreme Court Judge S. Gene Schwarm, Chair.

Minimum Continuing Legal Education Board

Patrick M. Kinnally, Esq., Chair; James A. Rapp, Esq., Vice-Chair; Justice Lloyd A. Karmeier, liaison officer.

- Special Supreme Court Advisory Committee for Justice and Mental Health Planning Appellate Judge Kathryn E. Zenoff, Chair.
- Special Supreme Court Committee on E-Business Bruce R. Pfaff, Esq., Chair; Justice Thomas L. Kilbride, liaison officer.
- Special Supreme Court Committee on Child Custody Issues

Judge Robert J. Anderson and Judge Moshe Jacobius, Co-Chairs; Chief Justice Rita B. Garman, liaison officer.

• Supreme Court Committee on Illinois Evidence

Judge Donald C. Hudson, Chair; Judge Warren D. Wolfson, Vice-Chair; Professor Ralph Ruebner, Professor-Reporter; Justice Mary Jane Theis, liaison officer.

- Supreme Court Commission for Access to Justice Timothy W. Kelly, Esg., Chair.
- Supreme Court Commission on Professionalism Judge Debra B. Walker, Chair; Judge Richard L. Tognarelli, Vice-Chair. Justice Robert R. Thomas, liaison officer.
- Supreme Court Judicial Performance Evaluation Committee Judge Kevin P. Fitzgerald, Chair; Justice Anne M. Burke, liaison officer.
- Supreme Court Probation Policy Advisory Board
- Supreme Court Rules Committee
 Brett K. Gorman, Esq., Chair; James R. Figliulo,
 Esq., Vice-Chair; Professor Keith H. Beyler, Esq.,
 Reporter; Professor Jo Desha Lucas, Esq.,
 Emeritus; Justice Thomas L. Kilbride, liaison
 officer.

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

he Judicial Conference of Illinois, consisting of eighty-two judges, is responsible for suggesting improvements in the administration of justice in Illinois. The Executive Committee, composed of the chief justice and fourteen members of the Judicial Conference, reviews recommendations of the various committees and makes recommendations to the Supreme Court, resolves questions of committee jurisdiction, acts on behalf of the Judicial Conference between annual meetings, and performs other duties delegated by the Supreme Court. The Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts serves as Secretary of the Conference.

Alternative Dispute Resolution Coordinating Committee Judge David E. Haracz, Chair Cook County Circuit Court

The Alternative Dispute Resolution Coordinating Committee monitors and assesses both court-annexed mandatory arbitration programs and mediation programs approved by the Supreme Court. During Conference Year 2014, the Committee continued review of mandatory arbitration statistics to monitor program efficacy. In the area of mediation, the Committee monitored the activities of the court-annexed major civil case mediation programs operating in eleven judicial circuits pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 99.

The Committee was charged to consider the perceptions of judges and attorneys surrounding assignment of cases to civil mediation. In Conference Year 2013, the committee developed a survey for judges who preside over cases that are subject to Rule 99 and Rule 99.1 mediation programs. The survey sought to gather first-hand information from judges about how they view civil mediation, the frequency of its use, and the methodology of its implementation. The survey results were obtained and distributed to the Committee for review and analysis. The results of this survey were then utilized to assist the Committee in developing a survey for attorneys who utilize mediation in an effort understand their views and perceptions regarding mediation. The results, analysis and findings for both the judicial and attorney surveys were presented at the 2014 Illinois Judicial Conference.

The Committee was also charged with developing standardized forms for use by Rule 99 and Rule 99.1 mediation programs. The Committee requested each circuit to provide any forms used in Rule 99 and Rule 99.1 mediation programs. Multiple forms have been received and are being analyzed for similarities and differences which will be used as a basis for drafting and presenting the proposed forms. The Committee will continue to address these charges in Conference Year 2015.

Automation and Technology Committee Judge David A. Hylla, Chair 3rd Judicial Circuit

In Conference Year 2014, the Automation and Technology Committee (Committee) collaborated with the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts on the establishment of a governance structure consisting of key judicial branch stakeholders charged with reviewing e-Business initiatives and requests for data exchange programs. The Committee and AOIC recommended to the Supreme Court the creation of a centralized e-Business Policy Advisory Board and Technical Committee to review e-Business initiatives and requests for court data, making recommendations to the Court on standards, policies, and rules. In November 2014, the Supreme Court created the e-Business Policy Advisory Board and related e-Business Technical Committee.

The Committee continued to monitor electronic filing and access programs in the trial courts, and in particular, working through the Chief Circuit Judges to identify and document e-Business initiatives, recommending improvements on how they are implemented and of their benefit to the court. The Committee studied a request submitted by the Eighteenth Judicial Circuit to expand electronic filing to include criminal cases. A recommendation was submitted to the Supreme Court to revise the Court's Electronic Filing Standards and Principles. In September 2014, the Supreme Court amended the Electronic Filing Standards and Principles to allow for the e-Filing of criminal cases.

With the creation of the Supreme Court's e-Business Policy Advisory Board and Technical Committee, effective January 1, 2015, the Automation and Technology Committee was sunset until further notice from the Supreme Court of Illinois.

> Criminal Justice Committee Judge William H. Hooks, Chair Cook County Circuit Court

During Conference Year 2014, the Committee addressed the charge on the use of videoconference technology in criminal cases. In prior years, the Committee made its original recommendation to use videoconference technology in criminal cases in the



form of a proposed rule. The Committee emphasized that the proposed rule was non-mandatory by the courts and the use of videoconference technology in criminal cases was at the discretion of the chief judge for each circuit. During a public hearing to discuss the rule, several concerns were raised which resulted in the charge being returned to the Committee to address those concerns. In Conference Year 2013, the Committee developed a questionnaire concerning the use of videoconference technology in criminal cases. The questionnaire was distributed to judges in all of the circuits. In Conference Year 2014, the results of the questionnaire were discussed and analyzed and the results of this questionnaire were presented to the Court at the 2014 Illinois Judicial Conference.

The Committee continued to address the charge of whether Supreme Court Rule 402(d) should be amended to address a potential increase in claims alleging ineffective assistance of counsel, based on the United States Supreme Court decisions of Missouri v. Frye and Lafler v. Cooper. In Conference Year 2013, the Committee had recommended that there was no need to amend Rule 402(d). In Conference Year 2014, the Court requested additional review and information relative to this topic. Subsequently, the Committee found that if Rule 402 were to be amended, the difficulty of managing a large volume court docket, such as misdemeanor and traffic courts, would become extremely difficult due to proposed extra requirements that would be involved in accepting a guilty plea, and reiterated the Committee's original recommendation that a rule amendment could possibly provide additional grounds for a post conviction petition.

The Committee also addressed the charge of whether Supreme Court Rule 604(d) should be amended due to the decision of *People v. Tousignant*, 2014 IL 115329. After discussion on this charge, the Committee reached a consensus that Rule 604(d) does require an amendment. The language of that amendment is still being discussed and will be proposed during the upcoming conference year.

Committee on Discovery Procedures Judge Barbara N. Petrungaro, Chair 12th Judicial Circuit

During Conference Year 2014, the Committee primarily discussed the issue of e-Discovery. The Committee considered proposed changes offered by the Supreme Court Rules Committee to the Discovery Committee's proposed e-Discovery amendments, which were referred to the Supreme Court in Conference Year 2013. The Committee agreed with those changes, which were suggested in light of comments made at a public hearing to consider the proposed amendments. The Supreme Court subsequently considered and adopted the proposed e-Discovery amendments, which became effective July 1, 2014. In a related project, the Committee drafted a guide that would act as a reference tool for trial court judges faced with e-Discovery issues and disputes. The Reference Guide, which was adopted by the Committee, provides a summary of the e-Discovery amendments adopted by the Court, and includes some definitions, links to organizations addressing e-Discovery and citations to pertinent cases and articles. The Committee also considered proposals to amend Supreme Court Rules 205, 206, 207, 208

and 236 that were forwarded from the Supreme Court Rules Committee. As a final matter, the Committee, in coordination with the Study Committee on Complex Litigation, drafted a statement of purpose, charge and recommended projects for the new Civil Justice Committee, which will result from the consolidation of both committees in Conference Year 2015.

> Committee on Education Judge Thomas M. Donnelly, Chair Cook County Circuit Court

The Supreme Court has given the Committee on Education a charge to develop and recommend a "core" judicial education curriculum for Illinois judges which identifies key judicial education topics and issues to be addressed through judicial education activities each Conference year, and to explore and develop a model for a Judicial College. This charge includes the identification of emerging legal, sociological, cultural and technical issues that may impact judicial decision making and court administration. Based upon this core curriculum, the Committee develops, in coordination with the Administrative Office Judicial Education Division, judicial trainings for the benefit of new and experienced judges, that include a Seminar Series devoted to the one or two day presentation of singular topics of judicial interest, the annual New Judge Seminar and Faculty Development Workshop, and the biennial Advanced Judicial Academy and Education Conference. The Committee reviews and recommends to the Court, non-judicial conference judicial education programs for the award of judicial education credit. In addition, the Committee works with the Administrative Office Judicial Education Division to produce the Civil and Criminal Complex Litigation Manuals and Illinois Judicial Benchbooks on Criminal Law and Procedure, Civil Law and Procedure, DUI/Traffic, Family Law and Procedure, Evidence, Domestic Violence and Juvenile Justice. The benchbooks are available to active Illinois judges in hard copy and electronic format.

> Committee on Strategic Planning Judge M. Carol Pope, Chair 4th District Appellate Court

The Committee on Strategic Planning continued its mission to assist the Supreme Court of Illinois in advancing the Court's goal of an impartial, accessible, and efficient justice system by identifying emerging trends and issues affecting the delivery of justice and developing specific objectives and actions to address each trend and issues. The Committee reviewed strategic action plans developed at the 2013 Future of the Courts Conference and the 2013 Illinois Judicial Conference Annual Meeting. Based on these strategic action plans, the Committee developed short-term and long-term strategies and goals. As a short term strategy, the Committee developed a court-user survey to assess the public's trust and confidence in the Illinois courts. The Committee is currently developing an implementation plan for the survey with a goal of the survey being conducted in all courthouses across the State. Once the survey is implemented across the State, the Committee will evaluate the results and develop strategic plans to address current problem areas. As a long term strategy, the Committee determined that to ensure a fair and efficient court system, the Illinois court system

Judicial Conference

23

must become more unified. To achieve greater unity, the Committee is developing strategic plans related to the structure, practices, and organization of the circuit court clerk system and court funding. The Committee is also exploring the option of conducting a study to assess the efficiency of the Illinois court system.

> Study Committee on Complex Litigation Judge Dinah J. Archambeault, Chair 12th Judicial Circuit

The Study Committee on Complex Litigation continued revising, updating, and simplifying the Manual on Complex Criminal Litigation (Criminal Manual). The Criminal Manual has not been updated since 2005. Accordingly, the Committee reviewed and revised existing content and added new material and topics to the Criminal Manual. The finished product will be published in hard copy and CD-ROM format.

The Committee also tracked and identified changes to Illinois civil law and procedure that would necessitate updates or revisions to the Manual on Complex Civil Litigation (Civil Manual), revised most recently in 2011. The Committee revised and updated the Civil Manual accordingly and decided to publish the revisions and updates as a supplement to the Fourth Edition of the Civil Manual.

The Committee was notified that, after the conclusion of Conference Year 2014, it would be consolidated with the Committee on Discovery Procedures to form a new Civil Justice Committee. The Committee was therefore charged with determining an appropriate committee to house and revise both the Civil and Criminal Manuals going forward. The Committee believed that responsibility for upkeep of both Manuals should be undertaken by a single committee and determined that the Committee on Education was the most appropriate one for the task. The Committee on Education is tasked with identifying the educational needs for the Illinois judiciary and designing educational programs that address those needs. In addition, the Committee on Education is currently charged with reviewing and updating all judicial benchbooks.

The Committee was also charged with coordinating with the Committee on Discovery Procedures to develop recommendations for membership and tasks for the Civil Justice Committee for Conference Year 2015. The Committee met both separately and jointly with the Committee on Discovery Procedures to discuss the issue and to finalize a proposed statement of purpose, general charge, and projects and priorities for the 2015 Conference Year.

Study Committee on Juvenile Justice Judge Jennifer H. Bauknecht, Chair 11th Judicial Circuit

During Conference Year 2014, the Committee updated Volume II of the Illinois Juvenile Law Benchbook, which addresses proceedings in juvenile court that involve allegations of abuse, neglect and dependency. The Committee contemplated suggesting proposed changes to select provisions of the Juvenile Court Act and Sex Offender Registration Act that would provide judges discretion in determining whether public safety requires a juvenile adjudicated for certain offenses are required to register as a sex offender after considering specific factors in relation to that juvenile.

The Committee also studied the procedural and legal barriers to the sharing of information among schools, law enforcement, and courts, and included an assessment of whether school conduct should be shared with courts and the appropriate contacts at community law enforcement, noting the significant procedural barriers between HIPPA laws, the Illinois School Code, law enforcement regulations and the Juvenile Court Act. The Committee believes that these procedural barriers need to be addressed by the legislature in order to effectuate any real change regarding information sharing among these entities. Toward that end, there is a state-wide sub-committee presently addressing these issues in conjunction with the Illinois Juvenile Justice Leadership Council. It appears that this state-wide sub-committee, which consists of members of the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government, is in a better position to address the information sharing issues.

As a final matter, the Committee was charged with examining the Illinois Judicial Canons to consider amendments allowing judges more active participation in the development of community based diversion programs and statutorily created Juvenile Justice Councils. The Committee specifically considered Rule 64, Canon 4, and opined that although there is nothing in the current language that would prohibit judges from actively participating in the development of community based diversion programs and local Juvenile Justice Councils, the Committee proposed a comment be included to Rule 64, Canon 4, that would strengthen the language in the Rule. On December 19, 2014, the following comment proposed by the Committee was adopted by the Court and added to the Rule: "A judge may serve on a committee that includes other judges, attorneys and members of the community for the purpose of developing programs or initiatives aimed at improving the outcomes for juveniles involved in the juvenile court system, or adults in the criminal court system. Such programs may include diversion, restorative justice and problem-solving court programs, among others."

Members of the Executive Committee of the Illinois Judicial Conference During 2014Chief Justice Rita B. Garman, ChairMichael J. Tardy, Secretary

James J. Allen, Circuit Judge, 12th Circuit Mark H. Clarke, Circuit Judge, 1st Circuit Mary Ellen Coghlan, Circuit Judge, Circuit Court of Cook County Neil H. Cohen, Associate Judge, Circuit Court of Cook County Lynn M. Egan, Circuit Judge, Circuit Court of Cook County Timothy C. Evans, Chief Circuit Judge, Circuit Court of Cook County Robert G. Gibson, Associate Judge, 18th Circuit Shelvin Louise Hall, Appellate Judge, 1st District William H. Hooks, Circuit Judge, Circuit Court of Cook County Julie K. Katz, Associate Judge, 20th Circuit
P. Scott Neville, Jr., Appellate Judge, 1st District
Elizabeth A. Robb, Chief Circuit Judge, 11th Circuit
Christopher C. Starck, Circuit Judge, 19th Circuit
Linnea E. Thompson, Circuit Judge, 14th Circuit
Lisa Holder White, Appellate Judge, 4th District

APPELLATE COURT

Court, a person has the right to request a review of a circuit court judge's decision by the Appellate Court.

The Appellate Court is organized into five districts. The first meets in Chicago, second in Elgin, third in Ottawa, fourth in Springfield, and the fifth in Mt. Vernon.

Each district can have one or more divisions. There are six divisions in the first district and one in each of the other four. The Supreme Court assigns judges to the various divisions. The presiding judge of each division assigns judges to panels of three to hear appeals.

The number of appellate court judgeships, currently fifty-four, is determined by the legislature. The Supreme Court can assign additional circuit, appellate or retired judges temporarily to any district. Judges are elected by voters in each district for ten-year terms, and may be retained for additional ten-year terms. Each judge has a support staff of two law clerks and a secretary.

Each district manages its own operations, subject to the overall authority of the Supreme Court. In the first district (Cook County), an executive committee exercises general administrative authority. This committee elects a chairperson and vice-chairperson for one year. In the other districts, judges select one of their members to serve as presiding judge for one year.

Civil & Criminal Caseloads	Civil** Filed	Civil** Disposed	Criminal Filed	Criminal Disposed	Total Caseload*	Filed	Disposed
2014	4,173	4,238	3,721	3,425	2014	8,015	7,816
2013	4,153	4,370	3,788	3,384	2013	8,134	7,954
2012	4,273	4,180	3,635	3,740	2012	8,079	8,062
2011	4,067	4,376	3,614	3,731	2011	7,826	7,286
2010	4,111	4,167	3,542	3,628	2010	7,836	7,962

** Totals do not include Industrial Commission Division Cases

Totals include Industrial Commission Division Cases

Appellate Court Administrative Matters

Annual Meeting: The Appellate Court held its annual meeting on April 7, 2014 with the Honorable Michael Burke, Second District Appellate Court, serving as the honorary chair. Fifty appellate justices were in attendance. Pursuant to Article VI, Section 15(e) of the Illinois Constitution, the Illinois Appellate Court selects two appellate justices to serve as regular members and three appellate justices to serve as alternative members of the Illinois Courts Commission. The Honorable Margaret Stanton McBride (First District Appellate Court) and the Honorable Richard P. Goldenhersh (Fifth District Appellate Court) will continue to serve as regular members, with Justice McBride commencing the third year of her third, three year term, expiring December 31, 2015, and Justice Goldenhersh commencing the second year of his first three year term ending December 31, 2016. The Honorable Mary S. Schostok (Second District Appellate Court), the Honorable Mary K. O'Brien (Third District Appellate Court) and the Honorable Thomas R. Appleton (Fourth District Appellate Court) will serve as alternate members to the Commission, for a one year term ending December 31, 2015. The Honorable Stuart E. Palmer (First Appellate District) was selected to serve as the honorary chair of the 2015 Annual Meeting of the Illinois Appellate Court to be held April 13-14, 2015.

Administrative Committee: The Appellate Court Administrative Committee was created to study and recommend improvements to the Illinois Appellate Court. Additionally, the Committee plans the Annual Meeting of the Appellate Court and develops the curriculum for the annual Appellate Court Conference. The 2014 Conference, held April 7, 2014 in Lombard at the Westin Hotel in conjunction with the biennial Education Conference for Illinois Judges, hosted fifty appellate justices, and Research Directors and Clerks and of the Appellate Court. The Conference address was delivered by the Honorable Mary Jane Theis, Justice, Supreme Court of Illinois. Conference presentations included *The Art of Legal Reasoning and the Angst of Judging and Opinion Writing*. The Honorable Donald C. Hudson (Second District Appellate Court) serves as Chair of the Appellate Court Administrative Committee. The Honorable Mary Jane Theis, Justice, Supreme Court of Illinois, serves as the Supreme Court liaison to the Appellate Court Administrative Committee.



DIVISION I

Mathias W. Delort,

Presiding Judge

Maureen E. Connors

Joy V. Cunningham

Sheldon A. Harris

DIVISION II

John B. Simon,

Presiding Judge

Laura C. Liu *

P Scott Neville, Jr.

Daniel J. Pierce *

DIVISION III

Aurelia Pucinski,

Presiding Judge

Michael B. Hyman *

Terrence J. Lavin

Mary Anne Mason *

2011

APPELLATE JUDGES

DIVISION IV

Presiding Judge

David W. Fllis

James R. Epstein

Nathaniel R. Howse, Jr.

DIVISION V

Stuart E. Palmer,

Presiding Judge*

Robert E. Gordon *

Jesse G. Reves

DIVISION VI

Thomas E. Hoffman,

Presiding Judge

Shelvin Louise Marie Hall +

Bertina E. Lampkin *

Mary K. Rochford

FIRST DISTRICT

First District - Chicago Michael A. Bilandic Building (Formerly State of Illinois Building) Completed in 1924; Remodeled in 1992; Renamed in 2003 (Holabird & Root/CDB photo) 160 North LaSalle Street Chicago, IL 60601 (312) 793-5600

Steven M. Ravid, Clerk Marilyn T. Kujawa, Research Director

Circuit: Circuit Court of Cook County

> **District Population:** 5,246,456 (2014 est.)

ninal posed	Total Pending Caseload* All Case Categories	Pending
674	2014	5,201
543	2013	4,841
627	2012	4,453
724	2011	6,092
727	2010	6,157
	*Totals include Industrial Commission [Julcian Casas

Civil & Criminal	Civil**	Civil**	Criminal	Crin
Caseloads	Filed	Disposed	Filed	Disp
2014	2,122	2,120	1,799	1,6
2013	2,119	2,292	1,850	1,5
2012	2,142	2,037	1,622	1,6

+ Chair ++ Vice-Chair: Executive Committee;

* circuit judge assigned to appellate court

2,338

2,095

**Totals do not include Industrial Commission Division Cases

2,095

2,118

Totals include Industrial Commission Division Cases

Appellate Court

James Fitzgerald Smith, Margaret S. McBride ++

2014 Annual Report • SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS • Administrative Summary

1,683

1,664

1.

1.

SECOND DISTRICT



Second District Courthouse - Elgin Completed in 1966 (Second District Photo) 55 Symphony Way Elgin, IL 60120 (847) 695-3750

Robert J. Mangan, Clerk Jeffrey H. Kaplan, Research Director

Circuits (Counties): 15th (Carroll, Jo Daviess, Lee, Ogle & Stephenson) 16th (Kane) 17th (Boone & Winnebago) 18th (DuPage) 19th (Lake) 22nd (McHenry) 23rd (DeKalb & Kendall)

District Population: 3,211,930 (2014 est.)

APPELLATE JUDGES

Mary S. Schostok, Presiding Judge*

Joseph E. Birkett Michael J. Burke Donald C. Hudson* Susan F. Hutchinson Ann Brackley Jorgensen Robert D. McLaren Robert B. Spence* Kathryn E. Zenoff*

*circuit judge assigned to appellate court

Civil & Criminal Caseloads	Civil** Filed	Civil** Disposed	Criminal Filed	Criminal Disposed	Total Pending Caseload* All Case Categories	Pending
		•		•		•
2014	702	765	569	581	2014	1,250
2013	717	703	596	590	2013	1,309
2012	743	708	662	695	2012	1,236
2011	661	720	646	703	2011	1,583
2010	699	741	607	717	2010	1,651
**Telela de sel tradede Tel		India Distation O			*Turale to all de Turbert de LO annateste d	

**Totals do not include Industrial Commission Division Cases

Totals include Industrial Commission Division Cases

THIRD DISTRICT





27

APPELLATE JUDGES

Tom M. Lytton, Presiding Judge

Robert L. Carter William E. Holdridge Mary W. McDade Mary K. O'Brien Daniel L. Schmidt Vicki Wright Third District Courthouse - Ottawa Completed in 1860 (Gist Fleshman Photo) 1004 Columbus Street Ottawa, IL 61350 (815) 434-5050

Barbara Trumbo, Clerk Gerald Ursini, Research Director

Circuits (Counties): 9th (Fulton, Hancock, Henderson, Knox, McDonough & Warren) 10th (Marshall, Peoria, Putnam, Stark & Tazewell) 12th (Will) 13th (Bureau, Grundy & LaSalle) 14th (Henry, Mercer, Rock Island & Whiteside) 21st (Iroquois & Kankakee)

District Population: 1,799,675 (2014 est.)

Civil & Criminal Caseloads	Civil** Filed	Civil** Disposed	Criminal Filed	Criminal Disposed	Total Pending Caseload* All Case Categories	Pending
2014	478	470	521	483	2014	940
2013	461	485	507	454	2013	889
2012	502	498	537	535	2012	861
2011	482	484	444	544	2011	851
2010	460	506	491	509	2010	945

**Totals do not include Industrial Commission Division Cases

*Totals include Industrial Commission Division Cases

FOURTH DISTRICT



Fourth District Courthouse - Springfield Waterways Building Renovated in 2001 (Photo by Terry Farmer Photography, Inc.) 201 West Monroe Street Springfield, IL 62708 (217) 782-2586

Carla Bender, Clerk Shirley Wilgenbusch, Research Director

Circuits (Counties): 5th (Clark, Coles, Cumberland, Edgar & Vermilion) 6th (Champaign, DeWitt, Douglas, Macon, Moultrie & Piatt) 7th (Greene, Jersey, Macoupin, Morgan, Sangamon & Scott) 8th (Adams, Brown, Calhoun, Cass, Mason, Menard, Pike & Schuyler)

11th (Ford, Livingston, Logan, McLean & Woodford)

District Population: 1,318,751 (2014 est.)



APPELLATE JUDGES

M. Carol Pope, Presiding Judge

Thomas R. Appleton Thomas M. Harris, Jr.* James A. Knecht Robert J. Steigmann John W. Turner Lisa Holder White

*circuit judge assigned to appellate court

Civil & Criminal	Civil**	Civil**	Criminal	Criminal	Total Pending Caseload*	Donding
Caseloads	Filed	Disposed	Filed	Disposed	All Case Categories	Pending
2014	530	527	571	461	2014	1,043
2013	515	546	596	589	2013	922
2012	565	566	578	631	2012	956
2011	515	476	602	521	2011	1,001
2010	473	442	552	459	2010	861

**Totals do not include Industrial Commission Division Cases

*Totals include Industrial Commission Division Cases

FIFTH DISTRICT



Fifth District Courthouse - Mt. Vernon Completed in 1857 (J. Huddleston Photo) 14th & Main Street Mt. Vernon, IL 62864 (618) 242-3120

APPELLATE JUDGES

Judy Lynn Cates, Presiding Judge

Melissa A. Chapman Richard P. Goldenhersh S. Gene Schwarm Bruce D. Stewart Thomas M. Welch

John J. Flood, Clerk Michael D. Greathouse, Research Director

Circuits (Counties): 1st (Alexander, Jackson, Johnson, Massac, Pope, Pulaski, Saline, Union & Williamson) 2nd (Crawford, Edwards, Franklin, Gallatin, Hamilton, Hardin, Jefferson, Lawrence, Richland, Wabash, Wayne & White) 3rd (Bond & Madison) 4th (Christian, Clay, Clinton, Effingham, Fayette, Jasper, Marion, Montgomery & Shelby) 20th (Monroe, Perry, Randolph, St. Clair & Washington)

District Population: 1,303,768 (2014 est.)

Civil & Criminal	Civil**	Civil**	Criminal	Criminal	Total Pending Caseload*	Develop
Caseloads	Filed	Disposed	Filed	Disposed	All Case Categories	Pending
2014	341	356	261	226	2014	676
2013	341	344	239	208	2013	647
2012	321	371	236	252	2012	637
2011	314	358	239	239	2011	692
2010	361	383	228	216	2010	748

**Totals do not include Industrial Commission Division Cases

*Totals include Industrial Commission Division Cases



29

CIRCUIT COURTS

The court of "original jurisdiction" is the circuit court. Effective December 3, 2012, as a result of Public Act 97-0585, Illinois is now divided into twenty-four circuits, six of which are single county circuits (Cook, DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry and Will). The remaining eighteen circuits contain two to twelve counties per circuit.

30

Circuit Courts

In Illinois, the circuit court is the court of original jurisdiction. There are twenty-four circuits in the state. Six are single county circuits (Cook, DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry and Will) and the remaining eighteen circuits comprise as few as two and as many as twelve counties each. Except for redistricting of the general assembly and ruling on the ability of the governor to serve or resume office, the circuit court has jurisdiction for all matters properly brought before it. The circuit court shares jurisdiction with the Supreme Court

to hear cases relating to revenue, mandamus, prohibition, and habeas corpus. If the Supreme Court chooses to exercise its authority in a case of these types, the circuit court loses jurisdiction. The circuit court is also the reviewing court for certain state agency administrative orders. There are two types of judges in the circuit court: circuit judges and associate judges. Circuit judges are elected for a six year term and may be retained by voters for additional six year terms. They can hear any circuit court case. Circuit judges are initially elected either circuit-wide, from the county where they reside or from a sub-circuit within a county, depending on the type of vacancy they are filling. Associate judges are appointed by circuit judges, pursuant to supreme court rules, for four-year terms. An associate judge can hear any case, except criminal cases punishable by a prison term of one year or more (felonies). An associate judge can be specially authorized by the Supreme Court to hear all criminal cases. Circuit judges in a circuit elect one of their members to serve as chief circuit court judge. The chief judge has general administrative authority in the circuit, subject to the overall administrative authority of the Supreme Court. The chief judge can assign cases to general or specialized divisions within the circuit.

Circuit Court Administrative Matters

Conference of Chief Circuit Judges: The Conference of Chief Circuit Judges is comprised of the chief circuit judges from the twenty-four Illinois judicial circuits. In 2014, and due to the appointment of former Conference Chairperson Judge S. Gene Schwarm, Chief Judge of the Fourth Judicial Circuit,

> to the Fifth District Appellate bench in March, Judge Elizabeth A. Robb, Chief Judge of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit, former vice-chairperson of the Conference, was elected to serve as chairperson of the Conference in April. Judge Joseph G. McGraw, Chief Judge of the Seventeenth Judicial Circuit, was elected to serve as the new vice-chairperson. The Conference meets regularly to discuss issues related to the administration of justice in the circuit courts and other matters referred to the Conference by the Supreme Court. The Administrative Office serves as secretary to the Conference.

Conference Committees and Activities: The Conference has several established committees which address particular issues. and provide information and recommendations. Committees active during 2014 include the Article V Committee; Chief Circuit Judges Manual Committee; Executive Committee; Orientation Committee; and Technology Committee. From time to time, the Conference may establish an ad hoc or special committee convened to study specific, short-term subject matter. To that extent, the Conference previously established the Special Committee on Extended Media Coverage to address issues related to the Supreme Court's Policy for Extended Media Coverage in the Circuit Courts of Illinois. In addition, and

during 2014, the Conference also established a Subcommittee on Language Access to review draft language for the Supreme Court's Language Access Policy and Code of Interpreter Ethics, a Nominating Committee to assist with the process of electing leadership positions for the Conference, and a special Jury Representation Committee to study whether the any issues exist that relate to disproportionate minority representation in jury pools.

During 2014, the committees of the Conference considered subject matter in several areas. The Article V Committee considered proposing several changes to Article V rules, including rules 501, 529 and 574 which impact the procedures and processes regarding traffic, conservation and ordinance violations, and also to accommodate changes to statutes proposed by PA 98-0870, also known as the Sign & Drive law. The Article V Committee also reviewed changes to the Uniform Citations, as well as printing instructions to accommodate a county's possible implementation of an electronic citations (e-Citation) program. Lastly, the Article V Committee developed and studied multiple proposals that could impact bail and the assessment and percentage distribution of monies that result from minor traffic and conservation cases resolved without a court appearance. The Special Committee on Extended Media Coverage considered expanding certain witness exemptions and general notice provisions in the Supreme Court's Policy for Extended Media Coverage in the Circuit Courts of Illinois. The Subcommittee on Language Access reviewed draft language for the Supreme Court's Language Access Policy and Code of Interpreter Ethics, which is to provide guidance to ensure access to courts for individuals with a Limited English Proficiency which was adopted by the Supreme Court in October 2014. The Jury Representation Committee collected and analyzed statewide data related to the jury summonsing and selection process as they continue to study the minority representation in jury pools for possible recommendations to the Conference and Court in the next year. The Executive Committee continued to review policies and issues related to court reporting services; while the Chief Circuit Judges Manual Committee continued with revisions and updates to the Chief Circuit Judge Manual. The Technology Committee met with other court technology related committees, learned of several e-business related initiatives

being discussed statewide, and assisted in the Supreme Court's establishment of the e-Business Policy Advisory Board and Technical Committee, which consolidated the multiple court technology committees into a single entity. The Orientation Committee, along with staff from the Administrative Office, met with and provided all new Chief Circuit Judges with information and tools to help guide them in their new administrative role. Ongoing throughout the year, the Special Committee on Standardized Forms disseminated and reviewed many court forms developed for use by the Commission on Access to Justice, including forms related to expungement, divorce and dissolution, orders of protection, mortgage foreclosure, as well as review drafts of the Proposed Self-Help Services Policy, a policy intended to provide guidance to court clerks, law librarians and self-help center staff as to the assistance they can provide to self-represented individuals. All of the many Conference committees continued to monitor and analyze new legislation, Supreme Court rules, policies and forms relevant to the committee's focus and the administration of justice in the trial courts as it is introduced and adopted.

In the interest of furthering the knowledge and skills of its members, the Conference hosted a variety of presentations focused on judicial and trial court issues. For example, the Conference received information from the Supreme Court Committee on Illinois Evidence with regard to implementing the newly created codified Rules of Evidence; the Judicial Inquiry Board about the role of Chief Judges when a judge has been referred to the Board; and the Supreme Court Committee on Professionalism and their lawyer-to-lawyer mentoring program. The Illinois Department of Corrections made a presentation about their Impact Incarceration Program, and the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services shared their plans and goals to improve capacity to families with children in need, reduce mal-treatment of children in foster care and improve upon the timeliness to permanency. Finally, the Conference also heard from the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority about the need to expand upon information sharing among the courts and law enforcement so as to enhance public safety; and from Kankakee Community College about a new Illinois Civics Academy for Teachers which hopes to improve the civic literacy of Illinois students by training secondary educators, and invited participation from the judiciary.



New Performance Measures for the 2014 Annual Report

Starting this year, the Administrative Office is including summary information about case clearance rates. The 2014 Annual Report Administrative Summary now offers statewide case clearance rates, which are presented on Page 33. The 2014 Annual Report Statistical Summary includes a section titled "Clearance Rates by Circuit." (See page 16 in the 2014 Annual Report Statistical Summary.)

A clearance rate is one of ten measures included in the National Center for State Court's *CourTools Trial Court Performance Measures* designed to offer feedback to courts on how they are performing and meeting goals. Clearance rates measure whether the court is keeping up with its incoming caseload. A clearance rate is calculated by taking the number of outgoing cases (e.g. disposed cases) as a percentage of the number of incoming cases (e.g. new filings and reinstated cases). If cases are not disposed in a timely manner, the pending caseload will increase. This measure is a single number that can be compared within the court for any and all case types, on a monthly or yearly basis, or between one county or circuit and another. Knowledge of clearance rates by case type or category can help a court pinpoint emerging problems and indicate where adjustments in resources or processes may need to occur.

In addition to the overall clearance rate, the Report includes the identification of the clearance rate for cases grouped into one of five court categories: Civil, Domestic Relations, Juvenile, Criminal, and Quasi-Criminal. The Administrative Office previously grouped cases into one of three case categories: Civil, Juvenile and Criminal. Further breakdown of case types into five categories is consistent with the NCSC Court Statistics Project and the *State Court Guide to Statistical Reporting* (Version 2.0), and should allow for greater comparison across Illinois' courts and with other states. Further breakdown by category also allows for cases with similar characteristics and processing methods (i.e. jury vs. non-jury) to be grouped together and provide for more detailed review, especially when capturing performance measures relating to time standards, such as time to disposition or age of pending cases. For more information about *CourTools*, visit www.ncsconline.org.

Brief analysis of the clearance rates presented on Page 33 indicates that for the past five years, the statewide clearance rate has remained stable between 98.1-99.7%. In 2014, the case categories of Civil (105.1%) and Criminal (100.1%) cleared 100% or more outgoing cases statewide than incoming cases, while Domestic Relations (99%), Juvenile (97.7%) and Quasi-Criminal (96%) cleared less than 100% of incoming cases. Further analysis indicates that Juvenile cases have seen the greatest change in clearance rate over the past five years, with the clearance rate increasing by 18.1%. Quasi-Criminal cases have experienced a decreased clearance rate by 5.2%.

Self-Represented and Limited English Proficient Litigants

Planned for the 2015 Annual Report will be the introduction of court case data which pertains to Self-Represented Litigants (SRL) and litigants with a Limited English Proficiency (LEP). Beginning in late in 2014, the Administrative Office requested that circuit courts begin collecting and reporting data that will offer courts more information about these ever growing concerns. The new information will provide courts with reliable information which can help better prepare courts to assist citizens obtain greater access the justice and the courts.

For example, preliminary circuit court data relating to SRL revealed the following:

- 66% of all disposed civil cases involved at least one SRL, and 26% of that total had cases where at least one plaintiff and one defendant were a SRL;
- From all persons reported to be a SRL, 72% were defendants;
- Order of Protection cases were most likely to have a SRL (88%), followed next by Family (75%) and Small Claims (73%). Law cases were least likely to involve a SRL (31%).

Preliminary data collected from circuit courts that pertains to persons with a LEP revealed:

- The top five most common languages interpreted were: Spanish, Polish, American Sign Language, Arabic and Russian. Spanish accounted for 93% of all interpretations;
- 85% of interpretation events occurred in the courtroom for criminal cases;
- 11% of interpretation events occurred in the courtroom for civil cases;
- 3% of interpretation events occurred in court-annexed proceedings;
- Less than 1% of interpretations were provided by other than a live interpreter (i.e. video or phone);
- Unregistered interpreters provided 78% of the interpretations, while registered and certified were used for 22% of the interpretations. American Sign Language interpreters were most often registered or certified.


CASE CATEGORIES

CIVIL: Law and Law Magistrate for monetary damages over \$10,000; Arbitration; Small Claims; Chancery (e.g., title to real property and injunctions); Miscellaneous Remedy (e.g., review of decisions of administrative bodies, habeas corpus matters, and demolition); Mental Health (e.g., commitment and discharge from mental facilities); Probate (e.g., estates of deceased persons and guardianships); Eminent Domain (e.g., compensation when property is taken for public use); Municipal Corporation and Tax (e.g., matters pertaining to the organization of municipalities and collection of taxes at the local level).

DOMESTIC RELATIONS: Adoption and Family (e.g., proceedings to establish parent-child relationship and actions relating to child support); **Dissolution** (e.g., divorce, separate maintenance, and annulment); **Order of Protection** (petition for order of protection, civil no contact order, and stalking no contact order filed separately from an existing case).

CRIMINAL: Felony (e.g., penalty of at least one year in prison); Misdemeanor and DUI (Driving Under the Influence).

QUASI-CRIMINAL: Ordinance, Conservation, and Traffic (excluding parking tickets).

JUVENILE: Abuse and Neglect, Delinquency, and Other (e.g., a minor who requires authoritative intervention).

Category	Caseload Statistics	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010
	Filed	457,444	513,928	554,747	555,088	643,740
Civil	Reinstated	22,930	24,002	24,293	25,961	28,168
Civil	Disposed	504,230	555,648	576,071	591,474	634,833
	Clearance Rate %	105.1%	103.3%	99.5%	101.8%	94.5%
	End Pending	731,445	759,914	778,519	778,898	792,126
	Filed	133,641	136,549	147,804	148,924	147,672
	Reinstated	1,354	1,467	1,798	2,371	1,876
Domestic Relations	Disposed	133,354	132,010	144,705	143,228	142,787
	Clearance Rate %	99.0%	95.7%	96.7%	94.7%	95.5%
	End Pending	105,145	106,754	102,126	99,497	93,169
	Filed	22,058	23,293	26,648	29,991	30,602
	Reinstated	213	204	1,255	208	294
Juvenile	Disposed	21,706	23,535	25,290	25,011	24,581
	Clearance Rate %	97.7%	100.2%	90.6%	82.8%	79.6%
	End Pending	54,941	55,444	56,308	54,785	50,087
	Filed	338,313	377,393	387,348	392,684	418,812
	Reinstated	6,876	8,408	8,481	8,752	9,334
Criminal	Disposed	345,011	377,209	400,254	398,324	437,662
	Clearance Rate %	100.1%	97.8%	101.1%	99.2%	102.2%
	End Pending	207,281	209,349	202,078	207,937	204,136
	Filed	1,979,530	2,122,981	2,164,553	2,253,825	2,516,286
	Reinstated	22,981	20,921	40,647	24,756	31,244
Quasi-Criminal	Disposed	1,919,908	2,076,351	2,197,592	2,258,560	2,577,827
	Clearance Rate %	96.0%	96.8%	99.7%	99.1%	101.2%
	End Pending	1,256,993	1,165,262	1,100,278	1,091,781	1,066,509
	Filed	2,930,986	3,174,144	3,281,100	3,380,512	3,757,112
	Reinstated	54,354	55,002	76,474	62,048	70,916
Statewide Totals	Disposed	2,928,680	3,164,753	3,343,918	3,416,597	3,817,690
	Clearance Rate %	98.1%	98.0%	99.6%	99.2%	99.7%
	End Pending	2,358,118	2,296,723	2,239,542	2,236,737	2,206,027





Richard J. Daley Center (Photo courtesy of the Chicago Architecture Foundation)

Timothy C. Evans, Chief Judge 50 W. Washington St., Suite 2600 Chicago, IL 60602

> Circuit Population: 5,246,456 (2014 est.)

CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY (First Appellate District)

Circuit Judges:

Martin S. Agran Maryam Ahmad John M. Allegretti Thomas R. Allen Mauricio Araujo Edward A. Arce Larry Axelrood Robert Balanoff Patricia Banks Ronald F. Bartkowicz Carole K. Bellows Andrew Berman Steven James Bernstein Robert W. Bertucci Paul P. Biebel, Jr. Carl B. Boyd Daniel P. Brennan Margaret Ann Brennan Eileen Mary Brewer **Tommy Brewer** Rodney Hughes Brooks Janet Adams Brosnahan Mary M. Brosnahan James R. Brown Andrea M. Buford Kathleen Marie Burke Charles Burns Thomas J. Byrne John P. Callahan, Jr. Diane Gordon Cannon Thomas J. Carroll Gloria Chevere Michael R. Clancy Evelyn B. Clay Jeanne Cleveland Cynthia Y. Cobbs Jean M. Cocozza Mary Ellen Coghlan Matthew E. Coghlan Bonita Coleman Ann Finley Collins Ann Collins-Dole Donna L. Cooper Patrick K. Coughlin Clayton J. Crane John J. Curry, Jr. Paula M. Daleo Thomas M. Davy Daniel R. Degnan

Maureen F. Delehanty Anna Helen Demacopoulos Grace G. Dickler Deborah M. Dooling Daniel P. Duffy Laurence J. Dunford Loretta Eadie-Daniels Lynn Marie Egan John H. Ehrlich Candace J. Fabri Thomas P. Fecarotta, Jr. Peter A. Felice Denise K. Filan Kathy M. Flanagan Thomas E. Flanagan James P. Flannery, Jr. Ellen L. Flannigan John J. Fleming Peter Flynn Nicholas R. Ford Raymond Funderburk Daniel J. Gallagher John T. Gallagher William G. Gamboney Celia G. Gamrath Rodolfo Garcia Vincent M. Gaughan James J. Gavin Aleksandra Gillespie Megan E. Goldish John C. Griffin Deborah J. Gubin Catherine M. Haberkorn Sophia H. Hall Orville E. Hambright, Jr. Kay M. Hanlon Anjana M.J. Hansen Edward Harmening Russell W. Hartigan Elizabeth M. Hayes Margarita Kulys Hoffman Thomas L. Hogan William H. Hooks Carol M. Howard Arnette R. Hubbard Cheyrl D. Ingram Marianne Jackson Moshe Jacobius Raymond L. Jagielski Lionel Jean-Baptiste Marilyn F. Johnson

Year	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	1,201,403	20,361	1,184,095	96.9%	1,108,254
2013	1,361,166	22,761	1,322,748	95.6%	1,069,752
2012	1,351,808	22,236	1,354,690	98.6%	1,006,847
2011	1,385,896	23,859	1,381,427	98.0%	986,611
2010	1,535,853	24,884	1,525,499	97.7%	958,283

Sharon O. Johnson Linzey D. Jones **Rickey Jones** Sidney A. Jones III Michelle D. Jordan Paul A. Karkula Themis N. Karnezis Joseph G. Kazmierski, Jr. Martin C. Kelley Thomas J. Kelley Kathleen G. Kennedy Kerry M. Kennedy Susan L. Kennedy Diana L. Kenworthy Edward J. King John P. Kirby Daniel J. Kubasiak Geary W. Kull Robert D. Kuzas Anthony C. Kyriakopoulos William G. Lacy Diane Joan Larsen Christopher E. Lawler Jeffrey Lawrence Marjorie C. Laws Pamela Leeming Casandra Lewis Kimberly D. Lewis Thomas J. Lipscomb Anna M. Loftus Robert Lopez Cepero Pamela E. Loza Stuart F. Lubin Marvin P. Luckman Freddrenna M. Lyle Daniel Joseph Lynch Thomas V. Lyons II Aicha MacCarthy Terence MacCarthy John J. Mahoney William 0. Maki Daniel B. Malone Edward M. Malonev Marcia Maras Lisa Ann Marino Jill Cerone Marisie Diann K. Marsalek LeRoy K. Martin, Jr. Marc W. Martin Patricia Martin Maritza Martinez Veronica B. Mathein James P. McCarthy James M. McGing Sheila McGinnis Dennis M. McGuire Terrence J. McGuire Kathleen M. McGurv Michael B. McHale Clare E. McWilliams Pamela McLean Meyerson Mary Lane Mikva Bridget A. Mitchell Raymond W. Mitchell Caroline K. Moreland Michael T. Mullen Allen F. Murphy James P. Murphy Patrick T. Murphy Thomas W. Murphy Timothy P. Murphy Joyce Marie Murphy Gorman Marva Nega Lewis Nixon Jessica A. O'Brien

Joan Margaret O'Brien Patrick W. O'Brien William Timothy O'Brien Ann O'Donnell James N. O'Hara Karen L. O'Malley Eileen O'Neill Burke Ramon Ocasio III Kathleen M. Pantle Sebastian T. Patti Paul S. Pavlus Sheryl A. Pethers James P. Pieczonka Edmund Ponce de Leon Jackie M. Portman Joan E. Powell Lorna E. Propes Robert J. Quinn Willaim B. Raines Cynthia Ramirez Sandra G. Ramos Erica L. Reddick Eve M. Reilly James L. Rhodes Judith C. Rice James G. Riley Kristal R. Rivers Anita Rivkin Carothers Mary Colleen Roberts Patrick T. Rogers Abbey Fishman Romanek J. Prendergast Rooney Diana Rosario Dominique C. Ross Thomas D. Roti Lisa Ruble Murphy James Ryan Kristyna C. Ryan Beatriz Santiago Leida Gonzalez Santiago Drella Savage Regina A. Scannicchio Andrea M. Schleifer George Scully, Jr. Patricia O'Brien Sheahan Colleen F. Sheehan Kevin M. Sheehan Diane M. Shelley Patrick J. Sherlock Robin D. Shoffner Anthony E. Simpkins Maura Slattery Boyle Irwin J. Solganick Laura M. Sullivan Sharon M. Sullivan Donald J. Suriano Shelley Sutker-Dermer Michael P. Toomin Sandra Tristano John D. Turner, Jr. Valarie Turner James M. Varga Raul Vega Kenneth J. Wadas Carl Anthony Walker Debra B. Walker Ursula Walowski Richard F. Walsh Maureen Ward Kirby Edward Washington II Steven G. Watkins Alexander P. White Camille E. Willis Thaddeus L. Wilson

E. Kenneth Wright, Jr. Frank G. Zelezinski

Associate Judges:

Carmen K. Aguilar Gregory E. Ahern, Jr. David B. Atkins Callie L. Baird Patrice Ball-Reed Mark J. Ballard Helaine L. Berger Laura Bertucci Smith Samuel J. Betar III Shauna L. Boliker Adam D. Bourgeois, Jr. Yolande M. Bourgeois Darron E. Bowden Karen J. Bowes William Stewart Boyd Elizabeth M. Budzinski Clarence Lewis Burch Anthony J. Calabrese Matthew J. Carmody John Thomas Carr James R. Carroll Joseph M. Cataldo Timothy J. Chambers Peggy Chiampas Joseph M. Claps LaGuina Clay-Herron Robert J. Clifford Neil H. Cohen Susan M. Coleman Thomas J. Condon Stephen J. Connolly Lisa R. Curcio Israel A. Desierto Thomas M. Donnelly Melissa A. Durkin Lauren Gottainer Edidin Maureen P. Feerick Fe' Fernandez Brian K. Flaherty Lawrence E. Flood Thomas V. Gainer, Jr. Nicholas Geanopoulos Daniel T. Gillespie Pamela Hughes Gillespie Susan Fox Gillis Gregory R. Ginex Steven J. Goebel Renee G. Goldfarb William E. Gomolinski Joel L. Greenblatt Maxwell Griffin, Jr. David E. Haracz Donald R. Havis Thomas J. Hennelly Rosemary Higgins Arthur F. Hill, Jr. Stanley L. Hill Earl B. Hoffenberg Michael J. Hood John L. Huff Bridget J. Hughes Colleen A. Hyland John J. Hynes William R. Jackson, Jr. Lana C. Johnson Moira Susan Johnson Timothy J. Joyce Michael J. Kane James N. Karahalios

Nancy J. Katz Stuart P. Katz Carol A. Kipperman Demetrios G. Kottaras Joan M. Kubalanza Maria Kuriakos Ciesil Kevin Thomas Lee Alfred L. Levinson Neil J. Linehan James B. Linn Patricia M. Logue Mark J. Lopez Patrick F. Lustig Thaddeus S. Machnik Alfredo Maldonado Ellen Beth Mandeltort Brigid Mary McGrath Patricia Mendoza Mary R. Minella Daniel R. Miranda Martin P. Moltz Thomas R. Mulroy Leonard Murray Raymond Myles Rita M. Novak Gregory M. O'Brien Thomas J. O'Hara James M. Obbish Marcia B. Orr Michael F. Otto Donald D. Panarese, Jr. Joseph D. Panarese Luciano Panici Kathleen Ann Panozzo Michael R. Panter Linda J. Pauel Alfred J. Paul Angela M. Petrone Michele M. Pitman Dennis J. Porter Carolvn Quinn Marguerite Quinn Jeanne M. Reynolds Hyman Riebman Elizabeth Loredo Rivera Steven Jay Rosenblum Stanley J. Sacks Bernard J. Sarley Naomi H. Schuster Richard D. Schwind Joseph M. Sconza Robert E. Senechalle, Jr. Terrence V. Sharkey Darryl B. Simko David A. Skryd James E. Snyder Domenica A. Stephenson Richard A. Stevens Sanjay T. Tailor Sybil C. Thomas Elmer J. Tolmaire III Mary S. Trew Franklin U. Valderrama Rena M. Van Tine Gregory P. Vazquez Peter J. Vilkelis Steven M. Wagner Allen P. Walker Neera Walsh Jeffrey L. Warnick Lori M. Wolfson Leon Wool James A. Zafiratos



35

Circuit Courts

Gregory J. Wojkowski



FIRST CIRCUIT (Fifth Appellate District)



Jackson County Courthouse, Murphysboro

James R. Williamson, Chief Judge Williamson County Courthouse 200 W. Jefferson Street, Ste. 260, Marion, IL 62959

Circuit Population: 213,833 (2014 est.)

Counties (seats):

Alexander (Cairo) Jackson (Murphysboro) Saline (Harrisburg) Johnson (Vienna) Massac (Metropolis) Pope (Golconda)

Pulaski (Mound City) Union (Jonesboro) Williamson (Marion)

SECOND CIRCUIT

(Fifth Appellate District)



Hamilton County Courthouse, McLeansboro

Thomas Tedeschi, Chief Judge

Jefferson County Justice Center 911 Casey Avenue, Suite HI-05 Mt. Vernon, IL 62864

Circuit Population: 196,717 (2014 est.)

Counties (seats):

Crawford (Robinson) Edwards (Albion) Franklin (Benton) Gallatin (Shawneetown) Hamilton (McLeansboro) Hardin (Elizabethtown)

Jefferson (Mount Vernon) Lawrence (Lawrenceville) Richland (Olney) Wabash (Mount Carmel) Wavne (Fairfield) White (Carmi)

THIRD CIRCUIT

(Fifth Appellate District)



Madison County Courthouse, Edwardsville

David A. Hylla, Chief Judge

Madison County Courthouse 155 North Main, #405 Edwardsville, IL 62025

Circuit Population: 283,829 (2014 est.)

Counties (seats):

Bond (Greenville) Madison (Edwardsville)

Circuit Judges: Brad K. Bleyer, Mark M. Boie, Mark H. Clarke, W. Charles Grace, Joseph Jay Jackson, Joseph M. Leberman, James R. Moore, Walden E. Morris, Phillip G. Palmer, Sr., William G. Schwartz, Carolyn B. Smoot, William J. Thurston

Associate Judges: Ralph R. Bloodworth, III, Charles Clayton Cavaness, Kimberly L. Dahlen, Todd D. Lambert, Brian D. Lewis, Christy W. Solverson, John A. Speroni

Year	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	78,983	56	74,402	94.1%	128,301
2013	84,512	72	78,846	93.2%	106,244
2012	87,306	108	83,852	95.9%	101,561
2011	85,656	112	80,448	93.8%	99,631
2010	92,871	94	88,242	94.9%	96,086

Circuit Judges: Eric J. Dirnbeck, Larry D. Dunn, Thomas J. Foster, David K. Frankland, Robert M. Hopkins, William C. Hudson, Paul W. Lamar, Michael J. Molt, Melissa A. Morgan, David K. Overstreet, Barry L. Vaughan, T. Scott Webb, Christopher L. Weber, Johannah B. Weber

Associate Judges: Jerry Crisel, Thomas J. Dinn, III, Kimbara G. Harrell, Timothy R. Neubauer, Mark Shaner, Mark R. Stanley

Year	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	37,547	14	36,889	98.2%	45,905
2013	40,581	18	39,580	97.5%	46,013
2012	45,672	9	43,846	96%	46,047
2011	46,618	54	47,480	101.7%	44,791
2010	56,150	274	55,855	99.0%	45,930

Circuit Judges: John B. Barberis, Jr., Barbara L. Crowder, John Knight, A. Andreas Matoesian, William A. Mudge, Kyle Napp, Dennis R. Ruth, Richard L. Tognarelli

Associate Judges: Philip B. Alfeld, Duane L. Bailey, Ben L. Beyers, II, Thomas Chapman, Donald M. Flack, David Grounds, Clarence W. Harrison, II, Janet R. Heflin, Elizabeth Levy, Martin J. Mengarelli, Neil T. Schroeder, Ronald R. Slemer, Stephen A. Stobbs

Year	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	80,914	608	80,591	98.9%	59,129
2013	87,289	611	88,711	100.9%	58,122
2012	97,096	351	95,745	98.3%	59,051
2011	95,905	363	98,565	102.4%	57,363
2010	108,804	409	108,037	98.9%	56,616



FOURTH CIRCUIT

(Fifth Appellate District)



Shelby County Courthouse, Shelbyville

FIFTH CIRCUIT (Fourth Appellate District)



Vermilion County Courthouse, Danville

Michael D. McHaney, Chief Judge

Fayette County Courthouse 221 S. 7th St. Vandalia, IL 62471

Circuit Population: 241,060 (2014 est.)

Counties (seats):

Christian (Taylorville) Clay (Louisville) Clinton (Carlyle) Effingham (Effingham) Fayette (Vandalia) Jasper (Newton) Marion (Salem) Montgomery (Hillsboro) Shelby (Shelbyville)

Millard S. Everhart, Chief Judge

Cumberland County Courthouse P.O. Box 145 Toledo, IL 62468

Circuit Population: 177,902 (2014 est.)

Counties (seats):

Clark (Marshall) Coles (Charleston) Cumberland (Toledo) Edgar (Paris) Vermilion (Danville)

SIXTH CIRCUIT

(Fourth Appellate District)



Douglas County Courthouse, Tuscola

Dan L. Flannell, Chief Judge Moultrie County Courthouse 10 South Main Street, Ste. 12

Sullivan, IL 61951

Circuit Population: 382,924 (2014 est.)

Counties (seats):

Champaign (Urbana) DeWitt (Clinton) Douglas (Tuscola) Macon (Decatur) Moultrie (Sullivan) Piatt (Monticello)

2014 Annual Report • SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS • Administrative Summary

Circuit Judges: Allen F. Bennett, Stanley Brandmeyer, Daniel E. Hartigan, Douglas L. Jarman, Kimberly G. Koester, James L. Roberts, M. Don Sheafor, Jr., Martin W. Siemer, Ronald D. Spears, Mark W. Stedelin, Wm. Robin Todd

Associate Judges: William J. Becker, James J. Eder, Jeffrey Marc Kelly, Allan F. Lolie, Jr., Bradley T. Paisley, Ericka Sanders

Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
45,607	61	44,865	98.2%	34,844
48,169	67	50,155	104.0%	35,088
52,893	81	51,088	96.4%	37,596
54,911	70	53,862	98.0%	36,383
63,634	42	63,153	99.2%	36,006
	45,607 48,169 52,893 54,911	45,607 61 48,169 67 52,893 81 54,911 70	45,607 61 44,865 48,169 67 50,155 52,893 81 51,088 54,911 70 53,862	45,6076144,86598.2%48,1696750,155104.0%52,8938151,08896.4%54,9117053,86298.0%

Circuit Judges: Claudia J. Anderson, Craig H. DeArmond, Nancy S. Fahey, Steven L. Garst, James R. Glenn, Brien J. O'Brien, Thomas M. O'Shaughnessy, Tracy W. Resch, Teresa K. Righter, Mitchell K. Shick, Matthew L. Sullivan

Associate Judges: Mark E. Bovard, Derek Girton, Mark S. Goodwin, David W. Lewis, Karen E. Wall

			Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	33,280	4	29,857	89.7%	49,862
2013	28,197	0	25,339	89.9%	48,569
2012	36,184	6	33,494	92.6%	46,794
2011	38,264	3	37,453	97.9%	46,404
2010	43,314	6	42,521	98.2%	47,153

Circuit Judges: Arnold F. Blockman, Robert C. Bollinger, Richard L. Broch, Jr., Harry E. Clem, Thomas J. Difanis, William Hugh Finson, Jeffrey B. Ford, Thomas E. Griffith, Jr., Michael Q. Jones, Karle E. Koritz, Heidi Ladd, Timothy J. Steadman, Albert G. Webber

Associate Judges: Holly F. Clemons, James R. Coryell, Scott B. Diamond, Jeffrey S. Geisler, John R. Kennedy, Richard P. Klaus, Charles McRae Leonhard, Thomas E. Little, Brian L. McPheters, Roger B. Webber

Year	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	67,594	432	66,590	97.9%	68,654
2013	73,732	372	72,703	98.1%	68,295
2012	75,849	375	76,124	99.9%	67,826
2011	81,135	341	79,687	97.8%	70,550
2010	85,122	350	84,056	98.3%	70,644



SEVENTH CIRCUIT

(Fourth Appellate District)



Morgan County Courthouse, Jacksonville

EIGHTH CIRCUIT

(Fourth Appellate District)

Kenneth R. Deihl, Chief Judge

Sangamon County Complex 200 S. 9th Street, Room 530 Springfield, IL 62701

Circuit Population: 321,588 (2014 est.)

Counties (seats):

Greene (Carrollton) Jersey (Jerseyville) Macoupin (Carlinville) Morgan (Jacksonville) Sangamon (Springfield) Scott (Winchester)

Diane M. Lagoski, Chief Judge

Adams County Courthouse 521 Vermont Street Quincy, IL 62301

Circuit Population: 141,752 (2014 est.)

Counties (seats):

Adams (Quincy) Brown (Mount Sterling) Menard (Petersburg) Calhoun (Hardin) Cass (Virginia)

Mason (Havana) Pike (Pittsfield) Schuyler (Rushville)

James B. Stewart, Chief Judge 130 S. Lafayette Street, Suite 30 Macomb, IL 61455

Circuit Population: 163,310 (2014 est.)

Counties (seats):

Fulton (Lewistown) Hancock (Carthage) Henderson (Oquawka) Knox (Galesburg) McDonough (Macomb) Warren (Monmouth)

Calhoun County Courthouse, Hardin

NINTH CIRCUIT

(Third Appellate District)



Knox County Courthouse, Galesburg

Circuit Judges: John Belz, Peter C. Cavanagh, David R. Cherry, James W. Day, Leslie J. Graves, Patrick W. Kelley, John M. Madonia, Eric S. Pistorius, Christopher E. Reif, John Schmidt

Associate Judges: Rudolph M. Braud, Jr., Matthew J. Mauer, Joshua A. Meyer, Steven H. Nardulli, Brian T. Otwell, Chris Perrin, Esteban F. Sanchez, Jeffery E. Tobin, April G. Troemper

Year	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	78,697	60	77,476	98.4%	93,187
2013	78,948	72	78,677	99.6%	92,612
2012	81,387	143	79,292	97.3%	92,174
2011	87,419	127	69,570	79.5%	84,687
2010	95,445	28	101,957	106.8%	61,807

Circuit Judges: Robert K. Adrian, Michael L. Atterberry, Charles H. W. Borch, Scott J. Butler, Mark A. Drummond, Bobby G. Hardwick, William O. Mays, Jr., John Frank McCartney, Alan D. Tucker, Scott H. Walden

Associate Judges: Thomas Brannan, Jerry J. Hooker, Thomas J. Ortbal, Chet W. Vahle, John C. Wooleyhan

Year	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	29,455	14	29,322	99.5%	19,751
2013	31,808	20	30,982	97.3%	20,139
2012	33,187	34	32,727	98.5%	19,409
2011	31,759	56	31,421	98.8%	18,970
2010	37,764	22	36,853	97.5%	18,941

Circuit Judges: Steven R. Bordner, Rodney G. Clark, William C. Davis, Thomas B. Ewing, Paul L. Mangieri, William E. Poncin, Scott Shipplett, James R. Standard, David L. Vancil, Jr.

Associate Judges: Heidi A. Benson, Raymond A. Cavanaugh, Richard H. Gambrell, Dwayne I. Morrison, Patricia Anne VanderMeulen-Walton

Year	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	32,152	9	30,613	95.2%	22,292
2013	31,963	7	32,091	100.4%	20,474
2012	33,205	54	33,805	101.6%	20,538
2011	34,862	21	35,896	102.9%	23,432
2010	38,879	34	37,953	97.5%	24,380



TENTH CIRCUIT





Tazewell County Courthouse, Pekin

Stephen Kouri, Chief Judge

Peoria County Courthouse 324 Main Street, #215 Peoria, IL 61602

Circuit Population: 346,667 (2014 est.)

Counties (seats):

Marshall (Lacon) Peoria (Peoria) Putnam (Hennepin) Stark (Toulon) Tazewell (Pekin)

ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

(Fourth Appellate District)



Livingston County Courthouse, Pontiac

Elizabeth A. Robb, Chief Judge

McLean County Law & Justice Center 104 W. Front Street, Room 511 Bloomington, IL 61701

Circuit Population: 294,585 (2014 est.)

Counties (seats):

Ford (Paxton) Livingston (Pontiac) Logan (Lincoln) McLean (Bloomington) Woodford (Eureka)

TWELFTH CIRCUIT

(Third Appellate District)



Will County Courthouse, Joliet

Richard C. Schoenstedt, Chief Judge Will County Courthouse 14 W. Jefferson, #439 Joliet, IL 60432

Circuit Population: 685,419 (2014 est.)

County (seat): Will (Joliet)

Circuit Judges: Paul P. Gilfillan, Jodi M. Hoos, Katherine Gorman Hubler, Thomas A. Keith, Kevin W. Lyons, James A. Mack, Michael P. McCuskey, Michael D. Risinger, John P. Vespa

Associate Judges: David A. Brown, Timothy Cusack, David J. Dubicki, Mark E. Gilles, Kim L. Kelley, Jerelyn D. Maher, Richard D. McCoy, Albert L. Purham, Jr., Kirk D. Schoenbein, Lisa Y. Wilson

Year	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	82,325	79	73,752	89.5%	53,925
2013	80,924	148	79,046	97.5%	45,647
2012	89,563	140	90,079	100.4%	43,835
2011	89,266	241	87,982	98.3%	44,535
2010	98,269	134	100,018	101.6%	43,371

Circuit Judges: Jennifer H. Bauknecht, Scott D. Drazewski, Charles M. Feeney, III, Matthew J. Fitton, Kevin P. Fitzgerald, Rebecca S. Foley, Robert L. Freitag, Paul G. Lawrence, Charles G. Reynard

Associate Judges: David W. Butler, John Casey Costigan, Mark A. Fellheimer, Thomas W. Funk, John Brian Goldrick, Lee Ann S. Hill, Michael Stroh, Robert M. Travers, William Gordon Workman, William A. Yoder

Year	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	65,872	990	66,079	98.8%	45,068
2013	68,518	840	68,982	99.5%	43,954
2012	71,371	735	70,777	98.2%	44,317
2011	73,862	946	84,590	113.1%	37,008
2010	81,874	834	93,866	113.5%	46,472

Circuit Judges: James Jeffrey Allen, John C. Anderson, Amy M. Bertani-Tomczak, David M. Carlson, Paula A. Gomora, Carmen Julia Goodman, Sarah-Marie F. Jones, Daniel L. Kennedy, Susan T. O'Leary, Barbara N. Petrungaro, Carla J. Alessio Policandriotes, Michael J. Powers, Daniel D. Rippy, Raymond E. Rossi, Daniel J. Rozak

Associate Judges: Dinah J. Archambeault, Brian Barrett, Matthew G. Bertani, Bennett J. Braun, Robert P. Brumund, Edward A. Burmila, Jr., M. Thomas Carney, David Garcia, Chrystel L. Gavlin, Theodore J. Jarz, Victoria McKay Kennison, Cory D. Lund, Rick A. Mason, Raymond A. Nash, Domenica A. Osterberger, Joseph C. Polito, Roger D. Rickmon, Marilee Viola

Year	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	150,724	4,399	157,430	101.5%	85,556
2013	150,905	4,143	159,531	102.9%	87,929
2012	158,734	4,747	168,479	103.1%	92,411
2011	164,945	5,525	170,080	99.8%	97,409
2010	175,448	6,598	189,745	104.2%	97,016

2014 Annual Report • SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS • Administrative Summary



THIRTEENTH CIRCUIT (Third Appellate District)



Bureau County Courthouse, Princeton

Howard C. Ryan, Jr., Chief Judge

LaSalle County Courthouse 119 W. Madison, #202 Ottawa, IL 61350

Circuit Population: 195,506 (2014 est.)

Counties (seats):

Bureau (Princeton) Grundy (Morris) LaSalle (Ottawa)

FOURTEENTH CIRCUIT

(Third Appellate District)



Henry County Courthouse, Cambridge

Walter D. Braud, Chief Judge

Rock Island County Courthouse 210 15th Street, #408 Rock Island, IL 61201

Circuit Population: 268,519 (2014 est.)

Counties (seats):

Henry (Cambridge) Mercer (Aledo) Rock Island (Rock Island) Whiteside (Morrison)

FIFTEENTH CIRCUIT

(Second Appellate District)



Jo Daviess County Courthouse, Galena

Ronald M. Jacobson, Chief Judge Ogle County Courthouse 106 S. Fifth Street, #306A Oregon, IL 61061

Circuit Population: 170,224 (2014 est.)

Counties (seats):

Carroll (Mount Carroll) Jo Daviess (Galena) Lee (Dixon) Ogle (Oregon) Stephenson (Freeport)

Circuit Judges: Marc Bernabei, Eugene P. Daugherity, Joseph P. Hettel, Troy D. Holland, Robert C. Marsaglia, Lance R. Peterson, Cynthia M. Raccuglia

Associate Judges: Daniel J. Bute, Karen C. Eiten, Cornelius J. Hollerich, Michael C. Jansz, Sheldon R. Sobol

Year	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	40,344	651	41,271	100.7%	18,949
2013	41,543	896	45,052	106.2%	19,799
2012	46,745	778	47,163	99.2%	22,702
2011	46,708	854	46,806	98.4%	22,611
2010	49,325	994	50,662	100.7%	22,006

Circuit Judges: James G. Conway, Jr., Clarence M. Darrow, Frank R. Fuhr, John L. Hauptman, Lori R. Lefstein, F. Michael Meersman, Jeffrey W. O'Connor, Terence M. Patton, Stanley B. Steines, Linnea E. Thompson, Mark A. VandeWiele

Associate Judges: Michael R. Albert, Thomas C. Berglund, Gregory George Chickris, Peter Church, Norma Kauzlarich, Theodore G. Kutsunis, W. S. McNeal, Dana R. McReynolds, Carol Pentuic, Richard A. Zimmer

Year	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	54,585	20	52,879	96.8%	53,574
2013	55,562	35	55,259	99.4%	54,865
2012	60,948	45	59,017	96.8%	55,903
2011	61,570	73	60,429	98.0%	54,783
2010	69,676	23	69,674	100.0%	55,322

Circuit Judges: Michael P. Bald, Daniel A. Fish, Val Gunnarsson, Robert T. Hanson, David L. Jeffrey, William A. Kelly, John B. Roe, IV

Associate Judges: Jacquelyn D. Ackert, Charles T. Beckman, James M. Hauser, John F. Joyce, Kathleen O. Kauffmann, John C. Redington, Glen R. Schorsch, Kevin J. Ward

Year	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	35,097	22	35,262	100.4%	23,331
2013	42,445	17	42,541	100.2%	24,079
2012	45,257	27	45,073	99.5%	107,969
2011	45,530	255	44,455	97.1%	110,176
2010	44,942	29	45,412	101.0%	26,184



SIXTEENTH CIRCUIT (Second Appellate District)



Kane County Courthouse, Geneva

Judith M. Brawka, Chief Judge

Kane County Judicial Center 37W777 Rte. 38, #400A St. Charles, IL 60175

Circuit Population: 527,306 (2014 est.)

County (seat):

Kane (Geneva)

* Effective December 3, 2012 Public Act 97-0585 created a new 23rd Judicial Circuit, separating Kendall and DeKalb counties from the 16th Judicial Circuit. For trend reporting purposes, the five year trend reports provided for the 16th and 23rd Judicial Circuit charts reflect totals for Kane County in the 16th Judicial Circuit and the combined totals for Kendall and DeKalb counties in the 23rd Judicial Circuit.

SEVENTEENTH CIRCUIT (Second Appellate District)



Boone County Courthouse, Belvidere

Joseph G. McGraw, Chief Judge Winnebago County Courthouse 400 West State Street, #215

Rockford, IL 61101

Circuit Population: 342,411 (2014 est.)

Counties (seats):

Boone (Belvidere) Winnebago (Rockford)

Circuit Judges: David R. Akemann, John A. Barsanti, Kevin T. Busch, Susan Clancy Boles, John G. Dalton, Joseph M. Grady, James C. Hallock, Thomas E. Mueller, James R. Murphy, John A. Noverini, Donald M. Tegeler

Associate Judges: Linda Abrahamson Baurle, René Cruz, Christine A. Downs, Elizabeth Flood, Thomas C. Hull, III, Kathryn Karayannis, David P. Kliment, Marmarie J. Kostelny, Mary Katherine Moran, Robert J. Morrow, William J. Parkhurst, Mark A. Pheanis, Edward C. Schreiber, Thomas J. Stanfa, Alice C. Tracy, Robert K. Villa, Leonard J. Wojtecki

Year	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	101,495	935	102,635	100.2%	57,070
2013	109,434	939	110,278	99.9%	57,090
2012	117,882	1,345	127,883	107.3%	56,995
2011	116,522	1,422	117,980	100.0%	65,651
2010	128,846	1,393	132,554	101.8%	66,587



47

Circuit Judges: Rosemary Collins, Eugene G. Doherty, Lisa R. Fabiano, Gwyn Gulley, Janet R. Holmgren, Brendan A. Maher, J. Edward Prochaska, Curtis R. Tobin, III, Ronald J. White

Associate Judges: Joseph J. Bruce, Fernando L. Engelsma, Mary Linn Green, Patrick L. Heaslip, John S. Lowry, Francis M. Martinez, Philip J. Nicolosi, Steven L. Nordquist, R. Craig Sahlstrom, Brian Dean Shore, John R. Truitt, Robert R. Wilt, K. Patrick Yarbrough, John H. Young

Year	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	90,946	287	89,251	97.8%	93,950
2013	93,015	144	88,783	95.3%	95,098
2012	94,773	277	95,452	100.4%	91,316
2011	98,612	266	101,735	102.9%	95,279
2010	109,309	200	112,976	103.2%	95,508

EIGHTEENTH CIRCUIT

(Second Appellate District)



DuPage County Courthouse, Wheaton

Kathryn E. Creswell, Chief Judge

DuPage County Courthouse 505 N. County Farm Rd., #2015 Wheaton, IL 60187

Circuit Population: 932,708 (2014 est.)

County (seat):

DuPage (Wheaton)

NINETEENTH CIRCUIT (Second Appellate District)



Lake County Courthouse, Waukegan

TWENTIETH CIRCUIT (Fifth Appellate District)

Randolph County Courthouse, Chester

John T. Phillips, Chief Judge

Lake County Courthouse 18 N. County Street Waukegan, IL 60085

Circuit Population: 705,186 (2014 est.)

County (seat): Lake (Waukegan)

C. John Baricevic, Chief Judge St. Clair County Building 10 Public Square Belleville, IL 62220

Circuit Population: 368,329 (2014 est.)

Counties (seats):

Monroe (Waterloo) Perry (Pinckneyville) Randolph (Chester) St. Clair (Belleville) Washington (Nashville)

Circuit Judges: Robert J. Anderson, George J. Bakalis, Liam C. Brennan, Rodney W. Equi, Blanche Hill Fawell, Daniel P. Guerin, John Kinsella, Robert G. Kleeman, Dorothy French Mallen, Patrick J. O'Shea, Kenneth Popejoy, Ronald D. Sutter, Brian F. Telander, Bonnie M. Wheaton

Associate Judges: Neal W. Cerne, Anthony V. Coco, Linda E. Davenport, John W. Demling, Brian J. Diamond, Robert E. Douglas, Thomas A. Else, William I. Ferguson, Paul M. Fullerton, Robert G. Gibson, Bruce R. Kelsey, James J. Konetski, Patrick J. Leston, Jeffrey S. MacKay, Paul A. Marchese, Alexander F. McGimpsey, Timothy J. McJoynt, Brian R. McKillip, Robert A. Miller, Jane Hird Mitton, Mary E. O'Connor, James D. Orel, Peter W. Ostling, Robert William Rohm, Richard D. Russo, Elizabeth W. Sexton, Terence M. Sheen, Ann Celine O'Hallaren Walsh, Karen M. Wilson, Michael A. Wolfe

Year	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	224,313	11,653	238,416	101.0%	57,682
2013	232,808	12,395	249,756	101.9%	60,141
2012	252,356	30,764	286,625	101.2%	64,693
2011	268,720	14,099	290,944	102.9%	68,203
2010	309,329	15,758	329,844	101.5%	76,329

Circuit Judges: James K. Booras, George Bridges, Valerie Boettle Ceckowski, Mitchell L. Hoffman, Mark L. Levitt, Margaret J. Mullen, Jorge L. Ortiz, Victoria A. Rossetti, Thomas M. Schippers, Daniel B. Shanes, Patricia Sowinski Fix, Christopher C. Starck, Jay W. Ukena, Diane E. Winter

Associate Judges: Luis A. Berrones, Michael B. Betar, Christen L. Bishop, David P. Brodsky, Raymond Collins, Michael J. Fusz, Brian P. Hughes, Daniel Jasica, Charles D. Johnson, Sarah P. Lessman, D. Christopher Lombardo, Margaret A. Marcouiller, Christopher B. Morozin, Veronica M. O'Malley, Theodore S. Potkonjak, Elizabeth M. Rochford, Helen Rozenberg, Joseph V. Salvi, John J. Scully, James Simonian, George D. Strickland, Christopher Stride, Donna-Jo Vorderstrasse, Nancy S. Waites

Year	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	163,101	10,149	175,139	101.1%	43,173
2013	178,926	7,005	190,925	102.7%	45,059
2012	184,349	9,005	195,321	101.0%	50,052
2011	197,576	7,774	207,291	100.9%	52,011
2010	223,823	13,451	235,088	99.1%	53,937

Circuit Judges: Richard A. Brown, James W. Campanella, Zina Renea Cruse, Dennis B. Doyle, Daniel J. Emge, Jan V. Fiss, Andrew J. Gleeson, Robert B. Haida, Robert P. LeChien, Vincent J. Lopinot, Stephen P. McGlynn

Associate Judges: Richard Aguirre, Brian A. Babka, Walter C. Brandon, Jr., Laninya Cason, Ellen A. Dauber, Julia R. Gomric, Eugene E. Gross, Julie K. Katz, Randall W. Kelley, Patricia H. Kievlan, Christopher T. Kolker, Stephen R. Rice, Heinz M. Rudolf

Year	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	99,537	219	100,858	101.1%	97,787
2013	104,927	305	101,684	96.6%	99,122
2012	107,442	278	109,389	101.5%	12,561
2011	112,039	193	118,846	105.9%	19,279
2010	119,759	195	124,967	104.2%	104,996



Circuit Courts

2014 Annual Report • SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS • Administrative Summary

TWENTY-FIRST CIRCUIT (Third Appellate District)



Kankakee County Courthouse, Kankakee

Michael J. Kick, Chief Judge

Kankakee County Courthouse 450 East Court Street Kankakee, IL 60901

Circuit Population: 140,254 (2014 est.)

Counties (seats):

Iroquois (Watseka) Kankakee (Kankakee)

TWENTY-SECOND CIRCUIT

(Second Appellate District)



McHenry County Government Center, Woodstock

Michael J. Sullivan, Chief Judge McHenry County Government Center 2200 N. Seminary Ave.

Woodstock, IL 60098

Circuit Population: 307,283 (2014 est.)

County (seat): McHenry (Woodstock)

TWENTY-THIRD CIRCUIT

(Second Appellate District)



DeKalb County Courthouse, Sycamore

Timothy J. McCann, Chief Judge Kendall County Courthouse 807 West John Street

Yorkville, IL 60560

Circuit Population: 226,812 (2014 est.)

Counties (seats):

DeKalb (Sycamore) Kendall (Yorkville)

* Effective December 3, 2012 Public Act 97-0585 created a new 23rd Judicial Circuit, separating Kendall and DeKalb counties from the 16th Judicial Circuit. For trend reporting purposes, the five year trend reports provided for the 16th and 23rd Judicial Circuit charts reflect totals for Kane County in the 16th Judicial Circuit and the combined totals for Kendall and DeKalb counties in the 23rd Judicial Circuit.

Circuit Courts

Circuit Judges: Adrienne W. Albrecht, Kathy Bradshaw Elliott, Clark E. Erickson, Gordon Lee Lustfeldt, Susan Sumner Tungate, Kendall O. Wenzelman

Associate Judges: Thomas W. Cunnington, Ronald J. Gerts, James B. Kinzer, Michael D. Kramer, Kenneth Leshen

Yea	ar	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
20	14	31,794	0	30,259	95.2%	57,683
20	13	33,823	1	31,484	93.1%	56,337
20	12	33,630	0	32,423	96.4%	54,143
203	11	34,327	0	35,033	102.1%	53,009
201	10	40,781	0	37,849	92.8%	53,819

Circuit Judges: Michael T. Caldwell, Michael J. Chmiel, Michael W. Feetterer, Gordon E. Graham, Maureen P. McIntyre, Sharon Prather, Charles P. Weech

Associate Judges: Robert Beaderstadt, Joel D. Berg, John D. Bolger, Kevin G. Costello, James S. Cowlin, Mark R. Gerhardt, Christopher M. Harmon, Suzanne C. Mangiamele, Thomas A. Meyer, Mary H. Nader, Robert A. Wilbrandt, Jr.

Year	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	64,089	2,173	67,975	102.6%	17,708
2013	72,312	2,546	76,393	102.1%	19,328
2012	77,204	3,223	82,986	103.2%	20,859
2011	81,003	3,568	84,710	100.2%	23,402
2010	90,341	3,432	93,371	99.6%	23,401

Circuit Judges: Melissa S. Barnhart, Thomas L. Doherty, Stephen L. Krentz, R. Matekaitis, Robert P. Pilmer, Robbin J. Stuckert, Bradley J. Waller

Associate Judges: William P. Brady, Marcy L. Buick, John McAdams, Philip G. Montgomery, Joseph R. Voiland

Year	Filed	Reinstated	Disposed	Clearance Rate %	Pending
2014	41,132	1,158	42,774	101.1%	22,483
2013	42,637	1,588	45,207	102.2%	22,967
2012	46,259	1,713	48,588	101.3%	23,943
2011	47,407	1,826	49,907	101.4%	24,559
2010	57,554	1,732	57,538	97.1%	25,233



ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

52

he AOIC Executive Office is comprised of the Administrative Director, Deputy Director, Chief Legal Counsel, and other legal and administrative staff. Under the Administrative Director's leadership, the Executive Office is responsible for coordinating and guiding operations of the Administrative Office's six divisions and serves as a



central resource for myriad operational issues which impact the administration of the Illinois judicial branch.

The **Executive Office**, on behalf of the Supreme Court, manages and coordinates liaison activities with Executive and Legislative Branch officials and agencies on matters that impact the Illinois Courts and the justice system. One of the major duties performed for the Supreme Court is the consideration of non-routine administrative matters presented during each Court term. The Administrative Director prepares and presents agenda issues to the Court for discussion and deliberation to assure that the business of the judicial branch is thoroughly and timely managed. Agenda items approved by the Court for action are then implemented by the Director through the Executive Office.

The Executive Office plans and coordinates Administrative Office staff support for Supreme Court Committees and the Committees of the Illinois Judicial Conference. In that regard, the Judicial Conference committees are charged with examining and making recommendations on matters of judicial branch policy. The reports and recommendations which flow from each Judicial Conference committee to the Supreme Court relate to the improvement of the administration of justice in Illinois. As such, the Court assigned new and on-going tasks and projects to Judicial Conference committees in 2015. The Administrative Director assigns senior level staff with subject matter expertise to serve as liaisons to assist each committee in its assignments.

In its administration of Supreme Court Rule 39 (Appointment of Associate Judges), the Executive Office conducted the election of 33 associate judges in 13 of Illinois' 24 judicial circuits during 2014. Also, as provided by Rule 39, the Executive Office will manage the 2015 quadrennial reappointment process for Illinois' more than 400 associate judges. The Executive Office additionally processes applications filed under Supreme Court Rule 295, which authorizes the assignment of associate judges to hear felony matters. Other matters administered through the Executive Office include applications for licenses issued to law students seeking to provide limited legal representation under Supreme Court Rule 711.

The Executive Office's activities and responsibilities include securing and tracking legal representation through the Office of the Attorney General for members of the judicial branch named in a civil case or controversy arising out of the performance of their official judicial duties. Executive Office staff also negotiates, prepares, and manages office leases and contracts for the Supreme and Appellate Courts, mandatory arbitration programs, and the Administrative Office. All vendor contracts generated by the Administrative Office and state judicial branch managers for use in securing goods and services are reviewed and approved by the Executive Office. Written summaries of recent Supreme Court opinions are prepared by legal staff within the Executive Office for distribution to all Illinois judges.

The Executive Office also oversees the Human Resource Unit and the Labor Relations Unit. The Human Resource Unit provides personnel services to state-paid judicial branch employees and managers; maintains comprehensive attendance and leave records for all judicial branch personnel covered by the Supreme Court's Leave of Absence Policies; and assists individuals with questions regarding the Supreme Court's leave and personnel policies. The Human Resource Unit also works with judicial branch employees and managers in administering the judicial branch's classification and compensation plan, as well as assisting judicial branch managers in their recruitment and selection process. Additionally, the Human Resource Unit is responsible for EEOC reporting and dissemination of economic interest statements required under Supreme Court Rule 68.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE DIRECTORY

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Michael J. Tardy, Director Marcia Meis, Deputy Director

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE DIVISIONS

Administrative Services Division - Kathleen L. O'Hara, Assistant Director

Civil Justice Division - Danielle Hirsch, Assistant Director

Court Services Division - Todd Schroeder, Assistant Director

Judicial Education Division - Cyrana Mott, Assistant Director

Judicial Management Information Services (JMIS) - Skip Robertson, Assistant Director

Probation Services Division - Margie Groot, Assistant Director

Administrative Office - Chicago

222 North LaSalle Street, 13th Floor Chicago, IL 60601 (312) 793-3250 FAX: (312) 793-1335 Administrative Office - Springfield 3101 Old Jacksonville Road Springfield, IL 62704 (217) 558-4490 FAX: (217) 785-3905

The Labor Relations Unit negotiates collective bargaining agreements on behalf of chief circuit judges and circuit clerks. The Labor Relations Unit has frequently been called upon to offer advice relative to personnel matters to assure appropriate actions that are just and in compliance with the negotiated agreements, common law rules of the workplace, and federal and state statutes.

Additionally, the Executive Office provides secretariat services to the Illinois Courts Commission, which includes filing and preservation of Commission records, distributing the Official Illinois Courts Commission Reports, and performing all other duties typically executed by a clerk of a court of record. Finally, Executive Office staff prepares and executes grants which provide for programming funded through the Lawyers' Assistance Program Act.

The Administrative Services Division provides technical and support services to the judicial branch through its four operational units; the Payroll/Benefits Unit, the Accounting Unit, the Budget Unit, and the Logistics Unit.

The Payroll/Benefits Unit maintains all payroll records for current state-paid judicial branch employees as well as records for all previous employees. Staff of this unit work with the Office of the Comptroller to produce both monthly and semi-monthly payrolls for over 1,500 current judicial branch employees. Payroll/Benefits Unit staff interact with representatives of both the Judges' Retirement System and the State Employees' Retirement System to ensure continued benefits for judicial branch officers and employees. Payroll/Benefits Unit staff also coordinate the state's varied employee benefit programs, including health, dental, and life insurance.

The Accounting Unit consistently and accurately processes all payment vouchers for the Supreme Court, the Appellate Court, the state paid functions of the circuit courts, and the Administrative Office. The Accounting Unit also maintains all financial records for the expenditure of resources appropriated by the General Assembly. Staff of this unit work closely with staff of the Comptroller's Office to reconcile payment information and provide that office any additional information needed to facilitate the payment of judicial branch bills.

In addition to overseeing procurement activities, the Budget Unit produces highly technical and analytical financial reports used by judicial branch managers and the Administrative Director. These reports track daily spending, contractual obligations, and projected spending needs. This unit also prepares the comprehensive documentation utilized in the development and implementation of the annual judicial branch budget. The Budget Unit also monitors the number of authorized judicial and non-judicial positions within the judicial branch.

The Logistics Unit oversees the distribution of mail and parcel services for the Administrative Office. Acting as its own print shop, staff of this unit review materials





presented for copying and determine the best method to replicate the originals. In many instances, the Unit produces print quality manuals, brochures, and publications. The Logistics Unit also serves as the central distribution and shipping center for the Administrative Office. Finally, the Logistics Unit is responsible for maintaining sufficient inventories of office supplies and coordinating the transfer of equipment and furniture among judicial branch offices.

The **Court Services Division** is organized into three working groups (the Courts, Children and Families Unit; the Program Unit; and the Recordkeeping and Technology Unit) and is involved in a diverse and wide range of activities and projects affecting judges, circuit clerks, court administrators and other components of the judicial branch of government. The Division is responsible for staffing a variety of Supreme Court committees, Judicial Conference committees, and the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges. The Division also serves as the primary liaison for the Supreme Court's Peer Judge Mentoring and Judicial Performance Evaluation Programs.

In accordance with Supreme Court Rules 10-100 and 101, Program Unit staff continued to work with the AOIC's Civil Justice Division, the Access to Justice Commission and its various committees involved with the development of statewide standardized forms. Additionally, the monthly data collection and monitoring system for statewide mandatory arbitration programs that was piloted and implemented in 2013 experienced the first full year of implementation. The newly established methodology provides program administrators and presiding judges more timely and thorough information to assist with program and arbitrator assessment and management. Working with individual Arbitration Administrators, Program Unit staff made some minor adjustments and customizations to the respective monitoring system during 2014.

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 99.1, Program Unit staff also began development of a new data collection instrument designed to enhance the type of data collection and analysis for residential mortgage foreclosure mediation programs. While the various residential foreclosure mediation programs differ in operation and process, this data collection enhancement allows the Court to capture the data necessary from each program to review program efficacy and financial sustainability. In collaboration with CCFU staff, Program Unit staff continued to support, monitor and assist trial courts with the submission of child custody and visitation mediation statistical reports pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 905, as well as receive updates to Circuit Court's Emergency Preparedness Plans.

The **Courts, Children and Families Unit (CCFU)** manage the programmatic and fiscal components of three (Basic, Data and Training) grant awards included in the federallyfunded statewide Court Improvement Program (CIP). The CCFU works to support the mission, vision, and core values of Illinois' CIP of ensuring safety and stability for children and families involved in child abuse and neglect proceedings. In 2014, the CCFU continued to develop the foundation and infrastructure for improved court practices in child protection cases by concentrating its efforts on the six pillars of Illinois CIP: the Statewide Legal Representation Initiative; Judicial Training; The Child Protection Data Courts Project; Child Protection Circuit Teams; Child-Wellbeing and Collaboration with the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services.

Statewide Legal Representation Initiative: The CCFU has focused efforts on improving outcomes by enhancing the effectiveness of legal representation in child abuse and neglect cases. Projects funded under the Legal Representation Initiative in 2014 include: the Family Advocacy Clinic at the University of Illinois School of Law for the representation of parents and children in juvenile abuse and neglect cases in Champaign County; the Juvenile Justice Clinic at Southern Illinois University providing guardian ad litem services for minors in juvenile abuse and neglect cases in Jackson County; the Winnebago County Guardians ad Litem Project, a project aimed at quality enhancement and development of best practice models in GAL representation. The CCFU offered the following trainings for attorneys: Child Welfare Law and Practice; Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC); and Child Development and Trauma for Practicing Attorneys. The CCFU also hosted a multi-state forum to address issues of guality parent representation in abuse and neglect cases. States participating, in addition to Illinois, included: Ohio, Michigan, Minnesota and Wisconsin.

Judicial Training: The CCFU is committed to developing and maintaining an effective system of training and technical assistance for judges that preside over child abuse and neglect cases. CIP Training funds were used to provide scholarships for five juvenile judges, respectively, to attend the annual National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges Child Abuse and Neglect Institute and the Advanced Child Abuse and Neglect Institute in Reno, NV. Additionally, the Administrative Office delivered its' specialized training for judges: Optimal Judicial Practice in the Early States of Child Protection Cases - The Shelter Care Hearing Through Adjudication and Disposition focusing on the beginning phase of the case to minimize delay and ensure proper findings in order to facilitate timely, safe and stable permanency for abused and neglected children.

Child Protection Data Courts Project (CPDC): Through the CPDC Project, the CCFU continued to collect and analyze child protection court performance measures, demographic information and case characteristics in child abuse and neglect cases. In 2014, the CPDC Project was expanded to include an additional project site, bringing the total to nine sites. The CPDC project sites track case demographic information and 18 of 30 nationally recognized child protection court performance measures. The project sites are implementing action plans developed by each county and based on performance measure data obtained. These action plans include a project initiative with goals, action items, responsibilities and timelines, and outcome measures.

Child Protection Circuit Teams (CPCTs): The CCFU is involved in a multi-year strategy to engage CPCTs and promote local coordination between courts and child protection stakeholders. The CCFU continues to fund projects and trainings developed by CPCTs.

Child Well-Being: CCFU continues to fund projects aimed at improving child well-being specifically focusing on trauma, educational issues, LGBTQ youth in care and substance abuse.

Collaboration with the Illinois Department of Child and Family Services (IDCFS): In 2014, the CCFU continued

its' working relationship with the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services by participating in federal site visits and providing training for IDCFS attorneys.

The Recordkeeping and Technology Unit (RTU) provides an array of guidance and technical support services to circuit clerks and their staff. RTU staff continues to work with the Illinois Association of Court Clerks in developing educational programs for circuit clerks and their staff, as well as coordinating the Circuit Clerk Mentor Program. The RTU monitored the filing of the circuit clerks' annual audits, updated the Applicable Legal Requirements, and distributed the Requirements upon request. E-Business programs in Illinois continue to expand and the RTU assisted with the amendment to the Supreme Court's Electronic Filing Standards and Principles, amended on September 16, 2014. Three new counties were approved to accept electronic filings in civil cases (bringing the total to 11), one county was approved for electronic filing in criminal cases, which includes citations, under the amended Standards. In 2014, two counties were approved to begin keeping records in civil case types, pursuant to the Court's Electronic Record Standards and Principles, which permits counties to make the electronic court record the official record. Five counties were approved to accept electronic pleas of guilty in accordance with the Standards for Accepting Pleas of Guilty in Minor Traffic and Conservation Offenses Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 529, bringing the total to 35 counties of 102 in the state. The Administrative Office provided merged jury lists to 101 counties in 2014 and Petit and Grand Jury Handbooks were supplied to counties as requested. The unit continues to manage the Offense Code Table (OFT), which identifies offenses reported to four state entities through the Automated Disposition Reporting (ADR) Program. A complete, updated version of the OFT was issued in May 2014. The RTU also is responsible for the publication of this two-volume Annual Report through the collection and compilation of guarterly caseload statistics and annual reports submitted by the clerks of the circuit, appellate, and supreme courts, and other divisions of the administrative office. During the past year, the RTU also provided assistance to the Civil Justice Division with the development of data collection instruments related to Self-Represented Litigants (SRLs) and parties with Limited English Proficiencies (LEPs), which were provided to the circuit courts for collection starting in 2015.

The **Civil Justice Division** is the newest Division, established in January 2014. The Civil Justice Division's objective is to help the legal system efficiently deliver outcomes that are fair and accessible to all court users, particularly to those who are low-income and vulnerable. The Civil Justice Division also supports the work of the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice, and works collaboratively with the Commission and its subcommittees to promote access to justice within the Illinois courts. Moreover, Civil Justice Division staff work closely with the other Divisions of the Administrative Office and with other civil justice system stakeholders to improve the justice delivery systems that serve lowincome, limited English proficient and vulnerable litigants.

The Civil Justice Division's current priorities include: (1) developing statewide standardized forms for simpler civil legal problems and basic procedural functions; (2) providing language access services and support to assist state courts in addressing language barriers and improving interpreter services; (3) developing training materials and education programs for courts, clerks and other judicial stakeholders to assist with interacting with self-represented litigants and limited English proficient parties and witnesses; and (4) expanding statewide civil justice data collection, research and analysis to aid in the development of innovative strategies to close the gap between the need for and the availability of quality legal assistance.

Standardized Forms. The Civil Justice Division partners with the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice Forms Committee (Forms Committee) and its various subcommittees to develop standardized, simplified forms that-once promulgated by the Forms Committee—must be accepted by state courts. Litigants who use the statewide standardized forms will be able to solve basic legal problems without the assistance of an attorney. At present, the Division is supporting the work of seven subcommittees developing forms in appellate, divorce, expungement/sealing, mortgage foreclosure, name change, orders of protection and procedural forms. Before finalizing any forms, drafts are sent to public user testing, reviewed by both the substantive subcommittee and the full Forms Committee, posted on the Court's website for public comment, shared with chief circuit judges for feedback and notice is provided to circuit

and appellate court clerks and bar associations statewide.

Language Access. The Civil Justice Division's language access efforts seek to promote initiatives and reforms to serve the growing number of people with limited English proficiency (LEP) participating in legal proceedings in state court. The Division also works with the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice Language Access Committee develop statewide standards to and policies and resources for LEP litigants. On October 1, 2014, the Court adopted the Illinois Supreme Court Language Access Policy and Code of Interpreter Ethics, which state that Illinois courts should provide interpreters for LEP litigants and witnesses in all civil and criminal proceedings and court-annexed

Inside the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts - Springfield

Administrative Office





proceedings. The policies also provide standard procedures for determining the need for an interpreter, establish a three-tiered certification program for court interpreters and support the development of circuitspecific Language Access Plans. In support of this new Court Language Access Policy, the Civil Justice Division launched a robust interpreter certification program that provides skill building and testing to foreign language and sign language court interpreters. The Civil Justice Division offered multiple two-day skill building orientation sessions and administered written and oral interpreter proficiency exams offered by the National Center for State Courts. All foreign language interpreter candidates who attended orientation and passed the written exam are eligible to be listed on the Administrative Office interpreter registry as registered interpreters, and those foreign language interpreter candidates who attended orientation, passed both the written and oral exams and clear a criminal background check are eligible to be listed on the Administrative Office interpreter registry as certified interpreters. Sign language interpreter candidates are eligible to be listed on the Administrative Office interpreter registry as sign language interpreters if they are licensed to interpret in legal settings, attend orientation and clear a criminal background check.

Training Materials and Educational Programs. The Civil Justice Division works with the Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Access to Justice Court Guidance and Training Committee (Court Guidance and Training Committee) to develop and maintain training materials and educational programs on access to justice issues. On October 22, 2014, the Civil Justice Division partnered with the Court Guidance and Training Committee, the Illinois Supreme Court Judicial Conference Committee on Education and the Judicial Education Division of the Administrative Office to host a day-long multidisciplinary training on language access and best practices for interacting with self-represented litigants and promoting pro bono. In attendance were judicial representatives from each judicial circuit, many circuit clerks and trial court administrators.

Data Collection. The Civil Justice Division is involved in efforts to begin collecting, compiling and analyzing access to justice data, including both the numbers of selfrepresented litigants involved in civil legal proceedings, by case type and party, and the numbers of LEP litigants requesting or requiring interpreter services in legal proceedings, by case type and the type of interpreter provided.

The Judicial Education Division coordinates and develops judicial education resources and curricula for the benefit of Illinois judges. In this regard, the Division, on behalf of the Supreme Court of Illinois, partners with, and provides administrative support to, the Illinois Judicial Conference Committee on Education, the Special Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Justice and Mental Health Planning, the Judicial Mentor Committee, the Appellate Court Administrative Committee, and other committees, commissions or entities as determined by the Court and the Administrative Director, as necessary to enhance the continuing educational needs of the Illinois judiciary.

Pursuant to the Comprehensive Judicial Education Plan for Illinois Judges, the Illinois Supreme Court requires all newly elected or appointed judges to attend New Judge Seminar, and each member of the Illinois judiciary, regardless of years on the bench, to attend the Court's biennial Education Conference. Education Conference features a flexible schedule of over 80 substantive sessions on a variety of criminal, civil, family and ethics topics. The 2014-2015 calendar of judicial education events include the following seminars, conferences and workshops for new and experienced judges: September 2014, March 2015, May 2015 Faculty Development Workshops; October 2014 Self-Represented Litigants training; February 2015 and December 2015 New Judge Seminar; March 2015 DUI/Traffic Seminar; April 2015 Appellate Court Conference and Annual Meeting; June 2015 Advanced Judicial Academy; October 2015 training on Evidence-Based Sentencing Practices, and curriculum development meetings to be held in May, September and October 2015 for the benefit of faculty preparing for Education Conference 2016.

The Judicial Education Division also provides administrative oversight of the New Judge Mentoring *Program*, and coordinates the annual production, printing and distribution of judicial benchbooks and manuals. Administration of the New Judge Mentoring program is managed in coordination with Judicial Mentor Committee, under the leadership of the Chair of the Conference of Chief Judges. The New Judge Mentoring program pairs new associate and circuit judges with an experienced judge for a period of one year during the first year of transition from the bar to the bench.

Judicial benchbooks are a collaborative effort of the Illinois Judicial Conference Committee on Education and the Judicial Education Division of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts. Active and retired members of the Illinois judiciary, and in some instances law professors, serve as authors, topic editors and peer reviewers for the following judicial benchbooks and manuals: Civil Law and Procedure; Criminal Law and Procedure; DUI/Traffic; Domestic Violence; Evidence; Family Law and Procedure; Juvenile Law Benchbooks - (Volume I - Delinquency, MRAI, Addicted Minors); (Volume II - Abuse, Neglect, Dependency and Termination of Parental Rights); the Illinois Manual on Complex Civil Litigation and the Illinois Manual on Complex Criminal Litigation. Benchbooks are available in hard copy, on CD, and the Judicial Portal and Judicial Links.

The Judicial Management Information Services (JMIS) Division is one of six divisions within the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC). JMIS provides technology to the offices and staff of the Illinois Supreme and Appellate Courts, Supreme Court supporting units and all divisions within the AOIC. JMIS also supports the Court's statewide digital recording initiative, which provides digital audio recording systems in the reviewing and circuit courts.

The JMIS division is staffed by 22 professionals consisting of four groups organized to respond to the technology initiatives assigned by the Supreme Court and Administrative Director. JMIS' Hardware / Software group manages the Courts' local and wide area networks, network servers, personal computers, peripherals, and productivity software. The Hardware / Software group is also responsible for the installation and support of the digital recording systems in the Supreme Court (2 courtrooms), Appellate Court (6 courtrooms) and Trial Court (330 courtrooms). JMIS' Internet Services group is responsible for the design and upkeep of the Court's



Inside the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts - Springfield

website (www.illinoiscourts.gov), where approximately 45,000 visitors access the website each month. The Internet Services group also administers the Court's social media Twitter account (@illinoiscourts), which broadcasts events and announcements to approximately 4,500 followers. JMIS' User Services group staffs the Help Desk, is responsible for database administration, telecommunication services, and asset tracking of the Court's technology equipment. The Application Group is responsible for the design and enhancements to approximately twenty enterprise database applications written in the Oracle or Progress database and programming languages. Division staff are also assigned to manage security, IT services, infrastructure support, and provide dedicated oversight to specific initiatives, such as the implementation of a reviewing courts case management system.

The **Probation Services Division** provides services to the Chief Judges and their probation staff in Illinois' 24 Judicial Circuits. The Probation and Probation Officer's Act, at 730 ILCS 110/15(1) states: *"The Supreme Court of Illinois may establish a Division of Probation Services whose purpose shall be the development, establishment, promulgation, and enforcement of uniform standards for probation services in the State, and otherwise carry out the intent of this Act."*

Consistent with its statutory responsibility, the mission of the Probation Services Division is to enhance the capacity of the community corrections system in order to reduce offender recidivism and create safer communities. In carrying out this mission, the Division's training, monitoring, standards setting, and technical assistance activities extend to all aspects of the administration and operation of the 67 local probation departments or districts that serve Illinois' 102 counties. All sixteen juvenile detention centers are also now administered by the circuit courts, with the governance of the Cook County Juvenile Temporary Detention Center (JTDC), 498-bed facility, transferred to the Circuit Court of Cook County effective May 20, 2015. As the primary communication link between the Division and probation and court services departments, Division employees play an integral role in achieving its mission and statutory mandates through teamwork, adopting a solution-focused approach, and demonstrating professionalism.

The Division is staffed by 26 employees with office sites in Springfield and Chicago. As the primary link between the Division and probation and court services departments, Division personnel serve an integral role in achieving its mission and statutory mandates through teamwork, a solution-focused approach, and professionalism. The Division is comprised of four operational units: Field Operations; Training and Juvenile Justice; Data, Eligibles, and Reimbursement Vouchering; and Interstate Compact/Instrastate Transfer. In 2014, two advanced level coordinator positions were created for Problem Solving Courts and for Pretrial Services.

Pursuant to statute, Division responsibilities include the administration of state reimbursement to counties for probation and detention services; review and approval of departments' annual probation plans; collection and analysis of statewide probation data; administration of probation employment and compensation standards and employment eligibility lists; development and implementation of evidence-based practices (EBP); monitoring and evaluation of probation programs and operations; administration of the interstate compact for probationers transferring into and out of the state; design and delivery of basic and advanced training for probation and detention personnel; and provision of technical assistance and staff support to circuit courts to improve the administration and operation of probation services in Illinois.

In 2014, six major projects/priorities defined substantial staff time or required additional dedicated personnel. These projects are: 1) Establishment and promulgation of problem solving court operational and certification standards; 2) Intensive technical support to the Circuit Court of Cook County Pretrial Services and Design of a Model Bond Court; 3) Initiation of the Illinois Measures for Justice Project; 4) Preparation for the transition of the JTDC; 5) Modification and implementation of adult and juvenile probation data collection tools and processes; and 6) Substantive updates to adult probation standards.

Division staff has been working with the Special Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Justice and Mental Health Planning to create Problem Solving Court Standards and a certification process for Illinois' 103 problem solving courts. Collaborative efforts with local and national organizations concentrate on the development and implementation of evidence-based practices in the problem solving court programs. Division staff continues to conduct site visits to the different problem solving courts offering technical assistance and support to the teams and stakeholders. Planning for future multi-disciplinary training for problem solving court team members remains a priority.

Promoting change in the administration of pretrial justice that focuses on practices that are evidence based and protects against the risk that individuals released will fail to appear in court or compromise safety to the community, is a major Division initiative. In conjunction with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC), the





Division reviewed and reported on the Circuit Court of Cook County's pretrial services administrative and operational policies, procedures and practices. In March 2014, the Supreme Court issued a report including forty (40) recommendations to address technical, managerial, and operational issues. While Cook was the first, pretrial services units across the state will be reviewed.

Substantive progress and accomplishments to address the report's recommendations resulted in systemic changes and the infrastructure to design the Cook County Model Bond Court Project. A collaboration between the Supreme Court, AOIC, and circuit court and input from the elected officials' stakeholder group promotes a paradigm shift from a system whereby release decisions are determined by the charge and an individual's ability to post cash, to release decisions based upon a defendant's identified level of risk for failure to appear and safety to the community. Consultants from Civic Consulting Alliance, the John and Laura Arnold Foundation/ Luminosity, and the MacArthur Foundation/Measures for Justice (MFJ) provide subject matter expertise. The Model Bond Court will launch July 1, 2015 at Central Bond Court in Chicago. Central to best practices in pretrial, AOIC and three sites (Cook, McLean and Kane Counties) will pilot the Public Safety Assessment-Court (PSA-C), a validated risk assessment tool that measures risks for failure to appear and new criminal activity, and flags for potential of new violent criminal activity developed in partnership by the Arnold Foundation/Luminosity.

Another major focus for the Division is to finalize updates to the monthly statistical report formats for adult and juvenile probation and pretrial services. Now in phase two of this initiative, AOIC and the NCSC are focusing on updating process and outcome data elements for problem solving courts, pretrial services and juvenile detention. Additionally, Division staff review, compile and analyze monthly statistical data submitted reported by probation and court services departments to assist in policy and decision-making. Quality assurance, validity and reliability, and outcome measures continued to be Division priorities with particular emphasis on risk assessment, case planning and supervision, and targeted interventions for higher risk offenders. Division staff assisted departments in the review and analysis of local system data related to case processing and outcomes. Additionally, through a grant from the MacArthur Foundation, AOIC and Measures for Justice will develop performance measures to assess key processes of the Illinois criminal system from arrest to post-conviction at the Circuit Court of Cook County and four selected pilot sites using measures established jointly with MFJ, in consultation with the Court and AOIC; and to develop a performance measurement framework and establish baseline measures for tracking the performance of Bond Court in Cook County.

Division staff also continued ongoing implementation of EBP through basic and advanced knowledge and skill-based training opportunities for adult and juvenile probation officers, detention officers, supervisors, and managers. Follow-up training and technical assistance on both juvenile and adult offender risk assessment and effective case management strategies were provided in circuits across the state. Division staff also worked in concert with circuit probation staff on the planning and delivery of regional training events to meet individual department needs. In 2014, the Division sponsored 80 training events that served nearly 1,675 participants. In addition to 40-hour basic training for adult and juvenile probation and juvenile detention officers, training topics included coaching and supervisory skills, detention manager symposium, probation and court services manager symposium and legal liability issues for adult and juvenile probation and juvenile detention officers, mental health needs of juveniles in probation and detention, and pretrial supervision. Further, a two-day multidisciplinary pretrial training was conducted for 120 representatives from the Cook County judiciary, pretrial, state's attorney, public defender, circuit clerks and county board.

The Division's Interstate Compact Unit staff oversees the transfer of adult probation felony and qualifying misdemeanor and juvenile probation cases between states consistent with the national rules set forth by the Interstate Commission of Adult offender Supervision and the Interstate Commission for Juveniles. Each of these national commissions host and manage electronic database systems to track transfers. As of December 31, 2014, a total of 5,457 (3,376 outgoing; 2,081 incoming) adult probation compact cases were under active supervision. In 2014, staff coordinated the transfer of 504 juvenile probation cases. In addition to overseeing the transfer of cases, the Compact Unit staff also provides extra information and support to probation officers about the Adult and Juvenile Commissions through training and monthly e-mail tips to address common questions about the transfer process. Unit staff also conducted joint training events for Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice parole agents and supervisors on the tracking system.

Through 2014, the Division convened several planning and special focus committees comprised of probation and court services officers, supervisors, or managers: Annual Probation Plan Workgroup; CMO Symposium Planning Committee; DUI Training Committee; and the Probation Services Fee Policies and Guidelines Committee. The purpose of these committees is to collaborate with probation and detention personnel in the design and implementation of training events, or to provide expertise and practical application feedback on programs, policies or initiatives. Staff also serve as liaison to the Supreme Court Probation Policy Advisory Board, the purpose of which is 1) To advise the AOIC on policy matters and programming in carrying out the duties and responsibilities of Illinois' probation and court services departments; 2) To provide a formal venue for communication, review, analysis and exchange of information; and 3) To identify opportunities, resources and strategies to advance probation's mission convened six meetings. Membership is comprised of appointed probation and court services managers representing all five of Illinois' court districts. Members provided advisement on myriad policies including the Probation Compensation Standards, Probation Fees, Annual Plans, Intrastate Standards, Legislation, Probation Reimbursement Allocations Formula, and efforts to establish statewide definition for "recidivism".

Also continued in 2014 were "Desk Side Chats", a telephonic venue to obtain feedback and input on targeted topics. Probation and/or detention personnel (depending upon the topic) are invited to call in and discuss the particular topic. In 2014, Intrastate Standards and the Implications of Public Act 98-1012 were topics discussed via a Desk Side Chat venue. Additionally, staff reviewed 2,519 applications for eligibility for employment/promotion. Of those reviewed, 1,929 were determined as meeting the eligibility requirements for employment or promotion as a probation/detention officer in Illinois.



Supreme Court of Illinois Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts

www.illinoiscourts.gov



M Table

10_110_ 001_0