

COURT DATA and PERFORMANCE MEASURES TASK FORCE FINAL REPORT

2022 Manual on Recordkeeping
and
Time Standards for Illinois Trial Courts
October 6, 2021

Membership of The Court Data and Performance Measures Task Force included Judges, Elected Circuit Clerks, Deputy Circuit Clerks, and Trial Court Administrators, representing the diversity of Illinois courts in volume of filings, court resources and geography.

Task Force Members:

Justice Ann B. Jorgensen Second District, Chair
Circuit Clerk Kathy M. Keefe McHenry, Vice-Chair
Judge Jorge Ortiz, 19th Circuit
TCA Dan Wallis, 22nd Circuit
Chief Judge William Mudge, 3rd Circuit
TCA Tom Jakeway, 17th Circuit
Judge John Gibbons, 17th Circuit
TCA Will Scanlon, McLean County
Janea Bennet, Cook County SAO
Alex Black, Cook County
Circuit Clerk Andrea Chasteen, Will County
Circuit Clerk Kahalah Clay, St. Clair County
Lisa Goodwin, DuPage County Circuit Clerk's Office
TCA Lori Hansen, Champaign County
Judge Brad Paisley, 4th Circuit
Michael Carroll, Circuit Court of Cook County
Peter Coolsen, Circuit Court of Cook County (retired)
TCA Donald O'Brien, Circuit Court of Cook County Law Division
Ashwin Raj, Cook County SAO
Judge Ronda Holliman, 6th Circuit
Judge Brandon Maher, 17th Circuit
Judge Michael Chmiel, 22nd Circuit

We acknowledge the assistance of AOIC Staff Nathan Jensen and Marty Lennon and the tremendous contributions of Jacque Huddleston, Cindy Braden, Amy Patterson, and Stephanie Wells who were responsible for providing training for Circuit Clerks on the application of the 2022 Manual on Recordkeeping (2022 MRK) and assisting with the development of the recommended Time Standards.

The Court Data & Performance Measures Task Force was charged with developing accurate and uniform data collection for every circuit and based on those data points, establishing time standards for all case types. This was a two-year project and we have completed the task. In October 2020, the task force submitted an amended 2022 MRK. This 2021 Final Report includes the final phase of our year one task: the training for the Circuit Clerks on implementing 2022 MRK and our October 2021 submission of recommended Time Standards for all case types in the 2022 MRK.

Year 1 - Manual on Recordkeeping Adoption and Update:

In year one, the Court Data & Performance Measures Task Force rewrote the existing Manual on Recordkeeping to facilitate consistent accurate and uniform data collection in all 102 counties.

On September 29, 2021, the Supreme Court adopted a new Rule 8 and revisions to Supreme Court Rules 281, 552 and 589 as recommended by the Taskforce in coordination with the updates to the MRK, effective January 1, 2022. (Attachment #4)

The amended MRK was adopted by the Supreme Court in late fall of 2020 and is effective 1-1-22, hence it is designated 2022 MRK in this report. The purposes and nuances of the amendments required education and training for implementation. In spring of 2021, AOIC staff developed and presented four virtual training sessions for Circuit Clerks and their staff on the 2022 MRK. They also joined Vice Chair, Circuit Clerk Kathy Keefe to present additional education and training for the Circuit Clerks at their June 2021 meeting in Springfield. The programs were informative and effective teaching tools which addressed the changes in the 2022 MRK.

With this report we submit an amended statistical report form M and N (Attachment #2), which accommodates the nuanced time standards beyond that previously contemplated. These reports are new to the 2022 MRK and present minimal change to previous training.

Year 2 - Time Standards for Illinois Trial Courts:

Our 2021 charge was to review relevant information and existing standards and recommend Time Standards for all case types in the 2022 MRK. For this purpose, Time Standards are defined as the expected lapse of time between the filing of the first pleading (which opens a case) and the filing of the final order on the last remaining issue (which closes a case) excluding any time the case is inactive as defined in the 2022 MRK. However, for reinstated cases, it is the day the pleading is filed that reinstates the case.

As applied, Time Standards represent the time during which the court exercises control over and is accountable for the progress and timely closure of a case. It is the standard for efficient use of court time and resources, cost effective litigation in both private and public sectors and access to a full and fair hearing with procedural due process.

Developing and implementing Time Standards establishes a statewide expectation. It allows each court to compare its actual performance (its actual time to close a case) to a statewide standard (the expected time to close a case). These results allow each court to evaluate its current status compared to a statewide expectation. It is ultimately a tool to assist the court to improve delivery of services to those who use the courts.

Thus, the overarching purpose of implementing Time Standards is to improve court process and provide measurable accountability which demonstrates our performance as a court system and our expenditures of judicial resources, including all court resources and services. This purpose honors our Core Value of Accountability; *Accountability - responsible and answerable for our conduct, performance, and transparent in the use of public resources.*

The Final Report on Time Standards for Illinois Trial Courts is presented in two parts. First, we submit our recommended Time Standards for all case types in the 2022 MRK together with recommended data reports to assemble statewide data for statistical analysis; second, if the Supreme Court adopts statewide Time Standards, we submit some considerations for implementation, together with examples of calculations based on 2022 MRK Statistical Reporting Forms M & N (as amended) and the proposed Time Standards.

1. Recommended Time Standards & Data Points:

Time Standards identify the number of days between the filing of the pleading that opens a case or reinstates a case and the filing of the final order that

closes the case, excluding any time the case is on inactive status; all terms are applied as defined in the 2022 MRK. Thus, the recommended Time Standards (Attachment #1) reflect the *expected* length of time a case should remain open. As submitted, these Time Standards are preliminary. They are based on limited, relevant information. However, the Task Force proposes they are reasonable, attainable and with future adjustment as *prospective data* may inform, maintainable.

By defining a Time Standard, we also necessarily define delay. If a Time Standard represents the length of time a case should remain open, delay is the time beyond that expectation.

Delay itself is *not* inherently a bad thing. It simply identifies a case, or group of cases, which are not closed within the expected time set forth in the Time Standard and signals TCAs, Presiding Judges and Chief Judges to review case histories and case management of that case type, to identify potential cause(s) for delay and to respond. We recognize that there may be many reasons for delay; some causes of delay will be within our control to address and correct, others will not.

For example, if law magistrate cases remain open longer than expected that identifies delay and should trigger a review of the case histories. If the review shows multiple continuances for service, the delay may be with the sheriff's office not achieving timely service. If so, the Court may have no control over the allocation of the Sheriff's personnel to serve summons. On the other hand, if review shows multiple continuance for hearings and trial the cause may be an overcrowded docket or a presiding judge who is also assigned case types which take priority over law magistrate cases, such as child custody. Here the Court may address the cause of delay through reallocation of its own resources and personnel. The point is - identification of delay prompts an inquiry, identifies the cause of delay, which in turn informs the response.

Not only will this review identify delay and appropriate responses by the court, but it will also identify measurable bases to support requests for additional resources.

With this in mind, we began.

The Task Force was divided into three groups - domestic relations & juvenile, criminal, and civil. Under the direction of co-chairs, Judge Jorge Ortiz and TCA Dan Wallis (domestic relations & juvenile), Judge John Gibbons and TCA Will Scanlon (criminal), Chief Judge William Mudge and TCA Tom Jakeway (civil) the individual groups met virtually to discuss and draft initial Time Standards. Collectively, the groups considered information from the National Center for

State Courts, American Bar Association Standards, data from individual states and the few existing time standards in Illinois circuits: all of which was reviewed by members with years of institutional knowledge and experience in Illinois courts. Each small group reached consensus on optimum time standards for their case types. In this process, each group also raised concerns on how these time standards would be used and implemented in all circuits.

The work product and concerns of the individual groups were circulated, discussed, fully vetted, and ultimately adopted by the full Task Force. Our final recommendations are the product of the collective research, debate and wisdom of the Task Force members. They include our recommended Time Standards and our considerations for their use and implementation should the Supreme Court adopt them.

The recommended Time Standards memorialize what we all intuitively know; simpler cases consume less judicial resources and take less time to close, while complex cases demand more attention. Thus, we recommend the shortest time for Traffic (TR), Quasi-Criminal (QC), Conservation (CV), and Ordinance Violations (OV), short Time Standards for cases such as Small Claims (SC), Evictions (EV), Misdemeanor (CM) and Domestic Violence (DV), longer Time Standards for intermediate cases such as Arbitration (AR), Law Magistrate (LM), Major Traffic (MT) and the longest Time Standards for the most complex cases, including Criminal Felony (CF), Law (LA), and Chancery (CH).

The recommended Time Standards recognize that all cases within a case type are not alike and proceed at different paces. However, *on average*, 75% of any case type is expected to be closed within the first mark of the Time Standard, and another 15%, or a total of 90%, at the interim mark and the final 98% is expected to be closed at the longest mark. By including only 98% rather than 100% the Time Standards inherently acknowledge that there will always be outlier cases which are the exceptions.

The task force adopted interim benchmarks at 75%, 90% and a final benchmark at 98% to give the court the optimum tools. The interim benchmarks give the court early indications of compliance or signal a need for a closer look. If a case type is meeting the 75% mark, the trend is likely to continue, and the 90% and 98% mark also will be met. Alternatively, if delay is noted at the 75% mark it would be prudent to identify the cause of the projected delay sooner rather than later. This early mark is an opportunity to anticipate issues, identify trends and respond early, rather than react to crisis. Achieving this was one of the cardinal goals of the original Illinois Judicial Conference strategic plan.

We recommend that cases which are open for the shortest time such as Traffic (TR), Conservation (CV), Quasi-criminal (QC), and Ordinance Violations (OV) and summary civil cases including Contempt of Court (CC), Civil Law (CL), Guardianship (GR) and Small Claims (SC) be reported only at a 75% and 98% mark. Order of Protection (OP) cases have only one benchmark of 98% identified due to the assumption that the majority of Order of Protection cases are initiated by a petition for an emergency order and the case is closed upon entry of the first order in the case. If the first order is for an emergency order of protection, any further interim or plenary proceedings are post-judgment. Using fewer benchmarks eliminates additional effort and is sufficient to achieve our goals for cases expected to be closed within one year.

Still, the accuracy, thus the value of these benchmarks is dependent on regular, frequent, and accurate reports with uniform data from the Circuit Clerk. It is these consistent reports that allow the court to monitor timely compliance with the time standards. Collectively, the Task Force prioritized optimum data and balanced its desired data reports against the ability (time and cost) of the Circuit Clerk to produce them on a regular and frequent basis.

The data reports requested are consistent with statistical reports M and N in the 2022 MRK (as amended with this report). However, going forward, we recommend that the age of cases be given in days rather than years. Virtually all circuits are able to count age in days (although we note that DuPage and Will counties are not currently able to do so.) Age of a case in days is the most accurate accounting. The calculated age of cases filed 1-1-22 and 1-31-22 would be the same in months; each one month on 1-31-22. The same cases counted in days show one is 30 days old the other is one day old. While this may be less significant in Time Standards covering the longest periods, it is much more relevant in monitoring shorter Time Standards.

We also strongly recommend quarterly rather than semi-annual reporting of case data. They are optimum because quarterly reports give the court the most current data to monitor timely compliance with Time Standards and are consistent with the purpose of identifying delay at the earliest point and where within our control, *addressing it promptly*. Quarterly review also allows the court to monitor its progress in addressing previously identified delay and observe whether its prior response to identified delay is working. As noted above, one of the original reasons for seeking accurate data was to allow the court to anticipate trends rather than react to crisis. Data submissions every 90 days enhance our ability to anticipate trends such as a spike in filings or drop in case closure that with timely warning may be corrected at the earliest point. Additionally, enhanced differential in case types in 2022 MRK has

allowed us to recommend more nuanced time standards in increments less than 6 months.

2. Implementation of Mandatory Statewide Time Standards: Our Considerations.

Implementation of statewide Time Standard ushers in a new day in data collection and accountability, and with that comes apprehension. We appreciate the enormity of implementing statewide Time Standards particularly given the diversity of this state in terms of population, infrastructure, case management systems, local funding, judicial personnel, and judicial workloads.

If the Supreme Court approves the recommended Time Standards and elects to implement them, we submit the following considerations for their implementation and future use. We recognize some of these considerations are within in the Court's direct control to address, some the court may only indirectly influence, and some are simply beyond the reach of the Court.

REVIEW OF TIME STANDARDS:

We *strongly recommend* that any adopted and implemented Time Standards be subject to review on a regular basis and adjusted as new data may dictate.

We have recommended nuanced time standards for Juvenile cases (JA) and (JD) in-detention and not in detention, and differentiated felony class classification. These are aspirational at this time. We note the statutory time frames for juvenile cases are difficult to capture and report at this time. If and when these become amenable to accurate and meaningful reporting, we would recommend they be included in statistical reporting forms M and N. The same is true of the differentiated CF cases. While some circuits can differentiate classes of felony cases (CF) now, we note that the filing of additional and upgraded charges would skew compliance with time standards. Again, if the collection of differentiated felony classes becomes amenable to accurate and meaningful reporting, we would recommend that they be included in statistical reporting forms M and N. Thus, we submit a time standard for the longest time standards be applied to all CF case types. We also included recommended Time Standards for activities pre and post-term for (JA), (DC), (DN) and (GR) cases.

PUBLIC PROMOTION BY THE COURT:

A public imprimatur from the Court will be invaluable on multiple levels. The imposition of these Time Standards will initiate a critical review of court operations. This will be a significant undertaking requiring an expanded level of time and resource management, particularly in year two and thereafter. The value of a public acknowledgment that those efforts are appreciated by the

Court cannot be overstated.

We note that statewide Time Standards and the related data collected is not truly statewide without participation from all 102 counties. Thus, if the Court implements the recommended Time Standards, we recommend that the implementation be mandatory. Further, every circuit must be expected to participate in good faith, undergo the same rigors, and be held to the same obligation to report consistent, uniform and accurate data in accord with the 2022 MRK.

ADHERENCE TO THE 2022 MRK:

Strict adherence to the 2022 MRK is the key to uniform and consistently accurate statewide court data. The most critical nuance is strict compliance to the event that opens a case and the event that closes a case. Aside from those definitions in the 2022 MRK, there are no other bases upon which to consider a case open, closed, reinstated, or inactive; nor are there any other terms in the 2022 MRK to indicate the status of a case as closed. Without strict compliance with these defined terms in the 2022 MRK, the goal of *uniform* statewide data is lost, and time standards will lose statewide value.

PROSPECTIVE APPLICATION:

As noted above, the recommended Time Standards are preliminary, based on existing information and the collective experience of the Task Force members. The task force unanimously recommends that the Time Standards be implemented, and related data collection be *prospective only*, beginning 1-1-22, the effective date of the 2022 MRK. The 2022 MRK mandates new case types, imposes strict case status criteria for open, inactive, reinstated and closed cases, and most importantly requires that all circuits henceforth collect and submit data in conformity with the 2022 MRK.

Past data is *not* uniform. A retrospective analysis of existing data in an attempt to fit old case types into new designations would require significant manpower and resources. Further, using existing disparate methods of data collection, would inevitably produce distorted results. While the lack of any retrospective analysis eliminates consideration of pre 1-1-22 performance, the inclusion of grossly inconsistent data collection would affect the integrity of any data results, and in turn skew reliance on such past performance to predict realistic Time Standards going forward.

On the other hand, a fresh start prospective approach based on new data from cases filed after 1-1-22, would produce a body of data untainted by past variable data collection. New, uniform data consistent with the 2022 MRK and collected under its mandates would be a far more reliable foundation upon which to begin and to base future decisions including any adjustments to Time Standards.

To accomplish this, we recommend that the circuit clerks continue to use the existing statistical reporting forms for all cases, including cases filed before 1-1-22 and cases filed after 1-1-22. In other words, the forms in use prior to 12-31-21 would continue to be used for reporting all cases filed prior to 12-31-21 and all cases filed after 1-1-22. *The change is that in addition each circuit clerk would also complete the new statistical reporting forms M and N for cases filed after 1-1-22 ONLY.* Thus, statistical reporting forms M and N would only include data for post 1-1-22 case filings. This is because after 1-1-22 the court will evaluate time standards *only* for post 1-1-22 cases. Statistical reporting forms M and N give the court the raw data to evaluate its measure for 75%, 90% and 98% case closure, for post 1-1-22 cases only.

Just as the collection of data must be uniform, the manner in which the time standard calculations are completed must also be uniform. General examples for those calculations are attached and incorporated into this report as Attachment #3.

REGULAR DATA AUDIT:

Auditing existing data is beneficial to future analysis. In accord with our recommendation of prospective application of times standards and data collection, after 1-1-22, we suggest that all courts conduct at least an annual audit of existing case data with focus on cases which have exceeded the recommended time standard.

Although analysis of pre 1-1-22 data would be of limited value in informing future decisions, there are benefits to cleaning existing data. While Circuit Clerks have kept good data, their records and data are based on filed orders. We anticipate that there are existing cases which for all practical purposes are closed, but statistically remain open because a count remains open or because an open case was taken off call with no future date. Identifying and correcting the status of such cases would give individual circuits a more accurate snapshot of existing caseloads on 12-31-21. Recognizing the resources needed, we recommend an audit of existing open cases as of 12-31-21. An audit would include review of open cases in each case type (case types based on the former MRK) that are older than the recommended Time Standard. For example, an audit of all L or CH cases would focus on cases open beyond 36 months, the proposed time standard for closure of 98% of LA (formerly L cases) and CH cases. An audit of current D cases which included all divorce cases would focus on cases open beyond 18 months, the proposed time standard for closure of 98% of DC (former D cases.)

At the end of 2021, the number of pre 12-31-21 cases will be finite, and we anticipate that virtually all of those cases will be closed within three to four years.

DATA ENTRY ISSUES:

There are significant changes in the 2022 MRK and there will be a learning curve on compliance with data input under the new requirements. While this may result in initial erroneous data entry, we are confident in the excellent training provided to the Circuit Clerks by AOIC staff, Cindy Braden, Amy Patterson, Stephanie Wells and Jacque Huddleston and believe any issues will be short-lived.

CONCLUSION & ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

The recommended Time Standards and thoughtful considerations for their use and implementation are based on the collective work experience and wisdom of the Task Force members. If adopted they will reflect the expectation of the Supreme Court that within these given time frames cases should be closed. If implemented, they are an extraordinary change in the oversight and management of the Illinois Trial Courts that will ultimately benefit all. On behalf of the Task Force, we appreciate the opportunity to have participated.

The members of this Task Force and our AIOC staff, accomplished an enormous task in an abbreviated year. This report is a compilation of every member's participation and is completed because of their extraordinary diligence. This group represents some of the finest judges, administrators, and clerks in the state. They brought their knowledge, skill and experience to the table and rose to the occasion. They and AOIC staff are to be commended for great work — and for completing what I and Kathy Keefe believe is an outstanding final product.

Respectfully submitted,

Justice Ann B. Jorgensen

Justice Ann B. Jorgensen

Kathy Keefe

Circuit Clerk Kathy Keefe

Attachment #1:**Proposed Time Standards – All Case Types**

Dated: 9/23/21

Family/Juvenile Categories

<u>Case Type/Category</u>	<u>% Complete</u>	<u>Time in Months to Completion</u>	<u>Time in Days to Completion</u>	<u>Notes</u>
DC	75%	9 Months	274 Days	Date of Filing to Final Order/Judgment (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
	90%	15 Months	457 Days	
	98%	18 Months	548 Days	
DN	75%	9 Months	274 Days	Date of Filing to Final Order/Judgment (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
	90%	12 Months	365 Days	
	98%	15 Months	457 Days	
FA	75%	9 Months	274 Days	Custody & Paternity; Date of Filing to Final Order/Judgment (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
	90%	15 Months	457 Days	
	98%	18 Months	548 Days	
DC*	98%	9 Months	274 Days	Post Judgment (litigation in closed case)
DN*	98%	6 Months	183 Days	
FA*	98%	9 Months	274 Days	
JD	90%	3 Months	91 Days	Date of Filing to Disposition (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
	98%	6 Months	183 Days	
JA	75%	6 Months	183 Days	Date of Filing of the TPR or Final Order/Judgment (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
	90%	15 Months	457 Days	
	98%	24 Months	731 Days	
JV	75%	9 Months	274 Days	Date of Filing to Final Order/Judgment (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
	90%	15 Months	457 Days	
	98%	18 Months	548 Days	
AD	75%	9 Months	274 Days	Date of Filing to Final Order/Judgment (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
	90%	15 Months	457 Days	
	98%	18 Months	548 Days	

*Post-judgment Time Standards

Attachment #1:

Criminal/Quasi Criminal Categories

<u>Case Type/Category</u>	<u>% Complete</u>	<u>Time in Months to Completion</u>	<u>Time in Days to Completion</u>	<u>Notes</u>
CF	75%	18 Months	548 Days	Date of Filing to Sentencing/Dismissal (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
	90%	24 Months	731 Days	
	98%	30 Months	913 Days	
CM DV	75%	6 Months	183 Days	Date of Filing to Sentencing/Dismissal (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
	90%	9 Months	274 Days	
	98%	12 Months	365 Days	
DT MT	75%	9 Months	274 Days	Date of Filing to Sentencing/Dismissal (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
	90%	12 Months	365 Days	
	98%	15 Months	457 Days	
TR OV QC CV	75%	3 Months	91 Days	Date of Filing to Sentencing/Dismissal (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
	98%	6 Months	183 Days	

Attachment #1:

Civil Case Categories

<u>Case Type/Category</u>	<u>% Complete</u>	<u>Time in Months to Completion</u>	<u>Time in Days to Completion</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Complex: ED FC LA CH PR	75%	18 Months	548 Days	Date of Filing to Final Order/Judgment (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
	90%	24 Months	731 Days	
	98%	36 Months	1096 Days	
General: AR GC LM MR	75%	12 Months	365 Days	Date of Filing to Final Order/Judgment (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
	90%	18 Months	548 Days	
	98%	24 Months	731 Days	
Summary: EV MH SC TX	75%	6 Months	183 Days	Date of Filing to Final Order/Judgment (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
	98%	12 Months	365 Days	
GR	75%	6 Months	183 Days	Date of Filing to Appointment of Guardian
	98%	12 Months	365 Days	

Attachment #1:

Other Case Categories

<u>Case Type/Category</u>	<u>% Complete</u>	<u>Time in Months to Completion</u>	<u>Time in Days to Completion</u>	<u>Notes</u>
CC	75%	6 Months	183 Days	Date of Filing to Final Order/Judgment (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
	98%	12 Months	365 Days	
OP*	98%	3 Months	91 Days	Date of Filing to Order/Judgment (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
CL	75%	3 Months	91 Days	Date of Filing to Final Order/Judgment (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
	98%	6 Months	183 Days	
MX	75%	9 Months	274 Days	Date of Filing to Final Order/Judgment (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
	90%	12 Months	365 Days	
	98%	15 Months	457 Days	

*There is an assumption the majority of Order of Protection cases are initiated by a petition for an emergency order. The case is closed upon entry of the first order in the case. If the first order is for an emergency order of protection, any further interim or plenary proceedings are post-judgment.

Attachment #1:

Proposed Aspirational Time Standards

Dated: 9/23/21

Additional Recommended Time Standards

<u>Case Type/Category</u>	<u>% Complete</u>	<u>Time in Months to Completion</u>	<u>Time in Days to Completion</u>	<u>Notes</u>
JD - in detention*	75%	1 Month	30 Days	Date of Filing to Disposition (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
	90%	1.5 Months	45 Days	
	98%	3 Months	91 Days	
JD - not in detention	75%	2 Months	61 Days	Date of Filing to Disposition (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
	90%	3 Months	91 Days	
	98%	6 Months	183 Days	
JA	98%	4 Months	122 Days	Date of Filing to Adjudicatory Hearing (statutory is 90 days from date of service)
JA	98%	5 Months	152 Days	Date of Filing to Ruling & Disposition
JA	75%	6 Months	183 Days	Date of Filing to Permanency Hearing; Time to Completion is from Date of Removal
	90%	11 Months	335 Days	
	98%	12 Months	365 Days	
CF (Class 1 and 2)	75%	15 Months	457 Days	Date of Filing to Sentencing/Dismissal (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
	90%	18 Months	548 Days	
	98%	27 Months	822 Days	
CF (Class 3 and 4)	75%	12 Months	365 Days	Date of Filing to Sentencing/Dismissal (Case Closed per 1/1/22 RKM)
	90%	15 Months	457 Days	
	98%	21 Months	639 Days	
GR	100%	12-36 Months	365-1096 Days	Required Periodic Case Review for estates every 1-3 years under 755 ILCS 5/24-11 and otherwise under 755 ILCS 5/11a-17(b)

These additional recommended time standards are aspirational and may be used as guidelines to ensure case closure timeframes are following the time recommended for the specified statutory or other time requirements.

*In Detention means the youth is in detention on the date of ruling and disposition.

Attachment #1:

Case Category Descriptions

Family & Juvenile:

<u>Category Code</u>	<u>Category Title</u>	<u>Category Description</u>
DC	Dissolution with Children	Dissolution of marriage or civil union, declaration of invalidity (annulment), petitions for legal separation, or separate maintenance as defined in 750 ILCS 5/303 when at the time of filing there are minor children
DN	Dissolution without Children	Dissolution of marriage or civil union, declaration of invalidity (annulment), petition for legal separation, or separate maintenance as defined in 750 ILCS 5/303 when at the time of filing there are no minor children
JD	Juvenile Delinquent	Addicted minors as defined by the Substance Use Disorder Act (20 ILCS 301/1-1 et seq.) in the Juvenile Court Act of 1987 (705 ILCS 405/4-1 et seq.) or delinquent minors as defined by the Juvenile Court Act of 1987 (705 ILCS 405/5-101 et seq.)
JA	Juvenile Abuse & Neglect	Dependent, neglected or abused minor as defined by 705 ILCS 405/2-1, et seq. of the Juvenile Court Act of 1987
JV	Juvenile	Minors requiring authoritative intervention as defined by 705 ILCS 405/3-1 et seq. of the Juvenile Court Act of 1987 or to any other proceedings initiated under 705 ILCS 405/1-1 et seq. of the Juvenile Court Act of 1987
FA	Family	Proceedings to establish the parent-child relationship, notice to putative fathers, and certain actions relating to child support
AD	Adoption	Cases filed pursuant to 750 ILCS 50/0.01 et seq

Criminal & Quasi-Criminal:

<u>Category Code</u>	<u>Category Title</u>	<u>Category Description</u>
CF	Criminal Felony	Complaint, information or indictment is filed in which at least one count charges a felony as defined in the Unified Code of Corrections (730 ILCS 5/5-1 et seq.) (Class M, X, 1, 2, 3, or 4)
CM	Criminal Misdemeanor	most serious charge carries a penalty of less than one-year imprisonment, limited to Class A, B or C offenses as defined in the Unified Code of Corrections (730 ILCS 5/5-1 et seq.)
DV	Domestic Violence	Violation of domestic battery under Section 12-3.2 of the Criminal Code (720 ILCS 5/12-3.2).
DT	Driving Under the Influence (DUI)	charging a violation of a statute, ordinance, or regulation governing driving or operating under the influence of alcohol, other drug, or combination thereof under Section 11-501 of the Illinois Vehicle Code (625 ILCS 5/11-501), Section 5-7 of the Snowmobile Registration and Safety Act (625 ILCS 40/5-7), and Section 5-16 of the Boat Registration and Safety Act (625 ILCS 45/5-16) and not classified as a felony
MT	Major Traffic	Class A, B, or C as defined by Supreme Court Rule 501(f)(1)(i), except DUI cases.
TR	Minor Traffic	Class P or B as defined by Supreme Court Rule 501(f)(1)(ii)
OV	Ordinance Violation	violation of a local ordinance is charged, other than a traffic ordinance
QC	Quasi-Criminal	Any offense classified as Petty or Business as defined in the Unified Code of Corrections (730 ILCS 5/5-1 et seq.), which is not otherwise defined as a DT, MT, TR, or CV case
CV	Conservation	As defined by Supreme Court Rule 501(c)

Attachment #1:

Civil:

<u>Category Code</u>	<u>Category Title</u>	<u>Category Description</u>
ED	Eminent Domain	Proceedings involving compensation to an owner for property taken for public use
FC	Foreclosure	Residential or commercial foreclosure proceedings
LA	Law	Tort, contract, and a variety of other actions in which the damages sought are greater than \$50,000
CH	Chancery	Complaints for equitable relief in matters such as contract actions, trusts, and title to real property
PR	Probate	Estates of decedents and missing persons
AR	Arbitration	Arbitration-eligible cases are defined by Supreme Court Rules 86 - 95
GC	Governmental Corporation	Petition seeking consideration by the court on new matters not included in the permanent case containing such matters as organization, appointment of officers, approval of bonds, and routine orders confirming annexation
LM	Law Magistrate	Tort, contract, and a variety of other actions in which the damages sought are \$50,000 or less
MR	Miscellaneous Remedy	Review of administrative decisions (other than of a tax commission) and a variety of other actions that include change of name, demolition, and corporation dissolution
EV	Eviction	Commercial or residential eviction proceedings and for any proceeding for ejection
MH	Mental Health	Proceedings involving hospitalization, discharge, or restoration to legal status
SC	Small Claims	Tort or contract for money not in excess of \$10,000, exclusive of interest and costs (defined in Supreme Court Rule 281)
TX	Tax	Annual tax sale, petitions for tax deed, objections, and a variety of other actions relating to the collection of taxes
GR	Guardianship	Guardianship of a minor, person with a disability, or an estate of any person under the Probate Act of 1975, as amended

Other:

<u>Category Code</u>	<u>Category Title</u>	<u>Category Description</u>
CC	Contempt of Court	Direct or indirect contempt of court, for charges initiated against a person who is not a party to the action in which the contemptuous conduct allegedly occurred, including a juror who has been impaneled
OP	Order of Protection	Any petition for an order of protection, petition for stalking no contact order, firearms restraining order, or civil no contact order
CL	Civil Law	Civil law violations as defined in Supreme Court Rule 585
MX	Miscellaneous Criminal	Variety of actions for civil processes relating to criminal proceedings such as search warrants, grand jury proceedings, statutory summary suspensions (when no DT case exists), probationer transfers, eavesdropping, seized property, sealing and expungement petitions (when no criminal case exists), habeas corpus and administrative subpoenas

Attachment #2:

PART 2

SECTION M

**ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR REPORT M
TIME TO CASE CLOSED STATUS
(include time spent on inactive status)**

Record the number of cases closed in each case category reported in Reports A, B, C or D as appropriate in the # Closed column during the reporting period. This report is limited to the cases filed as of 1/1/2022 and after.

For each case closed, report the amount of time in months from the date of filing to date closed in the appropriate column, including any time a case was on inactive status using the Time in Months/Days to Completion Table below.

The totals recorded in each category for months to date closed should equal the # Closed column.

Case categories L, P, F, D, and J are excluded from this report as they have been eliminated.

Time in Months/Days to Completion

Months	End Day	Months	End Day	Months	End Day
1	30	13	396	27	822
2	61	14	426	30	913
3	91	15	457	36	1096
4	122	16	487	48	1461
5	152	17	517		
6	183	18	548		
7	213	19	578		
8	244	20	609		
9	274	21	639		
10	304	22	670		
11	335	23	700		
12	365	24	731		

Based off of 365days/yr (30.4375/month)

PART 2

SECTION N

**ADDITIONAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR REPORT N
TIME TO CASE CLOSED STATUS
(excluding time spent on inactive status)**

Record the number of cases closed in each case category reported in Reports A, B, C, or D as appropriate in the # Closed column during the reporting period. This report is limited to the cases filed as of 1/1/2022 and after.

For each case closed, report the amount of time in months from the date of filing to date closed in the appropriate column, subtracting any time a case was on inactive status using the Time in Months/Days to Completion Table below.

The totals recorded in each category for months to date closed should equal the # Closed column.

Case categories L, P, F, D, and J are excluded from this report as they have been eliminated.

Time in Months/Days to Completion

Months	End Day	Months	End Day	Months	End Day
1	30	13	396	27	822
2	61	14	426	30	913
3	91	15	457	36	1096
4	122	16	487	48	1461
5	152	17	517		
6	183	18	548		
7	213	19	578		
8	244	20	609		
9	274	21	639		
10	304	22	670		
11	335	23	700		
12	365	24	731		

Based off of 365days/yr (30.4375/month)

Attachment #3

Calculation of Time Standard:

(Using Reports M & N) Calculations and examples work the same for both reports

CF Cases Time to Case Closed Time Standards

% Complete	<u>Time in Months to Completion</u>
75%	18 Months
90%	24 Months
98%	30 Months

Example 1: (See Sample Report N attached):

197 CF cases closed within quarter 3rd quarter (2025)

Add number of cases closed within the columns to the appropriate benchmark listed above

102 cases closed in 18 months

146 cases closed in 24 months

175 cases closed in 30 months

Calculate percentage:

How to calculate percentage of a number. Use the percentage formula: $P\% = Y/X * 100$

Solving for what percentage(P%) is 102 of 197?

$$102/197 = 0.52$$

Convert decimal

$0.52 \times 100 = 52\%$ (Analysis: 52% of the case closed within the 3rd quarter met the 18-month benchmark.)

$$146/197 = .74$$

$.74 \times 100 = 74\%$ (Analysis: 74% of the cases closed met the 24-month benchmark.)

$$175/197 = .89$$

$.89 \times 100 = 89\%$ (Answer: 89% of the cases closed met the 30-month benchmark.)

Conclusion: The Court is not meeting or exceeding established time standards.

Attachment #3

Calculation of Time Standard:

(Using Reports M & N) Calculations and examples work the same for both reports

LA Cases Time to Case Closed Time Standards

% Complete	Time in Months to Completion
75%	18 Months
90%	24 Months
98%	36 Months

Example 2: (See Sample Report N attached):

188 cases closed within 3rd quarter (2025)

Add number of cases closed within the columns to the appropriate benchmark listed above

107 cases closed in 18 months

170 cases closed in 24 months

183 cases closed in 36 months

Calculate percentage:

How to calculate percentage of a number. Use the percentage formula: $P\% = Y/X * 100$

Solving for what percentage(P%) is 107 of 188?

$$107/188 = 0.57$$

Convert decimal

$$0.57 \times 100 = 57\% \text{ (Analysis: 57\% of the case closed within the 2 quarter met the 18-month benchmark.)}$$

$$146/188 = .78$$

$$.78 \times 100 = 78\% \text{ (Analysis: 78\% of the cases closed met the 24-month benchmark.)}$$

$$183/188 = .97$$

$$.97 \times 100 = 97\% \text{ (Analysis: 97\% of the cases closed met the 30-month benchmark.)}$$

Conclusion: The Court is not meeting established time standards

Attachment #3

Calculation of Time Standard:

(Using Reports M & N) Calculations and examples work the same for both reports

DN Cases Time to Case Closed Time Standards

75%	9 Months
90%	12 Months
98%	15 Months

Example 3: (See Sample Report N attached):

199 cases closed within 3rd quarter (2025)

Add number of cases closed within the columns to the appropriate benchmark listed above

185 cases closed in 9 months

196 cases closed in 12 months

197 cases closed in 15 months

Calculate percentage:

How to calculate percentage of a number. Use the percentage formula: $P\% = Y/X * 100$

Solving for what percentage(P%) is 185 of 199?

$$185/199 = 0.93$$

Convert decimal

$0.93 \times 100 = 93\%$ (Analysis: 93% of the case closed within the 2nd quarter met the 9-month benchmark.)

$$196/199 = .98$$

$.98 \times 100 = 98\%$ (Analysis: 98% of the cases closed met the 12-month benchmark.)

$$197/199 = .99$$

$.99 \times 100 = 99\%$ (Analysis: 99% of the cases closed met the 15-month benchmark.)

Conclusion: The Court exceeding established time standards

QUARTER:3rd YEAR: 2025 COUNTY: McHenry CIRCUIT: 22nd	REPORT N TIME TO CASE CLOSED STATUS (excluding time spent on inactive status)
---	--

CIVIL CASES																
CATEGORY	CODE	# CLOSED	0-3 months	4-6 months	7-9 months	10-12 months	13-15 months	16-18 months	19-21 months	22-24 months	25-27 months	28-30 months	31-33 months	34-36 months	37-48 months	49+ months
ARBITRATION	AR	115	14	23	36	14	11	8	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
CHANCERY	CH	117	8	14	11	14	21	12	15	8	7	3	2	1	1	0
EMINENT DOMAIN	ED	27	4	6	1	2	6	3	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
EVICTIION	EV	201	63	46	53	32	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FORECLOSURE	FC	215	32	17	46	53	13	21	9	13	8	2	1	0	0	0
GOVERNMENT CORPORTATION	GC	19	4	2	6	3	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
GUARDIANSHIP	GR	71	23	13	14	16	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
LAW > \$50,000	LA	188	6	3	17	28	19	34	26	37	7	3	1	2	4	1
LAW < \$50,000	LM	231	12	19	28	56	19	21	27	34	11	3	1	0	0	0
MENTAL HEALTH	MH	22	4	3	8	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MISCELLANEOUS REMEDY	MR	43	5	11	3	7	5	2	6	2	0	0	2	0	0	0
PROBATE	PR	171	17	16	13	26	31	12	14	11	8	9	6	3	4	1
SMALL CLAIM	SC	576	237	280	42	11	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
TAX	TX	58	11	12	17	14	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL		2054	440	465	295	280	141	121	106	112	43	21	13	6	9	2

CRIMINAL AND QUASI-CRIMINAL CASES																
CATEGORY	CODE	# CLOSED	0-3 months	4-6 months	7-9 months	10-12 months	13-15 months	16-18 months	19-21 months	22-24 months	25-27 months	28-30 months	31-33 months	34-36 months	37-48 months	49+ months
CRIMINAL FELONY	CF	197	16	12	34	12	11	17	12	32	16	13	10	8	3	1
CRIMINAL MISDEMEANOR	CM	388	68	110	92	56	33	12	11	3	2	1	0	0	0	0
CONSERVATION VIOLATION	CV	157	56	63	23	11	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	DV	187	13	28	56	65	14	7	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE	DT	263	15	63	56	42	62	11	9	3	1	0	1	0	0	0
MAJOR TRAFFIC	MT	300	63	57	78	48	32	11	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
MINOR TRAFFIC	TR	950	396	497	43	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ORDINANCE VIOLATION	OV	93	29	48	13	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
QUASI-CRIMINAL	QC	41	13	19	6	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL		2576	669	897	401	250	158	60	43	41	20	14	11	8	3	1

M.R. 3140

**IN THE
SUPREME COURT
OF
THE STATE OF ILLINOIS**

Order entered September 29, 2021.

(Deleted material is struck through, and new material is underscored.)

Effective January 1, 2022, Illinois Supreme Court Rules 281, 552, and 589 are amended, and new Rule 8 is adopted, as follows.

Amended Rule 281

Rule 281. Definition of Small Claim

For the purpose of the application of Rules 281 through 288, a small claim is a civil action based on either tort or contract for money not in excess of \$10,000, exclusive of interest and costs, or for the collection of taxes not in excess of that amount.

The order entered December 6, 2005, amending Rule 281 and effective January 1, 2006, shall apply only to cases filed after such effective date.

Amended effective December 15, 1966; amended May 27, 1969, effective July 1, 1969; amended January 5, 1981, effective February 1, 1981; amended December 3, 1996, effective January 1, 1997; amended December 6, 2005, effective January 1, 2006; amended Sept. 29, 2021, eff. Jan. 1, 2022.

Committee Comments

(Revised December 6, 2005 January 1, 2022)

This rule was based on paragraph A of former Rule 9-1 which was in effect from January 1, 1964, to January 1, 1967. The only changes of substance made by the 1967 revision were increasing the upper limit of a small claim from \$200 to \$500, including tax-collection cases in the definition, and adding the phrase "based on either tort or contract." The limit was further increased to \$1,000 by the 1969 amendment, and to \$2,500 by amendment in 1981.

Rule 281 was amended in 2005 to increase the jurisdictional limit from \$5,000 to \$10,000. As the change will require a modification to the allocation of judicial resources, the change was made applicable only to new cases and does not apply to pending cases.

Rule 281 was amended effective January 1, 2022, to remove tax collection cases up to \$10,000 from being filed as a small claims case.

PILED

SEP 29 2021

**SUPREME COURT
CLERK**

Amended Rule 552

Rule 552. Uniform Tickets-Processing

Uniform Citation and Complaint forms and conservation complaints shall be in forms which may, from time to time, be approved by the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges and filed with this court. The uniform forms shall be adapted for use by municipalities.

The arresting officer shall complete the form or ticket and, within 48 hours after the arrest, shall transmit the portions entitled "Complaint" and, where appropriate, "Disposition Report" and/or "Report of Conviction," either in person, by mail, or electronically where authorized by the Supreme Court, to the clerk of the circuit court of the county in which the violation occurred. Each Uniform Citation and Complaint form and conservation complaint shall upon receipt by the clerk be assigned a separate case number, chronologically, excluding including multiple citations issued to the same accused for more than one offense arising out of the same occurrence (see Rule 503(a)). Each accused shall be assigned a single case number containing multiple counts when more than one citation is issued arising out of the same occurrence. A final disposition shall be evidence of the judgment in the case. Upon final disposition of each case, the clerk shall execute a Disposition Report and promptly forward it to the law enforcement agency that issued the ticket. On a plea or finding of guilty in any traffic case, the clerk shall also execute a Report of Conviction, if and as applicable, and such other reports as required by section 6-204 of the Illinois Vehicle Code, as amended (625 ILCS 5/6-204) and promptly forward same to the Secretary of State. This rule does not prohibit the use of electronic or mechanical systems of record keeping, transmitting or reporting.

Amended effective October 7, 1970; amended February 17, 1977, effective April 1, 1977, in counties other than Cook, effective July 1, 1977, in Cook County; amended December 22, 1981, effective January 15, 1982; amended April 27, 1984, effective July 1, 1984; amended March 27, 1985, effective May 1, 1985; amended June 26, 1987, effective August 1, 1987; amended June 19, 1989, effective August 1, 1989; amended September 30, 2002, effective immediately; amended Dec. 29, 2017, eff. Jan. 1, 2018; amended Sept. 29, 2021, eff. Jan. 1, 2022.

Amended Rule 589

Rule 589. Uniform Civil Law Citations-Processing

Uniform Civil Law Citation forms shall be in a form, which may from time to time be approved by the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges and filed with this court. The uniform form shall be adapted for use by 'municipalities. The law enforcement officer shall complete the form or citation and, within 48 hours after the issuance, shall transmit the portions entitled "Complaint" and "Disposition Report," either in person or by mail, to the clerk of the circuit court of the county in which the violation occurred. Each Uniform Civil Law Citation form shall, upon receipt by the clerk, be assigned a separate case number, numbered chronologically, excluding including multiple citations issued to the same accused for more than one violation arising out of the same occurrence. Each accused shall be assigned a single case number containing multiple counts when more than one citation is issued arising out of the same occurrence. A final disposition noted on

the reverse side of the "Complaint" shall be evidence of the judgment in the case. Upon final disposition of each case, the clerk shall execute the "Disposition Report" and promptly forward it to the law enforcement agency that issued the citation. This rule does not prohibit the use of electronic or mechanical systems of record keeping, transmitting, or reporting.

Adopted Sept. 1, 2016, eff. immediately; amended Sept. 29, 2021, eff. Jan. 1, 2022.

New Rule 8

Rule 8. Case and Document Accessibility

(a) All cases and documents are presumed to be accessible by the court and the clerk. Clerks shall limit access to case information and documents that are not identified as public to the clerk and/or limited supervisory staff through the use of access codes restricting access. Access to court records and documents remotely over the Internet shall be as authorized by the Illinois Supreme Court Remote Access Policy.

(b) Unless otherwise specified by Rule, statute or order of court, access to case information and documents maintained by the clerk are defined as follows:

(1) "Public" means a document or case that is accessible by any person upon request.

(2) "Impounded" means a document or case that is accessible only to the parties of record on a case; otherwise, the document or case is only accessible upon order of court.

(3) "Confidential" means a document or case that is accessible only to the party submitting the document or filing the case; otherwise, the document or case is only accessible upon order of court.

(4) "Sealed" means a document or case that is accessible only upon order of court.

(5) "Expunged" means a document or case that is accessible only upon order of court as provided in section 5.2(E) of the Criminal Identification Act (20 ILCS 2630/5.2(E)).

(c) Notwithstanding the above, the court may enter an order restricting access to any case or document per order of court.

Adopted Sept. 29, 2021, eff. Jan. 1, 2022.