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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In November 2010, the Kane County IT Technology Task Force Committee selected URL Integration to conduct a comprehensive assessment to facilitate, review, analyze, and recommend potential guidelines, standards, and a course of action for the future state of Kane County’s case management system (CMS).  

Shortly after, URL began to conduct a series of assessment sessions with agency representatives from the Circuit Clerk’s Office, Judiciary, Court Services, Sheriff’s Office, State’s Attorney’s Office, Public Defender’s Office, and the County Information Technology Department. As a result of URL’s initial findings, it was determined that a more in-depth assessment of the justice environment – agency workflow, information flow between agencies, and technical infrastructure – was required in order to determine the core issues related to the CMS.

In April 2011, URL conducted a series of four Information Exchange Meetings with all agency representatives to identify the wide range of information, including law enforcement-related workflow, incident to filing court processes, court pre-disposition processes, and post-disposition court and supervision processes.

The following is a high-level overview of URL’s key findings and recommendations:

1. **Procurement of a new Circuit Clerk CMS to service the Courts:**
   a. The Circuit Clerk’s current CMS (JANO) has the ability to store data in order to support the normal day-to-day business process of recording and managing court cases; however, it has significant shortcomings in terms of data validation, organization, access, reporting capabilities, and courtroom management. The recommendation is to procure a new CMS in order to meet and expand on current and future court business requirements.
   b. The current CMS vendor, JANO Systems’ business has fragmented and no longer supports the system or ongoing maintenance and updates to the CMS source code in Kane County, which is not an ideal situation. This has undermined the viability of the CMS and has potential adverse effects to the quality of data and information sharing. The recommendation is for the new CMS to come from an established vendor who meets essential court CMS functions and interoperability standards in order to ensure long-term viability.
   c. Currently, there are insufficient levels of usage, collaboration, and cooperation between the Clerk’s CMS and the Courts. This practice has allowed a paper-driven and redundant

---

1 It should be stated that the civil and family case types, as well as related functions, were considered outside the scope of this project and therefore not examined.
Kane County Case Management System (CMS) Assessment Project

data entry process to continue in the judicial environment. This is a significant productivity issue, since about 75% of the information exchanges that occur within the criminal justice process involve the court sending or receiving information. That being said, judges’ support of real-time entry in the courtroom is critical to real-time information exchange with other agencies. Therefore, the recommendation is to procure a new Clerk’s CMS to include facilitation of interface requirements and system training/proper usage efforts.

2. Procurement of new case management system (CMS) for partnering agencies:
   a. Court Services (pre-trial, probation, Kane County Diagnostic Center, and juvenile CMS): Currently the individual Court Services units have the responsibility to evaluate, monitor, and supervise defendants; however, there is no automated process or system in place to gather, collect, and share this data. Information sharing with other agencies is a handwritten, paper-driven process that takes a tremendous amount of resources to maintain and manage. There is an open RFP to procure a new system, but there are no defined standards, requirements, or features. The recommendation is to select a vendor based on clearly defined workflow and business requirements (Court Services and partnering agencies) and capable of Global Reference Architecture (GRA) conformance.
   b. State’s Attorney’s Office (SAO): Currently, the SAO utilizes many unrelated Access databases to address specific data collection and reporting needs that result in redundant and manual data entry. The recommendation is to procure a new CMS that specifically is designed to meet the business needs of the prosecutor’s office. This system must be developed to create and submit filings to the court, share information with partnering agencies, and capable of GRA conformance.
   c. Public Defender’s Office: Currently, the Public Defender has a custom-built system in place. While meeting basic case tracking needs, it is limited in scope and captures very basic information, such as, court date, charges, public defender assignment, dispositions, and sentencing information. The recommendation is to procure a new CMS that performs all the needed functions and requirements specific to the Public Defender and is capable of GRA conformance.
   d. The Sheriff’s Office: Recently, the Sheriff’s Office procured a records management system (RMS) and jail management system (JMS) to exclusively meet the needs of the law enforcement and jail business processes. Both systems have the capacity to interface and share information with other agency systems and the only recommendation here is to understand the workflow and business requirements in order to develop the appropriate exchanges.

3. Implementation of Information Sharing Initiatives:
   a. Based on the recommendations above, URL is advocating that each agency procure a CMS that is capable of GRA conformance in order to address their unique business needs and functions. With this model, data will be entered one-time at the originating point and then automatically shared across the justice enterprise, eliminating data
redundancy and manual entry efforts. This allows each agency the ability to create, render, and print documents without the necessity of scanning, imaging, uploading, emailing, or other forms of duplicate data entry.

b. This vision will require that all key stakeholders develop a deep understanding of their unique business and technical issues, needs, and workflow requirements by formulating a technology-focused governance committee with three specific levels – policy, business, and technical. At a policy level, this group should focus on broader issues, frameworks, and the approach that supports the business goals of the entire justice enterprise, solely based on advocating and enforcing industry standards and practices. At a business level, this group is made up of primarily practitioners who understand the workflow and day-to-day business needs of the agencies and is responsible for providing specific details surrounding the coordination, mapping, and usability of data and information. At the technical level, this group is made up of IT staff and agency staff familiar with the technical solutions, and responsible for providing the County with a shared and automated infrastructure that ensures the successful flow of data and information.

4. Halting the development of Circuit Clerk’s adjunct systems:
   a. There are a number of applications that the Clerk is planning, developing, or hosting in order to supplement the absence of electronic information sharing and functionality between law enforcement, prosecutors, and public defenders. As stated in the above Implementation of Information Sharing Initiatives section, each agency must procure a CMS that is capable of GRA conformance based on their unique business processes. Therefore, the recommendation is to halt the development or future production of all adjunct systems, including the Electronic Court Operations Suite (ECO), and reallocate resources and efforts toward acquiring the new CMS and developing the specifications for the information exchanges. Applications such as eCitation will require adaptation to the new information exchange environment.

5. Standard conformance of public interface applications:
   a. There are a number of applications that are in production, development, or planned in order to address the needs of the general public and private attorneys. These applications include Online Portal eServices, Electronic Payment, ePlea/eGuilty, Expedited Filing (xFiling), Protection Orders Filing Wizard, and Kane Online Case Inquiry System (KOCIS). For the applications in production, they will need to be replaced, or be capable of GRA conformance. Any planned electronic filing application should be Electronic Court Filing (ECF) conformant prior to implementation.

The following documentation provides a high-level overview of Kane County’s justice environment, including observations and recommendations on the current Clerk’s CMS, core requirements and agency-specific CMS needs, information sharing and exchange requirements, and the proposed technical architecture and approach, including costs and timeline.
VISION

Technology can be a significant investment for any jurisdiction and this investment needs to be purposeful, goal-oriented, and ultimately benefit the mission of key stakeholders within the justice environment. An accepted vision for justice technology and information sharing efforts is to enhance public safety and improve agency efficiencies by establishing an automated workflow that shares information in real-time, enables better and more informed decision making, minimizes paper dependencies, and eliminates redundant and manual data entry.

Today, with the use of technology and industry standards, business-specific systems have the ability to interact with other systems, while maintaining autonomy. This mainly allows agencies to design, operate, leverage, and maintain systems to meet their own business requirements without disrupting the flow of information passing to and from other agencies, including external organizations (private law firms and general public).

COURT CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Overview of Core Functional CMS Requirements

A number of years ago, the National Center for State Courts (NCSC), coordinated an effort with representatives from the court and vendor community to establish functional standards that best categorize and describe the core functions of a trial court CMS. Core functions can be described as those functions which serve as the foundation of information necessary to effectively and efficiently manage trial court business processes. This foundation has to be set before other interfaces can be built, e.g., a CMS must have a capacity to accept funds and post receipts before a jurisdiction can place an e-pay system on a public website. The passage of time has resulted in a discipline that has more experience with CMS. That experience impacts the nature of the original core functions; for example, depending on the case type, the jurisdiction, and the system architecture, some of the functions might be collapsed, expanded, or eliminated.

Recommended Core Functions

The Clerk’s CMS should have the following core functionality:

1. Case Initiation and Identifiers
2. Indexed Search Capabilities
3. Docketing
4. Scheduling/Calendaring
5. Document/File Management
6. Exhibit Management
7. Financial Management
8. Pretrial Hearings/Processing
9. Trials and the Official Court Record for Appeal
10. Findings/Judgments and Dispositions
11. Post judgment Activities
12. Case Closure
13. Compliance
14. Appeals
15. Configuration Management and Security
16. Alerts and Notifications—both Internal (interpreter, transcripts and reporting, system security, person status, case status, etc.) and External (orders, scheduled events, etc.)
17. Person Summary Screens
18. Operational Reporting
19. Caseflow Management Reporting which helps support Differentiated Case Management and a Business Intelligence component
20. Judge Note Taking Capabilities
21. Data Integrity
22. Infrastructure to Access Data
23. Infrastructure to Share Data with other Entities
24. Infrastructure to e-filing

When possible, the core functions above should exist in a single CMS, and separate linked systems supporting different court functions should be avoided. The Clerk’s current CMS, JANO, is a legacy CMS that no longer satisfies the needs of the Clerk’s Office, the Judiciary, or other partnering agencies and needs to be replaced within the next several years. Since the court CMS serves as the core for many other adjunct system interfaces, replacing the court CMS should be the number one focus of available resources.

In procuring a new CMS, care should be taken not to simply automate a bad business practice. This situation should be viewed as an opportunity to review existing practices and maintain the ones that are solid, change the ones that need adjusting, and discard the ones that do not take advantage of the capabilities the new technology offers.

Specifications and requirements for this new CMS should be developed jointly by the Clerk’s Office and the Judges, particularly where they support the capabilities or responsibilities of the Judiciary.

Overview of Public Interface Functional Requirements

Once a new CMS has met the above core functionality requirements, it needs to address application functionality for the general public and private attorneys, including ePay, ePlea/eGuilty, eFiling, etc. These adjunct applications are intended to improve internal business processes as well as the customer service experience. Recognizing the current limitations of JANO, the Clerk’s Office has been addressing the public interface requirements by developing many ancillary applications.
Recommended Public Interface Functions

Given the limited technical resources available to the Clerk’s Office and the amount of time required to produce specifications and requirements for a new CMS, public interface applications which are already deployed should be maintained. However, any public interface applications that are not conformant to the GRA and/or ECF (for e-filing) should either be modified or replaced in anticipation of the new CMS.

The public interfaces should include the following functions:

1. Public access to data in a docket and to public documents, when authorized to do so
2. An e-filing system that allows the public and private attorneys to file their documents electronically and enables intelligent filing of data driven documents
3. A web-based application that allows the public to plead and pay for certain offenses

Other public-facing systems should be developed to improve the customer service experience and allow the general public to conduct court business, without physically driving to the court facility. These public-facing functions should be built after the core functions are operational.

Overview of Justice Agency Interface Functional Requirements

The basic premise of an interface with partnering agencies is the need to eliminate unnecessary or redundant data entry, improve business needs and staff efficiencies, as well as, promote applications capable of GRA conformance and interoperability standards. In this scenario, the Clerk plays a key role in defining the incoming and outgoing data requirements for these inter-governmental data exchanges and information sharing initiatives.

Recommended Justice Agency Interface Functions

The new Clerk’s CMS must accommodate the technical architecture that will facilitate the workflow and data sharing/exchanges compiled by the Clerk, the Judiciary, SAO, the Public Defender, the Sheriff’s Office, and Court Services. Meanwhile, the case management systems for partnering agencies must be built to meet their specific and unique business needs. Data sharing and exchange requirements must include, but are not limited to:

1. Warrants
2. Orders of Protection
3. Scheduled Court Events
4. Court Orders/Sentencing Orders
5. Custody Status
6. Service and Summons
7. Criminal Charges
8. Dispositions
9. Child Support Information
These data exchange service specifications and CMS sharing functions should be built while the core CMS is being implemented. However, the exchanges cannot be deployed until the CMS and justice partners’ systems are operational.

**CMS DATA CONVERSION**

**Overview of Current Situation**
The Clerk’s Office has found that the existing JANO CMS is unable to produce meaningful reports required by the Judiciary, and extra efforts are expended by staff to prepare such reports. This situation is further complicated by the fact that JANO contains unreliable and inconsistent data. To remedy both of these situations, the Clerk’s Office proposed to develop a data warehouse. The purpose of this solution is to clean data being migrated from JANO to the data warehouse in order to render reports that can be prepared on-demand and that contain more meaningful data.

**Recommended Solution**
It would be beneficial to convert as much of the data in the existing JANO system into the new proposed CMS, regardless of when that system is deployed. Too many system migrations discard valuable history when moving to a new CMS because they deploy “day forward” and end up losing a gold mine of information that could be used in business intelligence operations. In addition, it is likely to be years before a new CMS is in production and judicial officers have immediate reporting needs that could be used to facilitate the managing of the judges’ workloads. Since the Clerk’s Office has already piloted the conversion of JANO data to a new data warehouse, we recommend the full conversion proceed while the new CMS is being procured.

**INFORMATION SHARING INITIATIVE**

**Overview of Identified Business Requirements**
The Kane County CMS Assessment Project goes beyond the assessment of identifying a CMS solution for the Circuit Clerk. The process included the recognition and prioritization of workflow and exchanges between partnering agencies, in order to take advantage of the role information sharing now plays in the automation of court and justice processes.

Exchange documentation included:

- How and what information is collected during the criminal justice process
- How and what information is sent to partnering agencies — electronically and via paper
- Gaps in the current business process
- Improvements that could be supported in an automated environment — paper to electronic, cost savings, and efficiencies
- Obstacles and alternate approaches to exchange implementation
Stakeholder Identified Information Exchange Priorities

On June 16, 2011, representatives from the Circuit Clerk’s Office, Judiciary, Court Services, SAO, Sheriff’s Office, and Public Defender’s Office met to discuss and identify Kane County’s top priorities for information exchange. The group identified the following specific documents and processes as priorities:

- Arrest Reports/Case Reports
- Warrants
- Charging Documents (Felony, Misdemeanor)
- Traffic Citations
- Continuance Orders/Court Orders/Sentence Orders
- Pre-Sentence Investigation (PSI) Reports
- Orders of Protection
- Dispositions (Including Prosecutor Disposition)
- Notification of Transport to Court
- Electronic Monitoring/GPS (removal/hookup)
- Supplemental Arrest/Case Reports
- PSI Order
- Order for Bond Report
- Defendant Status Query – Law Enforcement Agency (LEA) would query court
- Address Updates

Recommended Information Sharing Standards

Global Reference Architecture (GRA)
GRA is a framework for guiding and standardizing the implementation of an information sharing project. GRA supports reusability of established practices and promotes business interoperability based on open industry standards, rather than on approaches that are proprietary to one specific agency. GRA provides a description and relationship of important concepts, specific to justice information sharing architecture. GRA also identifies, at a high level, the kinds of components (software systems, hardware infrastructure, policies, practices, intersystem connections, etc.) necessary to bring those concepts to life in a particular context.

GRA includes capabilities and intermediaries. Capabilities are what justice system partners provide one another, they are agency-specific, and should be well-defined so that one agency does not impose upon another’s inherent capabilities. GRA intermediaries are, in themselves capabilities, which physically reside between agency systems and facilitate the exchange of messages between those systems. Agency systems are often referred to as providers and consumers of information; the provider system makes the data available for the consumer system, and most participant agencies are both providers and consumers of information. The intermediary is responsible for five identified types of mediation: message routing, orchestration, validation, interception and transformation.
National Information Exchange Model (NIEM)
NIEM, the National Information Exchange Model, is a partnership of the U.S. Department of Justice, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. It is designed to develop, disseminate and support enterprise-wide information exchange standards and processes that can enable jurisdictions to effectively share critical information in emergency situations, as well as support the day-to-day operations of agencies throughout the nation.

NIEM enables information sharing, focusing on information exchanges among organizations as part of their current or intended business practices. NIEM will standardize content (actual data exchange standards), provide tools, and managed processes.

Service Specification Packages
GRA solutions to information exchanges are made up of a combination of the connection method (often web services), the exchange language (use of NIEM is encouraged), and the security specifications (encryption at the transport layer, data layer, etc.). These specifications are packaged into a GRA solution that can be customized to meet an individual organization’s needs. A repository of Reference Service Specification Packages (SSPs) for information exchange in the justice community is being established.

Electronic Court Filing (ECF) Standard
ECF, the Electronic Court Filing Version 4.0, is a specification developed primarily through efforts of the OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing Technical Committee (ECF TC) and endorsed by the Joint Technology Committee. Its latest version, 4.0 is based on NIEM.

The ECF standardizes general common filing behaviors for courts and defines them as a set of services that work together between courts and attorneys. The ECF TC has developed specifications for the use of XML to create and transmit legal documents from an attorney, party or pro se litigant to a court, from a court to an attorney, party or pro se litigant or to another court, and from an attorney or other user to another attorney or other user of legal documents.

Recommended Technical Architecture
This recommendation proposes a service-oriented architecture (SOA), specifically GRA conformant, that clearly delineates the functions related to the relevant stakeholders. The exchanges that Kane County has prioritized during the assessment will be used to identify common business processes across the enterprise and will be implemented as common services with identified exchanges using NIEM-conformant messages. The messages will be triggered by a business event at the sending agency, sent to the receiving agency, and processed into their application. The architecture will also support error handling, as defined by endpoint agencies involved in the exchange. In proposing this technical solution, we recommend the use of web services as the technical implementation of the GRA.
URL’s proposed solution will use products and tools that meet key standards and best practices in the justice community, and will not be dependent on any one vendor’s proprietary solution. URL firmly believes that the County’s business process is unique and while there are reusable specifications and artifacts that can be leveraged to make the job easier, the “heavy lifting” with this process is not around fitting the technology into the current business process but adapting the new technology and business process to take full advantage of the capabilities it offers. By leveraging standards, there is a much better chance that potential vendors will be able to competitively meet the County’s requirements.

We recommend that the servers and storage devices for the new systems, including any intermediaries, be housed in County IT. This will require a shift over time of resources to support the new equipment. The respective agencies will be responsible for the applications and decisions pertaining to the maintenance of these applications.

A high level architecture defining the key components is shown below with descriptions of each component after.
Central to the ideology of SOA is the notion of an intermediary. It is the service intermediary and not the applications or web portals that ultimately control the functions of message routing, guaranteed message delivery, and other core functions necessary for a robust implementation of an SOA. An example of an intermediary is an Enterprise Service Bus (ESB), which allows for seamless electronic sharing of information. URL recommends an ESB that is open source and conforms to Web Services Interoperability Standards.

The Operational systems level is the sum total of all applications, supporting the unique business functions of the various stakeholders. It includes case management systems, records management systems, jail management systems and other packaged web based applications for public or non-specific users, as well as business intelligence applications. Each of these operational systems has a distinct delineation of functionality based on the relevant participants in the enterprise.

The court record management application, its business layer, and database implement only those case management functions and business processes necessary for managing and retaining the court database of record and are wholly independent of the other stakeholders. This application is typically part and parcel of a court’s case management system.

The Judge Interface supports the business process of judges related to managing their caseload and order generation. This interface should support real-time in-court interactions. This likely will be offered as a part of the CMS, but could be provided by a third party, if conformant to standards. Note that because it supports the business process of other stakeholders besides the Clerk, it is imperative that there is consensus on CMS selection between the Judges and the Clerk’s Office with regards to functionality.

The e-filing web application supports the business process of private attorneys and pro se performing the act of assembling and submitting court filings. It is the functionality that implements what is referred to as the “Filing Assembly” major design element. While this functionality can be part of a larger CMS, the attorneys whose business processes are affected should be part of an application selection process.

The System Admin web application is a standalone web application that is hosted by the intermediary for the purposes of configuration, manual message error correction (if required), and general health monitoring.

The Justice Query and Reporting web application supports the business processes of the justice practitioners relating to reporting and general system wide information. This application would have ties to the Reporting Services.

The Public access web portal provides various clerk related services that are both informational and transactional in nature. An example of a transactional service is the ePay service.
The local law enforcement agencies, as well as the Sheriff’s Office house their own systems that facilitate their internal business processes. To enable integration, web services are placed in each of the endpoints to facilitate the automation of the manual exchanges. The eCitation application (APS currently) which is a law enforcement capability but currently sponsored by the Clerk’s Office will require modification to GRA standards.

In contrast to law enforcement, the State’s Attorney’s and Public Defender’s Offices do not currently have their own system. The current mode of operation to date has been to attempt and augment the existing CMS to allow some degree of web interface when interacting with the court, but does nothing to improve their internal business processes. It is for these reasons that we recommend that each of these offices procure their own CMS system to help automate their own business processes and integrate with the full enterprise. It is important to note that these CMS systems would also include some functionality for the preparation and submission of filings by means of the ECF 4.0, in addition to any other functionality to enable the exchanges of data between law enforcement and the State’s Attorney’s Office.

The law firm filing and case management system is included in the architecture diagram above, in order to highlight that the enterprise would also enable the direct connectivity of any third party court filing systems compliant to the ECF 4.0 specification and its corresponding GRA Service Implementation Profile out of the box.

**COURSE OF ACTION**

As part of this study, Kane County was interested in assessing the costs associated with a new case management system, and how they compare with continuing on the current path. As part of this review, we compared the costs of a new case management system with some rough estimates of what it costs the courts – as well as other criminal justice partners – to process paper files in the current system, given that there is little or no true data integration between criminal justice system partners when it comes to the court process (from filing, through court events, to sentencing and case disposition). The implementation of the CMS will certainly be a large and expensive undertaking. This study projects the five (5) year costs of maintaining the existing legacy system to **minimally** be $5,922,345.85. This estimate does not include costs of the several ancillary systems being currently pursued by the Circuit Court Clerk’s Office, with the exception of the proposed data warehouse project. It also does not assume any funding for case management systems for the State’s Attorney, the Public Defender, or Court Services.
The projected total costs for the new CMS solution over five (5) years is $12,641,950.05, which includes the full implementation of the “to be” environment URL proposes elsewhere in this document.

### Kane County ICJIS Strategic Plan - Year by Year Cost Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency System</th>
<th>Year I</th>
<th>Year II</th>
<th>Year III</th>
<th>Year IV</th>
<th>Year V</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Warehouse for Data Conversion</td>
<td>$800,000.00</td>
<td>$      -</td>
<td>$        -</td>
<td>$      -</td>
<td>$          -</td>
<td>$800,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing System Maintenance</td>
<td>$18,750.00</td>
<td>$18,750.00</td>
<td>$18,750.00</td>
<td>$      -</td>
<td>$          -</td>
<td>$56,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Court Clerk CMS</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$4,080,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New SAO CMS</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td>$180,000.00</td>
<td>$180,000.00</td>
<td>$180,000.00</td>
<td>$1,540,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Public Defender CMS</td>
<td>$350,000.00</td>
<td>$350,000.00</td>
<td>$126,000.00</td>
<td>$126,000.00</td>
<td>$126,000.00</td>
<td>$1,078,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Court Services CMS</td>
<td>$350,000.00</td>
<td>$350,000.00</td>
<td>$126,000.00</td>
<td>$126,000.00</td>
<td>$126,000.00</td>
<td>$1,078,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IT Infrastructure &amp; Project Management</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESB Configuration &amp; Support</td>
<td>$        -</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td>$6,300.00</td>
<td>$6,300.00</td>
<td>$6,300.00</td>
<td>$53,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Assistance, Project Management &amp; Support</td>
<td>$130,000.00</td>
<td>$31,250.00</td>
<td>$31,250.00</td>
<td>$31,250.00</td>
<td>$31,250.00</td>
<td>$255,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court IT Staff</td>
<td>$431,779.92</td>
<td>$440,415.52</td>
<td>$449,223.83</td>
<td>$458,208.31</td>
<td>$467,372.47</td>
<td>$2,247,000.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exchanges</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I – Requirements Development / Exchange Implementation</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
<td>$210,000.00</td>
<td>$25,200.00</td>
<td>$25,200.00</td>
<td>$25,200.00</td>
<td>$375,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II – Requirements Development / Exchange Implementation</td>
<td>$        -</td>
<td>$105,000.00</td>
<td>$270,000.00</td>
<td>$32,400.00</td>
<td>$32,400.00</td>
<td>$439,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III – Requirements Development / Exchange Implementation</td>
<td>$        -</td>
<td>$        -</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$195,000.00</td>
<td>$23,400.00</td>
<td>$278,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase IV – Requirements Development / Exchange Implementation</td>
<td>$        -</td>
<td>$        -</td>
<td>$        -</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
<td>$270,000.00</td>
<td>$360,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$3,670,529.92</td>
<td>$3,040,415.52</td>
<td>$2,292,723.83</td>
<td>$1,810,358.31</td>
<td>$1,827,922.47</td>
<td>$12,641,950.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The difference between the existing legacy system costs and the projected costs for the new solution - $6,719,604.20 – represents the County’s true costs over the five-year period of this study.

Summary of Benefits
Clearly the difference between the cost projections associated with maintaining the existing legacy system and those associated with the procurement and implementation of all aspects of the “to be” justice environment in Kane County – over $12 million over five (5) years – is significant and may beg the question as to why the investment in new technology is necessary. This study presents projections of both direct and indirect benefits that make the business case that the new system is well worth the investment.

To make this case, we used the number of filings per year in Kane County for criminal, traffic, and the case types in the civil court that, according to the Administrative Office of Illinois Courts (AOIC), are allowable for electronic filing\(^2\). We estimated the time and cost of all parties – the Courts, State’s Attorney, and Public Defender – in filling out necessary forms, filing, and retrieving paper copies.

It is clear that these costs are high-level estimates and that in some cases processes may take more or less time or resources to move cases through the criminal and civil justice systems. The total benefits of automating these processes are estimated at $1,277,031.50/year. Assuming the full benefits of this “to be” environment would not be achieved until year three, once the new systems are up and the cross-agency information sharing has begun. Our estimated cost for new systems and exchanges will be spread over five years with cost benefits primarily following implementation of exchanges.

Kane County could expect to recover its investment ($6,719,604.20) in the new CMS environment and integration after Year VIII. We believe this estimate to be conservative, as once the new CMS systems are operational, efficiencies will be immediate.

It is possible that Kane County would not have to bear the full cost of this project. By using fees for electronic filing – especially with the civil courts, the defense bar and pro se files – the County can compensate for some part of its costs using a convenience fee. We anticipate that these filers would gladly pay such a fee for the convenience of being able to do filing online rather than coming down to the courthouse.

\(^2\) Those case types include: family, divorce, law magistrate, small claims, law, arbitration, and chancery.
Kane County has, like many counties in Illinois, built its justice automation around a legacy Court CMS. Being a legacy system, i.e. older technology, does not in and of itself mean the system should be replaced. If the CMS is built on solid data and business design and maintained during its lifecycle, the system often can be built upon with newer technology. This is not the case with the JANO system for reasons discussed above. The Circuit Clerk should be commended for her efforts to bring newer technology to the courts and the other justice partners, given the limitations she faced. The fact that only the Sheriff has a business line application in place required any enhancements by the Clerk to be unilateral.

But now that the County is focused on a justice-wide solution to the Court CMS and other agencies’ automation needs, a new paradigm needs to be embraced. Each agency should have its own system which supports its own unique business needs, and where all data entry takes place. With the new interoperability standards and technology, real-time sharing of information is now quite feasible.

To make this happen, it will take the cooperation and strong investment of all the justice stakeholders and the County Board. No single agency or elected official can bear the burden alone, if this is to succeed.
INTRODUCTION

JUSTICE AS AN ENTERPRISE PARADIGM

A widely accepted mission for technology investment in public agencies is centered on improving effectiveness and efficiency through better and more informed decision making. Objectives include improved workflow, real-time accessibility to information, reduction in paper dependencies, and the elimination of redundant and manual data entry. Technology initiatives are often a significant investment for any jurisdiction from both an appropriation and staff resource perspective. Because of this, jurisdictions such as Kane County do not get many opportunities to make these investments. When these opportunities do arise, the initiatives should leverage solutions that will be relevant for years to come.

Today, there are many court case management systems (CMS) on the market that are designed to support the court’s process and record keeping requirements. There are also a number of interfaces and applications to these systems that jurisdictions can invest in, such as e-citation, e-filing, e-pay, e-access, etc., and the choices can be difficult to sort out. Each one of these interfaces can add value to the court and individuals that interact with the court. To the non-technical decision maker, these all sound important, but it can be difficult to decide which investments make the most sense, i.e. who actually benefits and how they all fit together. For this reason, if the court case management system is viewed in isolation, and each interface is also evaluated in a vacuum, then it is difficult to separate the good long term investments from the shortsighted ones.

Information is constantly flowing in and out of the court to other agencies and attorneys. Traditionally, this has been through paper which is a very expensive way to move information. With the advent of web technology, alternative electronic means of moving information in and out of the court, as noted above, have emerged. These have sped up the delivery time but have had less of an impact on staff time and workflow. More recently, there has been a shift in thinking from individual agencies functionality to an enterprise-wide view of the justice system. When agencies begin to consider their information sharing needs, as well as overall justice system efficiency, the benefits of the technology solutions become clear.

Employees are the biggest expense the County bears. Getting a high level of productivity from staff generates cost effectiveness and flexibility in the allocation of staff resources. The County pays for staff in the Sheriff’s Office, Court Services, the States Attorney’s Office (SAO), and the Public Defender’s Office. All of these agencies are depending on interactions with the Court to do their job. If that interaction is not efficient, it affects much more than court resources. The County pays for these interactions one way or another. Therefore, implementing an enterprise wide solution that will allow for maximum staff productivity, through reduction of paper processing and redundant data entry, will be of greatest benefit to the County.
To fully benefit the County as an enterprise, the agencies that interact or exchange information with the court must be included in the solution. The other justice agencies have unique business functions that can benefit from technology, and solutions that benefit the court should take into account those unique business functions. We understand that there are significant costs associated with bringing on systems for the SAO, the Public Defender and Court Services in addition to a court CMS. But, we want to be clear that without these systems in place, the benefits to the County will be more than proportionally reduced. Some of the applications developed in the Circuit Clerk’s Office have been created because other agencies are lacking robust CMS’s that should handle their own core functionality. Without procuring these CMS’s in the future, the County may find itself developing/purchasing additional applications to supplement the new Court CMS, just as it has done with JANO. That is a situation to be avoided, because in the long term, it will lead to cost without full benefit.

The technology solution should enhance the work product of these distinct agencies and produce a consistent outcome. If staff in these respective agencies is required to enter information more than once – whether in their own system or another partnering agency’s system – then they are not benefiting from what technology can now offer. Today, with the use of emerging technologies and industry standards, agencies can implement autonomous and business-specific systems that interact with other systems – independent of the court CMS. This allows agencies to acquire, develop, and maintain systems that address their own business requirements, while leveraging the ability to exchange information in a very regulated and compliant framework. Below is an example of an exchange in Kane.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During an investigation if the Grand Jury returns a True Bill, the State’s Attorney sends an Indictment to the Court to initiate the case. If the defendant is not in custody, the Court issues an Arrest Warrant to Law Enforcement to arrest and update the warrant system.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

There are court case management vendors who provide systems that not only address court case management needs, but also contain modules/applications for the other disciplines. While this may appear to be an attractive solution, it does bind the agencies closely for the life of the system. The negative results of this approach have been seen in Kane and other Illinois counties using the JANO system. The system was bought with a prosecutor module, which over time stopped meeting the needs of the SAO and was abandoned, leaving them without a system.

The intent of this document is to make observations and recommendations based upon this paradigm shift. The document will provide the best roadmap for Kane County to take full advantage of emerging technologies and standards, with the anticipation they will continue to advance and evolve.
This document lays out a roadmap for a solution to the Court CMS shortcomings using the enterprise paradigm described above. The solution utilizes technical standards that enable this to become a reality. To the business level decision maker, these technical details can be difficult to wade through. The key point to understand is that given the current standards, vendor systems can interoperate at a level not feasible before while maintaining their autonomy. A traffic cop of sorts can sit in between these systems and manage all of the business rules and guarantee the information has been received.

Common data definitions have been developed and standardized so that case management system vendors understand how information is represented across the justice domain. This includes the way information is organized and provides sets of common codes for such things as eye color, vehicle makes and crime codes. Overlaying all of this is a standardized architecture guiding vendors and jurisdictions as to how these systems talk to each other on a technical level. Below is an example of the exchange shown above but with the information sharing infrastructure in place.

The State’s Attorney’s Office has received the case information from Law Enforcement. The State’s Attorney’s Office enters the charges and other information from the True Bill. An Indictment document is created from this data in the SAO CMS and filed with the Court. The intermediary routes the document to the Court CMS which initiates the case and returns a case number. The intermediary logs the transaction and sends the case number back to the SAO CMS.

The Indictment and docketed information, along with a Warrant Request, appears on the Judges docket for this case. The Judge issues the Arrest Warrant through the CMS, which sends the Warrant to the intermediary. The intermediary examines the warrant for the originating agency and routes it to the appropriate Law Enforcement Agency. The data transferred with the warrant is conformant to the NIEM standard and can be sent to LEADS directly.

There are of course options the County has depending upon preferences and funding. It is possible to build one’s own CMS from scratch. This can ensure the system fully meets the unique business process of Kane County. From a cost perspective, this averages at least two times the price of the average “out of the box” CMS from a vendor. It also requires the jurisdiction to maintain the system in-house. It is also important to understand that the vendor provided solution may require customization to meet local needs. To the degree this can be minimized, the better the price point. If it is extensive, it can then cost as much as a custom developed system would. In addition, highly customized systems are difficult for a vendor to maintain over time.

Vendor provided systems do vary in cost and in some cases significantly. It is crucial to understand whether or not you are comparing apples to apples or apples to oranges.
The County may not be able to afford the applications for the SAO, Public Defender or Court Services in the near term. This would reduce the benefits to the County and in many ways continue to do business as its being conducted today but with a better Court CMS. The SAO and Public Defender could enter information into Court provided access points for filing similar to an e-filing system for the public.

The recommended solution provides for an incremental approach to bringing up individual exchanges step-wise over time. This gives immediate benefit to the enterprise while stretching the cost over time. The roadmap separates exchange costs from CMS costs, even though there will be additional customization required at each CMS. The exchanges will also require work in the middle (i.e. between agencies); this effort guarantees the reliability of the enterprise architecture and eliminates the need for redundant overhead within each agency. CMS components can also be brought on over time to spread costs. The important overriding concern is that all investments meet the standards and build for future growth.

**AS-IS JUSTICE AGENCY FINDINGS**

The Kane County Case Management System (CMS) Assessment Project was initiated to solve the following technology challenge among the County’s criminal justice enterprise:

“The County of Kane is currently using a case management system that is in its ninth year of service and various stakeholders have determined that the best course of action is to replace the system with one or more products that more closely meet the agencies’ requirements...[the goal of this project is] to assist with the review, analysis, and recommendations regarding the County’s case management systems...to facilitate, review, analyze, and recommend potential guidelines, standards, and a course of action to the Task Force.”

In achieving this goal, the County set forth several objectives, including:

- Understanding and documenting current technology infrastructure as well as future needs, such as standards, backup/disaster recovery, and data conversion;
- Develop an understanding of agency case management system requirements, as well as information flow between agencies, and opportunities for process improvement;
- Financial analysis of the cost of new system(s) and integration, over three and five years, as well as a return on investment;
- Document in a blueprint that provides specific short- and long-term steps and priorities for achieving case management goals and integration.

---

3 RFP 26-010 Technology Consultant, Case Management, System, April 26, 2010
In November of 2010, the Kane County IT Technology Task Force Committee selected URL Integration to conduct a comprehensive assessment to facilitate, review, analyze, and recommend potential guidelines, standards, and a course of action for the future state of Kane County’s case management system (CMS). At the outset of the CMS Assessment project, the following expected outcomes were clearly outlined and understood:

- A shared, practical understanding among stakeholders about what case management is and what it will be in Kane County;
- Actionable, specific work products, reports, and artifacts that provide a blueprint and direction to Kane County for case management system requirements and the implementation of integrated justice; and
- Financial analysis to project and justify cost of case management and integration project.

From December 2010 through March 2011, URL conducted a series of assessment sessions with agency representatives from the Circuit Clerk’s Office, Judiciary, Court Services, Sheriff’s Office, State’s Attorney’s Office, Public Defender’s Office, and the County Information Technology Department to document the business and technical environments that currently exist within each agency. As a result, individual Agency Review documents were prepared and presented to agency representatives to discuss initial findings, including business case types and processes, system architecture, and hardware and IT support.

Upon completion of each draft document, agency representatives were provided with those documents for review. Conference calls, as well as on-line meetings, were held to review the individual agency documentation. Upon completion of those review meetings, documents were edited to reflect necessary changes and incorporated into this Final Report.

The following information in this section contains a very high-level summary of URL’s findings and recommendations by agency — Circuit Clerk’s Office, Judiciary, Court Services, Sheriff’s Office, State’s Attorney’s Office, and Public Defender’s Office. For more detailed documentation of each Agency Review, please refer to Appendix A through F. Please note: the information found in the appendices is based upon site visits that were vetted with the agency representatives to ensure URL understood the current environment and agency direction.

**CIRCUIT CLERK’S OFFICE FINDINGS**

**CIRCUIT CLERK’S COURT CASE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CMS)**

The Circuit Clerk’s current CMS (JANO) has the ability to store data in order to support the normal day-to-day business process of recording and managing court cases; however, it has significant shortcomings in the ability to enable partnering agencies to share information consistently, accurately, and securely.
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Summary of system challenges:

- Notifications are paper-based with some email and fax.
- Court date scheduling for criminal cases, tracking bonds within the civil side of the CMS, and recording disbursements for child support are not supported through JANO and are managed manually.
- Critical data fields require manual entry, questioning the accuracy of the data.
- Evidence management is not supported, requiring manual entry and tracking.
- Data access for reporting is cumbersome and time-intensive to compile due to the lack of database documentation (both data dictionary and structure) and the practice of storing data in multiple files.
- The JANO database uses common terms with multiple definitions that are not obvious to the user and results in unpredictable data entry and essential data validation when creating reports.

Summary of logistical challenges:

- The current CMS vendor, JANO Systems’ business has fragmented and no longer supports the system or ongoing maintenance and updates to the CMS source code.
- There are two IBM AS400’s supporting JANO that have approximately two years left on the lease term which will require replacement and an intense migration process.

DATA WAREHOUSE

The Clerk’s Office has begun a (approximately $800,000) data warehouse project intended to support all of the reporting functions that are lacking in the current CMS. This project has been piloted with a subset of data. Essentially, this project includes a normalized case management repository from which the data warehouse is populated and is intended to solve the following challenges:

- Elimination of recurrent hours spent each month manually aggregating data for reporting needs.
- Reduction of the demands on the current CMS.
- Provide a means of on-demand report generation (dashboards) of pre-identified reports by other agencies.

The project includes a comprehensive clean-up and scrub of the data that currently exists in JANO and will require some level of manual intervention. The expected result is to gain access to reliable data and allow for more accurate reporting.

ADJUNCT APPLICATIONS

The Clerk’s Office has implemented applications to address the changing needs of the court and supplement the existing CMS, and is planning to implement a number of applications that are intended to add value to the court, other justice agencies and the general public. These include three main categories of services; web access to the general public for access to court information, plea/pay, and
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EOP petition submission capability; planned civil case type filing capability for the public; intelligent form submission and information access capability for the other justice agencies. The primary application for the submission of documents from the SAO and the Public Defender is the ECO Suite, which is partially in production.

For more information on the Circuit Clerk’s Office Review, see Appendix A.

JUDICIARY FINDINGS

Currently, there are insufficient levels of usage, collaboration, and cooperation between the Clerk’s CMS and the Judiciary. This practice has allowed for a paper-driven and redundant data entry process to continue in the Judiciary environment. This is a significant productivity issue, since about 75% of the information exchanges that occur within the criminal justice process involve the court sending or receiving information. That being said, judges’ support of real-time entry in the courtroom is critical to the exchange of information with other agencies.

The Judiciary relies on JANO for critical reports that must be prepared for the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC), including fines and fees based on Judge’s order and exception reports that identify people who did not report to Probation. There are other reports that are generated but the data has been proven erroneous in terms of both loss and quality.

The Judiciary also depends on the document imaging system, Real Vision Imaging (RVI) that is tied to JANO. This system allows the courts to retrieve and review the case file from any location. While documents are generally scanned immediately, there are instances where uploaded/scanned documents are difficult to read (due to the quality of the document that was used for scanning) or unavailable due to a delay in scanning, which requires clerks to depend on paper files for validation of information.

Other JANO system challenges:

- Court case scheduling is not sufficiently supported and calendars are currently kept in journals by each judge.
- Defendant cases are unable to tie together and cases can’t be scheduled and batched on the same day/time.
- There is no centralized location for attorneys and pro se litigants to get information regarding their case and associated courtroom information.
- Judges and staff aspire to obtain accurate, real-time reports without having to rely on a single point of contact at the Circuit Clerk’s Office

For more information on the Judiciary review, see Appendix B.
COURT SERVICES FINDINGS

Currently the individual Court Services units have the responsibility to evaluate, monitor, and supervise defendants; however, there is no automated process or system in place to gather, collect, and share this data. Information sharing with other agencies is a handwritten, paper-driven process that takes a tremendous amount of resources to maintain and manage. There is an open RFP to procure a new system, but there were no defined standards, requirements, or features.

One area that needs improvement is the ability for the individual units to gather and share key pieces of information necessary to better supervise the defendant. The processes to gather and share this information are problematic. Key pieces of information must be rewritten, re-entered and requested numerous times during a defendant’s supervision life cycle. This sharing of data is typically a paper process and creates a tremendous amount of additional work for staff. In interviews with staff, they expressed their frustration of having to write the same information numerous times. They feel they have become buried in paper making their job more difficult and frustrating.

Due to the lack of technology (Case Management System) Court Services relies heavily on spreadsheets to manage information. This does not allow for the information to be shared between the units and causes the staff a significant amount of work re-entering information throughout the process.

For more information on the Court Services review, see Appendix C.

SHERIFF’S OFFICE FINDINGS

The Sheriff’s Office has made a significant investment into the New World / AEGIS System, and the agency is generally pleased with the functionality of the system. This provides a solid records management system (RMS) and jail management system (JMS). This system is housed and supported by County IT.

Redundant data entry does still occur due to a lack of integration between the Sheriff’s Office and other agencies. The office would greatly benefit from the implementation of various information exchanges with the other agencies. AEGIS has the capacity to interface with other agency systems, and is able to share information with other agencies if the architecture and governance are in place.

For more information on the Sheriff’s Office review, see Appendix D.
The State’s Attorney’s Office needs to improve current automated case management and reporting capabilities. At this time, many unrelated Access databases have been created in the State’s Attorney’s Office to address specific needs for the various departments within the office. No case management system is in place to support the entire office.

Currently, notices of court hearings are mailed or set in court. Court dates are entered into the interoffice calendar in Outlook. Subpoenas are created in Word. Evidence logs, attorney dispositions, and the time defendants are sentenced to, are completed on paper. Staff would like to see the information automated. With the paper based system the Staff may wait up to two weeks to discover if a defendant is in custody.

Staff sees great value in reducing the enormous amount of paperwork that goes along with the complaint and the warrant – they have to keep that paperwork for three years after cases are closed, and in murder and other sexual abuse cases that paperwork is never destroyed. Reducing the need to create and store so many paper files would be of great value to their division.

Currently, law enforcement officers call the on-duty Assistant State’s Attorney for that review, and the State’s Attorney authorizes specific charges to be filed. The law enforcement officer then completes the Charging Document and files it with the court in PDF form housed on the Web. The problem is that officers often select the wrong wording and those selections are not being reviewed by the SAO before the Bond Call, which is conducted every single day of the year.

The exchange of information between Court Services and SAO was mentioned as an area that would benefit from sharing information electronically. Probation Officers routinely file Violation of Probation requests with SAO by emailing the request as an attachment. Along with the request, they must send police reports and a criminal history from LEADS. SAO will determine if the violation should be filed with the court. It is the PO’s responsibility to follow up with SAO, or research the court records in JAN to see if the SAO filed the case.

For the issues summarized above and the often mentioned concern that statistical reports are very difficult to derive, it is clear the Office is not as efficient as it could be with a robust case management system.
Currently, the Public Defender has a custom-built system in place that is easy-to-use, but it is limited and does not meet the needs of the attorneys. The system tracks basic information, including Court Date, Charges, Public Defender Assigned, Dispositions, Sentences, etc.

Summary of system challenges:

- Charge Types/Class of Charge is not currently being tracked.
- Reports and forms cannot be generated, including types of cases, case load per month, attorney-specific caseload, etc.
- Critical statistics are not being properly tracked, such as, pending cases/trends, fees paid by defendants, types of cases defended, dispositions, etc.
- Data in their current system doesn’t automatically share with the Circuit Clerk’s CMS; therefore they are required to perform redundant data entry and validation.
- Attorney calendars do not synch with the Courts to remind and confirm scheduling day, time, and courtroom.

While the Public Defender’s system meets very basic case tracking needs, it is limited in scope and captures very basic information that cannot easily be shared with Circuit Clerk’s Office and the State’s Attorney’s Office.

**JUSTICE AGENCY RECOMMENDATIONS**

It would be beneficial to convert as much of the data in the existing JANO system into the new proposed CMS, regardless of when that system is deployed. Too many system migrations discard valuable history when moving to a new CMS because they deploy “day forward” and end up losing a gold mine of information that could be used in business intelligence operations. In addition, it is likely to be several years before a new CMS is in production and judicial officers have immediate reporting needs that could be used to facilitate the managing of the judges’ workloads. Since the Clerk’s Office has already piloted the conversion of JANO data to a new data warehouse, we recommend the full conversion proceed while the new CMS is being procured. However, there has been expressed concern over the projected price. Bidding this conversion out may be the only way to determine what the best price for a quality solution is.

**Recommendations:**

- The Clerk’s Office replaces the existing JANO CMS with a new CMS which meets minimally the Core Functions defined below.
- The States Attorney’s Office acquires a CMS to replace paper driven business process and multiple Access databases.
- The Public Defender’s Office acquires a CMS to replace current application.
- Court Services consider reissuing or purchasing from the open RFP they issued last winter.
- Convert and scrub JANO data into normalized relational database.
The following section describes in detail the functions a new Court CMS should be required to meet. An RFP should incorporate in addition to any specific requirements the Clerk and Court determine necessary. We have not included functional requirements for the other CMSs we are recommending as it was not in the scope of the project to set out specific functional requirements for other agency case management systems. However, for probation case management systems, the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) released a set of functional standards titled “Functional Standards Development for Automated Case Management Systems for Probation”, which is available off of their website at http://www.appa-net.org/eweb/docs/appa/pubs/FSDACMS.pdf. Unfortunately, for prosecutors and public defenders there is not an equivalent document.

We recommend the various agencies use the reviews in the appendices as a starting point for identifying the requirements for their respective CMSs.

**Circuit Clerk’s Office - Court Case Management System**

Several years ago, the National Center for State Courts (NCSC), coordinated an effort with representatives from both the court and vendor communities to establish functional standards that best categorize and describe the core functions of a trial court CMS. Core functions can be described as those functions which serve as the foundation of information necessary to effectively and efficiently manage trial court business processes. This foundation has to be set before other interfaces can be built, e.g., a CMS must have a capacity to accept funds and post receipts before a jurisdiction can place an e-pay system on a public website; and a court CMS must be able to create and store scheduled events before it can share that information with other justice system partners.

Those standards were developed and posted for consumption by the court’s community, over a period of years, by case type (http://www.ncsconline.org/d_tech/standards/). The passage of time has resulted in a discipline that has more experience and has matured with court CMSs. That experience impacts the nature of the original core functions, for example, depending on the case type, the jurisdiction, and the system architecture, some of the functions might be collapsed (e.g., scheduling and calendaring can be combined, bookkeeping and receipting can be combined into a financial function), or expanded (e.g., alerts/notifications and person summary screens have all become indispensable to conducting court business effectively).

Kane County must begin to think beyond the basics of a case tracking system (i.e., a system which simply tracks cases and people through the system). A meaningful CMS allows judges and the Clerk’s Office to manage cases through the system (e.g., gather information on the status of a case, the number of continuances that have been requested and granted, the rationale for the continuances, the age of the case, whether or not next scheduled events have been assigned to a case, etc.). The goal of any new CMS should be to implement effective case flow management tools and create easy interfaces designed
to share data with other entities. Although it is important to provide a mechanism that lists the transactions in a case, it is equally important for the Judges and the Clerk’s Office to have tools which manage these cases through the system in a way that promotes equal protection, due process, system access and customer service for all of the parties involved in a case. Differentiated case management, e.g., being able to distinguish between simple cases that consume minimal resources and very complex cases that consume an extraordinary amount of available system resources, is yet another tool in the arsenal of approaches to introduce effective case flow management. The basic principle behind case management is that the court takes control of their calendars and tries to walk the fine line between moving cases along as quickly as possible while still providing litigants fair and equitable treatment in the process (to minimize the bad effects of time on witness memories and other evidence, treat victims fairly and quickly, enhance customer service to the litigants, witnesses, potential jurors, etc.)—an effective CMS will facilitate that process.

There are a couple of fundamental premises that underlie URL’s recommendations regarding the County’s pursuit of a new Case Management System (CMS). In our view, a Court CMS must be capable of performing a whole host of critical day-to-day functions in support of the Court’s business process. For instance, the Court CMS must be able to accept filings, maintain financial information, provide accurate court calendars, manage documents, and support reporting needs. Contemporary CMS products are built on technologies that provide the ability to share real-time, workflow-driven information with other systems, such as the receipt and acceptance of electronically filed cases and charges with the Court.

### Differentiated Case Management (DCM) System

Another concept that looks past simply automating current processes is the idea of Differentiated Case Management (DCM) systems. A Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) Differentiated Case Management (DCM) Program Brief can be found at [http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/difb.pdf](http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/difb.pdf). The following information is taken from that Program Brief in order to properly introduce the DCM concept.

Differentiated Case Management (DCM) is a technique courts can use to tailor the case management process to the requirements of individual cases. The DCM concept is premised on the assumption that all cases are not alike and, therefore, should not be subject to the same processing events and timetables. Some cases can be disposed of promptly with little or no time needed for discovery and few intermediate events. Others require extensive court supervision over pretrial motions, the scheduling of expert witnesses, and settlement negotiations. Moreover, some cases, even if complex, need to be given scheduling priority for a variety of reasons, such as imminent threat of harm to a party, age or physical condition of a witness, and local prosecutorial policies.

Inherent in the concept of DCM is the recognition that some cases can—and should—proceed through the court system at a faster pace than others. In a DCM system, the traditional “first-in-first-out” rule for case scheduling and disposition is replaced by a case management system that accommodates the diversity of case processing events and timeframes appropriate to the individual cases filed.
The following discussion presents best practices regarding the functionality that should be – and in many cases are – included in contemporary Court CMS products. We then present these best practices for functionality to assist the Court and Circuit Clerk’s Office in the selection of a new Court CMS. Some of this functionality is reflected in the current CMS and the myriad of ancillary systems currently used by the Circuit Clerk’s Office. A new system will include more functionality and better integration to enhance how the Court does business.

**RECOMMENDED CORE FUNCTIONALITY**

An effective court CMS should be designed to provide justice system decision makers, with the most reliable, valid, complete and timely information available so they can make the most informed decisions possible.

Each of the following functions described below is an important component of an effective CMS. Vendors may accommodate for these functions differently, i.e., some may combine these delineated functions in varied modules throughout their software applications, and the user interface is likely to also vary among the applications. Nevertheless, these core court functions should exist for all case types serviced by the Judges and the Clerk’s Office. Although economic and organizational constraints in some jurisdictions have resulted in the incremental development of separate information systems for different case types, it is not a best practice to create a separate CMS for each case type, and Kane County should pursue a single court system that will accommodate all case types.

In addition to these functions, care should be taken to ensure that the proper data fields are captured. Although examples of such data elements are provided within each function identified below, the examples are certainly not intended to be exhaustive. There are many data schemas already identified in national data standards, but Kane County needs to make a concerted effort to identify what outputs it needs from the new CMS. These outputs, both operational and management reports will drive the actual data that needs to be collected. Unfortunately, too many jurisdictions do these assessments backwards, i.e., they ID the data elements first, and are then left with creating operational and management reports from those elements that are first identified. Kane County needs to first identify the outputs, and then identify the data elements required to yield those needed outputs. These lists are necessary for both systems that are developed in-house and those which are outsourced or purchased from a vendor.
The Clerk’s CMS should have the following core functionality:

**CASE INITIATION AND IDENTIFIERS**

The Case Initiation and Identifier function encompasses the range of activities that initiate a case record and assign identifying information to that case and parties associated with any case. These activities include filing of initiating documents, the acceptance and processing of the initial filing and associated fees, determining the case category, assigning a case number (i.e., this function should be done automatically by the CMS), assigning a case number (i.e., should be done automatically by the CMS), capturing core case information (e.g., charges in criminal cases), and capturing party information (e.g., names, addresses, dates of birth, finger print based identifiers, DNA based identifiers, social security numbers, driver’s license numbers, demographics, relationships to other cases, personal relationships among the parties, and other core identifying information depending on the case category of the plaintiff and defendants or respondents).

A goal of the Clerk’s Office is to be positioned for someone outside of the Clerk’s Office to initiate the core function of case initiation. This might be accomplished through the APS e-citation’s project (even though this should be rewritten at a later date using national standard, National Information Exchange Model (NIEM), data transfer protocol, in order to allow for enhanced information sharing when the new CMS is in place), e-filing, and in-bound data transfers from other criminal justice agencies (e.g., case creation through arrest information from the sheriff, or initial charge information from the State’s Attorney). The extent to which these may require Clerk’s review and acceptance will depend on the type of information and the future direction of the Illinois Supreme Court. National trends strongly indicate this will move toward requiring little intervention, as long as the core function of case initiation can be exposed to outside entities.

**INDEXED SEARCH CAPABILITIES**

The Indexed Search Capability’s function creates and maintains indices usually based on case or person identifiers, that will allow an interested party the ability to track down a specific set of cases, or cases specific to an individual (e.g., a name index, a traffic ticket index, an index of wills in probate, etc.) for more detailed research and assessment. Depending upon the CMS cases/people reside on these indices for at least the duration of the case, and when possible, forever. The information that is displayed in these indices should also be able to be sorted and filtered. These indices are also useful in: identifying cases for differentiated management or time-sensitive processing, grouping related parties, conducting person background searches, and capturing secondary identifiers, etc.

**DOCKETING**

A docket is case specific. Docketing (i.e., creating a register of actions) involves those activities associated with creating the court record. A docket contains the core information about the case and the parties in the case, and chronologically lists the various actions that occur in a case’s history (i.e., the most recent or the oldest depending on user preferences). These actions can occur both outside and inside a hearing/trial (e.g., judge orders, bail/bond setting, filing of documents, scheduled events).
These events can be initiated by any of the parties, the Court Clerk’s Office, or Judicial Officers and their staff, e.g., the Electronic Court Operations (ECO) Suite enables the SAO and the Public Defender to create docs within ECO and have them auto populate the docket (the document, however, must be created through ECO, because neither the SAO nor the Public Defender’s Office has a CMS that can initiate the document at this time).

A state-of-the-art court CMS will also display the status of various participants within a case as relevant to the entire system (e.g., whether or not there is a warrant, protection order, immigration issue, sex offender issue). It will also display the status of that specific case, e.g., is it closed, on appeal, awaiting judgment, reopened. These person/case statuses are critical components of a registry of actions (ROA). It alerts the observer to items of immediate importance as they are relevant to a litigant or a case. In addition to the person and case status updates, the header for each case and person summary should also include some indicators related to that case or person that are not related to the status, but are related to something else an observer should note about that individual or case, e.g., is money owed the court from other cases in the system, an identified security risk, a need for an interpreter, a need for ADA accommodations. A sample of what specifically may be included on a docket include, but are certainly not limited to: basic demographics about the parties, core information about the case (e.g., the charges), court orders, the record of pleadings filed, financial information, bond information, judgment information, basic disposition information (which should include sentencing), and scheduled event information. For the most part, it is a listing of events by date, which may or may not provide specific details. More state-of-the-art systems allow users to double click on a listed event in a docket and retrieve the specific document(s), order(s), etc.

**SCHEDULING/CALENDARING**

This function includes activities associated with scheduling upcoming events, maintaining and displaying information on scheduled events, monitoring adherence to schedules, and establishing parameters for scheduling (e.g. number of events per time period, etc.). Scheduling events is merely a subcategory of what might appear on a docket, but it is significant enough to discuss separately because it is at the core of case tracking and caseflow management. Scheduled events, e.g., hearings and trials, appear on a docket along with other events, e.g., a State’s Attorney filing an indictment, local law enforcement locating a defendant on a warrant. The system should also allow for recusals.

State-of-the-art systems also have a component of scheduling which allows staff to identify available slots for hearings and then track those slots as they are assigned. This will allow Judges and clerks easy access to available slots while in the courtroom. This should replace the awkward paper calendars that drape courtrooms throughout the country. Contemporary e-filing systems should allow litigants to see available dates and make initial selections that may be reviewed by the Clerk’s Office and Judges before permanently assigning those slots, but if rules can be enforced need not be.
According to the NCSC Functional Requirements document, the calendaring function includes the creation, formatting, maintenance, and distribution of court calendars for each type of hearing and conference. In reality, calendaring is nothing more than an output of scheduled events, and for that reason we are combining the two NCSC functions into one category. Calendaring, therefore, encompasses the displaying of all proceedings in which arguments, witnesses, or evidence is considered by a judge, or other judicial officer in court events such as trials and hearings, appellate conferences, trial court conferences aimed at information gathering or pre-trial resolution, and Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) events. Some jurisdictions use calendars to display reminders on certain cases that need scheduled reviews for progress and assessments (e.g., submitting case management plans, reviewing the status of probate cases, etc.).

The scheduling of hearings and conferences (Scheduling Function) provides the source information for court calendars. Depending on the preferences of those who use the calendar, a calendar may or may not include other information relevant to that case (e.g., a State’s Attorney may want charges on the calendar). Calendars may be distributed in any number of ways, including but not limited to: e-mailing, exchange with another agency, posting on the Court’s web page, displaying the daily calendar on monitors located in the courthouse after litigants go through security, etc. The current JANO CMS does sort by courtroom and/or judge, but the calendar cannot be emailed or exchanged with another agency, nor posted directly to the web. It is, however, published to the Web for the public to utilize.

A contemporary method of displaying a calendar for the Judges would be for the Judges to see a daily list of all of the cases on their calendar for the day (time ordered). This “virtual calendar” would be available to the Judge/clerk each morning, and would be the automated version of having a stack of paper file folders stacked on the bench in order of the call. As a Judge double clicks on a case, the Judge is presented with the electronic docket and a list of all of the documents (grouped logically—motions with the relevant order). Judges/clerks could then double click on any document, and the imaged document would appear on the monitor; the current system does integrate scanned documents with case data. With better viewing of information on the screen at the bench, as well as new input devices that allow for easy interaction with the system, judges have greater access to calendar information than ever. When working properly, this obviates the need for paper in the courtroom (as well as all of the costs associated with managing the flow of that paper). Judges could add to this electronic file folder as necessary.

**DOCUMENT/FILE MANAGEMENT**

Although Illinois currently identifies the paper document as the official record of the court, the issue of identifying the well maintained (and backed up) electronic copy of a record as the official record of the court in certain case types needs to be addressed. This can be phased in as e-submission/e-filing gains ground in Illinois, and it is understood that pending further action by the Illinois Supreme Court, the paper document would still have to be maintained. The goal is to eliminate maintenance of both a paper and an electronic system—which can only increase costs with little perceptible benefits.
Records Management describes the activities associated with receiving, creating, storing, managing, tracking, archiving, and disposing of manual, electronic, and imaged case files and other documents. Much of this should be based on records retention manuals which specifically dictate (by either statute or court rule) how long specific documents in specific case types need to be maintained before they can be destroyed. Designing a records management system provides Kane County with an opportunity to review any record retention requirements, and determine if they should be different in automated records as opposed to manual records. A CMS should be intricately linked to a document management system (DMS). Anyone (obviously qualified by certain security parameters), should be able to navigate to a specific document through the CMS, and/or anyone should be able to get to the case in the CMS from the DMS.

The NCSC Functional Standards describe document creation and tracking activities as those that are associated with creating, storing, accessing, distributing (e.g., servicing documents to the litigants), and tracking court documents such as notices, orders, judgments through the use of some bar coding technologies linked to the CMS. The methods of distributing these documents include but are not limited to (1) those that typically require service by a law enforcement officer or other authorized process server with a return of service such as criminal and civil warrants, petitions, summons, and complaints; (2) those that are given or sent by mail to litigants with a proof or certificate of service such as notices and letters; and (3) those that are sent with no proof of service or used internally such as forms, letters, and brief reports.

The assumption supporting the development of the original functional standards is that communication outside of the court must be somewhat paper-based. While that might have been a realistic assumption at the time the standards were developed, the current trend is to do service electronically (especially for documents distributed after the initial service). Newer e-filing systems are working with local sheriffs and private service providers for them to be notified electronically when initial service is required. Subsequent service can be done through electronic notifications — all with a goal of migrating to a paper-on-demand environment.

An electronic DMS brings with it more than just a method for receiving, storing, tracking and retrieving documents, but it also needs to accommodate other functions that have existed in the paper world for centuries, but are now highlighted in the transition to electronic systems. For example, in the paper world, Judges are familiar with making copies of originals and scribbling their own notes on those copies and attaching yellow sticky notes to these originals as they are forwarded to their clerks and others for processing. Clerks are also dependent on some processes in the paper world that will need accommodations in the electronic document world, e.g., redaction, backup copies, date/time stamping, electronic signatures, etc. Although these are all functions within a DMS, they are important to note in CMS specifications/requirements to alert designers about what they are linking to via the CMS (e.g., marked up copies or originals or both).
A DMS should be used to store copies of relevant documents that are either created within the CMS, received electronically from external sources or uploaded through some sort of scanning process or document upload process. That being said, state-of-the-art systems are being designed that allow for the use of smart forms rather than an image-based DMS. The smart forms (or templates) are completed by the filing parties and the data, usually received in XML, is stored in the database of the CMS, and is tagged to a specific version of the smart form. The smart forms (or templates) are stored separately, and when someone needs a copy of the actual completed document, the CMS/DMS reconstruct the template with the relevant data to produce the “original” form. This system is much more efficient in terms of data entry, storage and transport through the network. Since all forms are not conducive to this approach, a DMS is still required to manage numerous original documents that will still need to be scanned.

The Kane County Circuit Court Clerk uses Real Vision Imaging (RVI) as a document management system (DMS) to retrieve and review the case file. Many Judges report that retrieving the files from RVI takes more time than manually reviewing a paper file. The existing DMS needs to be fully assessed to evaluate its compatibilities with the new CMS, and to fully examine its strengths and weaknesses, e.g., it needs to be able to save to a PDF format.

EXHIBIT MANAGEMENT
As with a DMS, exhibit management takes on some new dimensions in the electronic and/or paper-on-demand world. In the non-electronic business environment, exhibits were treated much like paper. It involved the receiving, placing into inventory, tracking, and returning or destroying of exhibits and other property gathered by the court (but not fixed assets and similar property of the court). Different courts had different timeframes within which they were managed dependent on the case types. When the exhibits were needed, someone physically retrieved them. The electronic business environment now requires that these exhibits be retrieved electronically, preferably from the CMS—much like documents are retrieved electronically from the DMS. This may involve requiring paper exhibits to be scanned or otherwise transformed into electronic documents and stored on an appropriate server, or physical objects being photographed and stored on that same server. The technologies can vary, but the link with the CMS should be maintained. The CMS should also be able to track the location/possession status of any physical property used as exhibits.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT
This function combines two functions outlined in the NCSC functional standards document, i.e., bookkeeping/accounting and receipting. The NCSC functional standards define bookkeeping/accounting as those activities associated with the financial recordkeeping and reporting performed during and at the end of a fiscal period (e.g. daily, weekly, monthly). These tasks include maintaining account, case, and person financial records; conducting internal and external funds transfers, invoicing, and other financial transactions; interfacing with receipting activities to exchange account and other financial information; and producing reconciliations, statements, reports, auditing changes, and other documents. This functional area speaks to the Court’s ability to reconcile the funds going into and out of the Court. It is clear from our conversations with the Court Clerk’s Office, that much of these financial
related transaction summaries occur in separate, standalone systems without integration to the JANO CMS (e.g., invoicing). These separate systems will need to be replaced with one single financial function within a new CMS.

The Accounting/Receiving Function addresses the collection of funds, issuing of receipts, posting of the receipts, cashier closeout and cashier management. Funds are collected from parties and their representatives who submit payments required by the court. Receiving functions can be performed at the cashiering station of the front counter in the Clerk’s Office if payments are made in person. Payments received electronically should be coded as such, and should be posted electronically to the CMS. The distribution of some fees to other relevant entities should be broken down automatically and distributed electronically. The new CMS must also be able to create, monitor and maintain payment plans—with associated interest. The system should comply with generally accepted accounting principles for state and local governments.

The Judges expressed a need for the system to provide online help regarding what fines and fees are related to what offenses to facilitate their ordering of the appropriate fines/fees amounts. This can best be accomplished through a feature of the system which auto populates the fines/fees data fields with the relevant amounts (that can be overwritten or waived if necessary).

**PRETRIAL HEARINGS/PROCESSING**

Many of the functions related to pretrial hearings and processing are currently managed by the Court Services Department, and in Kane County are more relevant to the new system being developed for the Court Services Department than to core functionality within the court CMS. These include functions like: bond setting recommendations, pre-plea setting negotiations, general adult and juvenile probation functions. Ultimately, this information should be transferred from the Court Services Department’s CMS to the Court’s CMS so it appears on the ROA (i.e., docket). The Clerk’s Office and the Judges will need to determine which of those data fields should appear as core data in the Court CMS (e.g., the bond setting date, the amount of the bond and the conditions of the bond).

**TRIALS AND THE OFFICIAL COURT RECORD FOR APPEAL**

The Hearings/Trials function describes activities associated with reaching a decision in scheduled events (e.g. trials, hearings, oral arguments, conferences, etc.), recording the results of these events (most likely done in a ROA), and notifying/distributing relevant information to the appropriate persons of court decisions. Hearings/trials include all proceedings in which arguments, and possibly witnesses, are heard, and evidence/exhibits may be introduced and examined by a judicial officer, or appellate panel. It also includes events through trial court disposition (e.g., pre-sentence investigations; preparing the record for appeal). The hearings function encompasses a number of in-court and post-court activities related to capturing and producing the official court record which may include: electronic digital recordings of the record, court reporting minutes, storing those records, copying the record for transcription and back-up, and making the official record available as requested by the parties, the public and other governmental entities. Links to these electronic records should be provided in a CMS.
FINDINGS/JUDGMENTS AND DISPOSITIONS
The Disposition function addresses activities associated with disposing a case, issues, parties, and/or charges/allegations in a case. In the trial courts, this includes any type of criminal disposition resulting from a court decision after jury or non-jury trial, guilty plea (e.g., by plea agreement), dismissal, bound over, transfer out to another jurisdiction, consolidation, nolo contendere, or bond forfeiture; or any type of disposition in other case types resulting from a jury or non-jury trial, mediation or arbitration, default dismissal, withdrawal, settlement, transfer out to another jurisdiction, or consolidation. In the appellate courts, disposition may be by decision (by published opinion, unpublished opinion, memorandum decision, order, per curiam affirmation, mandate, or other decision), dismissal, denied appeal, transfer, or other resolution.

POST JUDGMENT ACTIVITIES
Post judgment/verdict activities include all of those events that occur after the judge has issued the judgment/verdict in a case. These functions include hearings on enforcement, sentencing hearings, garnishment hearings, hearings/actions for cases that are reopened for any number of reasons. Case Closure is a function at the trial court level that can be simple, but is very important. It generally defines that stage in the process where the court has performed every function through judgment and has no more responsibilities unless there is post judgment activity. In some situations, it can also define the point at which the court is in a position where it cannot process anything else in a case due to some obstacle (e.g., the defendant is wanted and cannot be located). Sometimes a court will close the case to stop the clock from adding unnecessarily to the case’s age—these cases can be reopened when the warrant is served.

COMPLIANCE
This function supports post-disposition (i.e., post-conviction or post-judgment) activities associated with monitoring compliance with sentence and supervision conditions, terms of a court order for alimony, child support, restitution payments, or other judgments. Criminal courts may track post-conviction activities reactively (e.g., when notified by the adult probation department of non-compliance with supervision terms) or proactively (e.g., when follow-up action has been established for a sentence involving fine payments and/or restitution). The Clerk’s Office and the Judges will need to determine which of those data fields should appear as core data in the Court CMS.

APPEALS
A trial court CMS should provide an electronic copy of the official court record for appeal. This should include electronic links to all of the relevant documents and orders, the ROA (i.e., docket), the digital recording of hearing/trial proceedings—or transcripts, etc., and it should have the capacity to electronically transfer all relevant party and judgment information to the appropriate data fields in the appellate court CMS. Functional requirements for an appellate court CMS are still under development.

CONFIGURATION MANAGEMENT AND SECURITY
Configuration management is related to the extent to which the CMS has flexibility in the look/feel of the CMS (e.g., design layouts), and various other options on how it can be used (e.g., table
maintenance), and varies significantly among the vendors—some offer more flexibility than others in how their systems might be configured and maintained.

The security function provides for activities associated with ensuring the security and integrity of the CMS, its data, and its documents. It addresses the issue(s) of who gets what access to what information, using what strategy, and under what conditions. These security functions should be available at all times, both during and after normal operating hours. Establishing and maintaining the security function should be part of the CMS.

This could be implemented through a Virtual Private Network (VPN), or through a web enabled front end of any new CMS that is either developed or otherwise acquired. This function significantly enhances user efficiencies.

A CMS should also have the capability of routinely backing up its data as part of its disaster recovery function, as well as its high availability function. A CMS no longer is a standalone system. As Kane County migrates away from a paper business environment, and becomes more dependent on its automation, it becomes essential for the CMS to be recoverable in order to sustain adequate business continuity.

**ALERTS AND NOTIFICATIONS**
Alerts are the items that require the immediate attention of either someone in the Clerk’s Office or a Judge—they are usually date driven and are sometimes governed by statutes and rules (e.g., Speedy Trial dates). Notifications are more general announcements that include such items as the distribution of orders, the reassignment of counsel, the announcement of a new litigant in a case, etc. They are generally important, but not time sensitive and may or may not require action by someone in the Clerk’s Office or a Judge. Alerts and notifications may be distributed to internal customers as well as external entities.

**PERSON SUMMARY SCREENS**
A State-of-the Art CMS no longer just restates information specific to a case or individual. That information is important, and plays an important role in allowing courts to better track and manage individual cases. Decision makers, however, need much more than that in a highly mobile society. They want to know a person’s history in the system, e.g., in child neglect and abuse cases, decision makers want to know the background history of all participants in a case. In child support cases, decision makers want to know the history of all participants in other domestic relations/family court cases, etc.

While some of that information is currently collected through manual research, it is more often than not as sketchy, inaccurate, or incomplete. A solid CMS has a capacity to compile this summary information on a person through the use of person identifiers collected in the CMS. These links can be supplemented with personal knowledge of individuals/cases in the system, links made by other entities and agencies, and through algorithms of various person demographics (combinations of which include DOB, last name, middle initials, etc.). These person summary screens are incredibly useful to decision
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makers. This advisory tool should be but one of many available to the decision makers in enhancing the quality and timeliness of their decisions.

OPERATIONAL REPORTING
Operational reports can be defined as those output which are routinely produced to support the daily operations of the Clerk’s Office or Judges and their staff. They include such items as: production of daily calendars, receipts, orders and opinions, financial summaries and balance sheets, and printing of dockets.

Caseflow Management Reporting helps support Differentiated Case Management and contains a Business Intelligence component. Unlike operational reports, caseflow management reports are used by managers to move cases through the system in as timely a fashion as possible. These reports traditionally cover such subject areas as: lists of all open cases by case type; the average/median age of cases at disposition by case type; the average/median age of pending cases by case type; the number of continuances requested and granted by case type; a list of cases that are approaching a specified time frame (e.g., two weeks) from deadlines identified by speedy trial rules and ABA time processing standards; and a list of cases that have exceeded ABA time standards. In addition, statistical reporting may also be necessary to comply with State/Local reporting requirements (e.g., aggregate stats on the number of pending, new and terminated cases by case type). All reports should be available in the aggregate and supported by detailed reports (on request).

Users create reports through choosing options on a parameter screen that allow them to filter based on a set of relevant criteria dependent on the report, e.g., dates, judges, case types. Simple reports that do not significantly tap into the CPU can be run on demand, but more complex statistical reports may need to be run in batch during off hours. Users or administrators must be able to direct reports to a variety of output devices, such as screens, printers, files, etc. Court personnel should specify only the preprogrammed reports that satisfy a clearly defined management objective and are intended for regular use--excessive pre-programmed reports may prolong system development. In addition, the CMS must provide comprehensive report generation capabilities to permit users to produce additional reports easily on an ad hoc basis.

Most importantly, state-of-the-art systems are beginning to use the wealth of information stored in a CMS to develop some useful business intelligence, i.e., to identify some rule based behavior and program the CMS to make recommendations to the decision makers based on those rules and/or based on patterns of past behavior. For example, one might study the success or failure of bond decisions based on any number of defendant characteristics or situations, and then apply those findings to new cases awaiting decisions. The same logic might also be used in sentencing decisions, and drug court admissions. Rather than the decisions being made on intuition or speculation, the data related to past behavior would be systematically aggregated and then based on the characteristics of the existing case, and the CMS would recommend courses of action for the decision maker. This function can either be a
module within a CMS, or built later using other business intelligence tools that might draw on the data warehouse that is currently being built in Kane County.

Another function of an efficient court CMS is a dashboarding component. It is an aggregate display function that provides administrators and other decision makers, with a quick one page graphical glance at the overall health of the system or their individual workload. Users would be greeted with this presentation right after the sign on page each day. This function should be tailored to the individual needs of a user, e.g., a Judge might want to see lists of cases that need their attention that day, an average age of their cases compared to those of the rest of the court, the number of pending cases on their calendar vs. the rest of the court, how their caseload is broken down by case type (in a pie chart), the average age of their pending cases compared to the rest of the court, etc. Administrators and Clerks of Court might have a different view.

**JUDGE INTERFACE**

Judges should have remote access to the CMS. This could be implemented through a Virtual Private Network (VPN), or through a web enabled Judge Interface integrated with any new CMS that is either developed or otherwise acquired. This function significantly enhances user efficiencies.

As with many of the other functions, this one has its roots in the evolution of a CMS. In the paper world, judges took notes on a legal pad, a filed document or some other artifact from the paper world, and wrote orders on forms or blank documents and worked out of the paper file. Judges must have the option of interfacing with the electronic file supporting the need for related information and the workflow. This function must be made available to judicial officers in a CMS. Availability to these notes must also be secure, but access to these notes on a case might be delegated to someone else at the discretion of the Judge. The look and feel of this function can vary from enabling Judges to type their notes and orders directly into a secured module on the CMS, to enabling Judges to use the handwriting function offered by tablets and have them integrated into that.

---

**Court Technology Framework**

Beyond CMS functionality, it is important to step back and look at the “big picture” regarding potential technologies, standards and business goals. The Court Technology Framework (CTF) is a concept developed by the Joint Technology Committee (JTC) and the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) as a tool to provide context for existing, and identification of possible new, technology standards initiatives for the courts community.

The JTC has outlined the following goals and objectives for the CTF:

1. Provide an organized view of the increasingly complex landscape of technologies and related standards;
2. Define a standard set of components and interfaces that make up a comprehensive court IT environment;
3. Help courts more readily identify opportunities for improved efficiency and cost savings through the use of technology; and
4. Promote alignment of IT initiatives with business goals of the court.

same Judge notes module of the CMS. Many offer the capability for Judges to still take handwritten notes and orders having those sheets scanned into the appropriate module of the CMS.

DATA QUALITY
Data quality reflects on the following characteristics of the information stored in a database: (1) its accuracy (e.g., are the dates correct, are the amounts in the financial module correct), (2) its validity (i.e., is it measuring what it needs to be measuring?), (3) its completeness (e.g., is all of the available person identifying information available) and (4) its timeliness (e.g., are warrants and orders of protection entered within a certain time window after the judge order). The absence of any one of those four components can render system output useless, or at best problematic.

Designing a well thought-out system and database architecture is vital to ensuring high quality data. Couple those design features with enhanced data validation checks, and the requirement for high quality data integrity is achieved. Systems that do not accommodate for high quality data in the design phase of the CMS are destined to ultimately yield poor quality and unusable system outputs.

Two essential components of a data quality function are: (1) The system’s ability to track and log the history of data values entered into each data field (e.g., addresses, charges in criminal cases); and (2) the system’s ability to log all edits to any critical data field (e.g., adds, modifications and deletes to financial entries).

INFRASTRUCTURE FOR THE PUBLIC AND OTHER ENTITIES TO ACCESS CMS DATA
Access to court data by non-court entities is becoming increasingly important. Providing others access to court data reduces the need of court staff to answer questions on the phone, through the mail, or through requests over the counter—this is a huge advantage as staffing resources diminish. Although not part of the core court CMS, the function of allowing non-court entities to access court data needs to be technically architected for implementation at a time after the core court CMS is deployed.

INFRASTRUCTURE TO TRANSFER DATA WITH NON-COURT ENTITIES
Technically architecting the CMS to facilitate in-bound and out-bound data transfers is also essential to save the Clerk’s Office resources in the long run. Although not part of the core court CMS, the function of structuring the CMS and database for real-time data transfers, which are compliant with national standards, needs to be technically architected for implementation at a time after the core court CMS is deployed.

INFRASTRUCTURE TO FACILITATE E-FILING
The demand for an e-filing function is increasing exponentially as courts recognize their role in more efficiently and effectively managing paper flow in the business environment. Although not yet part of the core court CMS, it too needs to be technically architected, based on national e-filing standards, for implementation at a time after the core court CMS is deployed.
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When possible, the core functions above should exist in a single CMS. Separate linked systems supporting different court functions should be avoided. The Clerk’s current CMS, i.e., JANO, is a legacy CMS that no longer satisfies the needs of the Clerk’s Office, the Judiciary, or other partnering agencies and needs to be replaced within the next several years. Since the court CMS serves as the core for many other adjunct system interfaces, replacing the court CMS should be the number one focus of available resources. The question should no longer be whether or not to replace JANO (an unsupported system), but how to fund the development, deployment and maintenance of a new CMS given available resources, and how to stage this over the next several years. Again, depending on resources it may have to be incremental. This may involve prioritizing the functions outlined above.

In procuring a new CMS, care should be taken not to simply automate a bad business practice, nor lose functionality that is currently in place. This situation should be viewed as an opportunity to review existing practices and maintain the ones that are solid, change the ones that need adjusting, and discard the ones that do not take advantage of the capabilities the new technology offers. The Clerk’s Office has re-engineered its business processes in the past in order to take advantage of technological advancements, so this will not be the first time that such a business assessment will be undertaken. This knowledge should be used in conjunction with the Judiciary to ensure that the new CMS meets future needs.

Although, in the ideal world where resources are plentiful, Kane County can afford to find a system that tailors itself to detailed business needs specific to Kane County. In the practical world of limited resources, Kane County may have to compromise and subsequently adjust some of its business practices to accommodate the offerings of a software application. This too is something requiring detailed analysis so as not to compromise core business practices for the sake of automation, but also recognizing that the benefits accrued from a new court CMS might outweigh the costs of maintaining some less essential business practices.

Specifications and requirements for this new CMS should be developed jointly by the Clerk’s Office and the Judicial Officers, particularly where they support the capabilities or responsibilities of the Judiciary.

**RECOMMENDED PUBLIC INTERFACE FUNCTIONS**

This section describes functions/applications supported by the Clerk’s Office that it should perform, but would not necessarily be part of a core CMS. In most cases, they would interact with the CMS at the service (business capability) level to keep all of the court information in one place and not create silos.

Once a new CMS has met the above core functionality requirements, it needs to address functionality for the general public and private attorneys, including access to court information, the ability to respond to court action, and the ability to initiate an action with the court. These public interfaces are intended to improve internal business processes as well as the customer service experience. Recognizing the need
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to provide this functionality, the Clerk’s Office has been addressing the public interface requirements by developing adjunct applications. These applications interface with JANO to the degree it will allow.

The public interfaces should include the following functions:

- **Public access to data in a docket and to public documents, in accordance with Illinois statutes and court rules.**
- **Ability for the public to plead and pay for certain offenses.**
- **An e-filing system that allows the public and private attorneys to file their documents electronically and enables intelligent filing of data driven documents.**

### Recommendations:

- **Public facing web applications will either need to be replaced or interfaced with the new CMS to meet recommended standards.**
- **Any electronic filing (e-filing) application the Clerk employs should be conformant to the ECF standard.**

### PUBLIC ACCESS TO INFORMATION

This function allows the public to obtain court information through various methods. These methods - most often take the form of a web application or Kiosks in the courthouse. The public would be able to view information and documents, which have been authorized for public access. This function requires the ability to redact data, documents and specific data within a document. The information would also need to be searchable through various indices such as litigant name and case number. The web application should be able to interface with the business layer of the CMS, taking advantage of core CMS business rules and the DMS. It is not uncommon for courts to charge the public a nominal fee for this service.

The Clerk currently extends information to the public through the Integrated Voice Response (IVR) system and the JANO public web access. The IVR allows the public to obtain information regarding traffic and civil cases. The public web access provides access to forms and answers to frequently asked questions. The Clerk does have plans to allow attorney access to limited court information online, as authorized by Supreme Court policy.

### PUBLIC ABILITY TO RESPOND TO COURT ACTION

This function provides the public with the ability to interact with the courts in order to submit information. The primary capability this provides the public is the ability to plead a charge and pay any fines or fees through a web based application. This would access the same core functionality in the CMS as if the person was in court or at the counter and the clerk had entered the information.

The Clerk has stood up the e-pay / e-guilty application to provide this capability. This application currently interfaces with the JANO system.
PUBLIC ABILITY TO INITIATE COURT ACTION
This function allows the public to remotely access filing services provided by the court. This function includes the ability to initiate petitions for emergency orders of protection all the way through filing documents in civil case types.

This functionality is intended to take full advantage of the CMS business layer as it pertains to the core functions of accepting filings, indexing, docketing, scheduling, notifying etc. The functionality should allow rule based access to CMS functionality, while limiting the need for clerk review or intervention, unless otherwise directed by court rules. The advent of data driven documents (smart forms) provides the CMS with the data required to accept the filing and act upon it.

To be clear, this functionality is more than providing PDFs with limited information. Many first generation e-filing applications simply provide an image of the document and a limited set of data. While this expedites the transport of the documents into electronic form, it does not alleviate the need for clerk intervention and review, nor does it give the public real-time access to court services.

There have been very specific electronic court filing standards developed based upon the more general justice information sharing standards. These standards allow for not only web based applications to interface with the CMS but also for law firms case management systems to file directly without reentry.

The Clerk’ Office has or is planning to sponsor, develop, or host a number of adjunct applications to provide e-file functionality for the public and private attorneys. The outside attorneys create the filing, the Judiciary reviews, and the clerk needs to docket and keep the record.

Combined, these current projects do not achieve our recommended filing solution for parties to the court; in order to do so, the filing agencies would have to acquire their own CMS’s in order to file documents through their own applications. Once a new CMS has met the above core functionality requirements, it needs to address application functionality for the general public and private attorneys, including e-Pay, e-Guilty, e-Filing, etc. that are currently being addressed by adjunct applications. These adjunct applications are intended to improve internal business processes as well as the customer service experience. Recognizing the current limitations of JANO, the Clerk’s Office has been addressing the public interface requirements by developing many of these ancillary applications.

Recommendations:
- Clerk’s CMS must accommodate the technical architecture that will facilitate data sharing/exchanges in its workflow.
- Agencies should share information system to system not through applications provided by another agency.
- Current justice agency interface applications such as ECO only continue with what is now in production.
Public-facing systems could be acquired to improve the customer service experience and allow the general public to conduct court business, without physically driving to the court facility. These public-facing functions should be implemented after the core functions are operational.

Given the limited technical resources available to the Clerk’s Office and the amount of time required to produce specifications and requirements for a new CMS, public interface applications which are already deployed should be maintained. However, any public interface applications that are not conformant to the Global Reference Architecture (GRA) and/or ECF (for e-filing) should either be modified or replaced in anticipation of the new CMS.

RECOMMENDED JUSTICE AGENCY INTERFACE FUNCTIONS

The basic premise of an interface with partnering agencies is the need to eliminate unnecessary or redundant data entry, improve business needs and staff efficiencies, enhance public and officer safety, as well as, promote applications capable of GRA conformance and interoperability standards. In this scenario, the Court/Clerk plays a key role in defining the incoming and outgoing data requirements for these inter-agency data exchanges and information sharing initiatives.

This section describes functions related to agencies that interact with the court, but are not part of the court. It is imperative that these agencies have the ability to interact with the court on a data level through their in-house system and not be required to re-enter information into a system provided by the court.

There are several adjunct systems that have been developed, or are in development, that include functions that are performed by outside entities. The adjunct systems that extend to other agencies are the online services portal, ECO suite and electronic citations. Since these systems include functions that are performed by outside agencies; the outside agencies should be involved in the creation of the exchange requirements. The other agency systems will need to be able to accept information from the court through exchanges, so they do not have to reenter information into their native system, as well as the one provided by the courts.

These exchanges are described in-depth in next section, and the important point to consider is that the CMS should be able to expose its functionality to accept filings, schedule events, query information, notify, etc. to the authorized justice agencies and personnel. This does not mean that the court must expose the CMS screens or a web based application to agency personnel, it means allowing the agency systems to interface with this functionality. This allows the agencies to maintain their capabilities to create documents within their own systems.
The new Clerk’s CMS must accommodate the technical architecture that will facilitate the workflow and data sharing/exchanges compiled by the Clerk, the Judiciary, SAO, the Public Defender, the Sheriff’s Office, and Court Services. Meanwhile, the case management systems for partnering agencies must be built to meet their specific and unique business needs. Information types the CMS must be designed to share include, but are not limited to:

10. Warrants  
11. Orders of Protection  
12. Scheduled Court Events  
13. Court Orders/Sentencing Orders  
14. Custody Status  
15. Service and Summons  
16. Criminal Charges  
17. Dispositions  
18. Child Support Information

**JUSTICE INFORMATION SHARING INITIATIVE**

The overall vision for justice technology and information sharing in Kane County is for information to be entered into an information system at the originating point, as part of IT supporting the existing criminal justice workflow. From there, the idea is that information would not have to be rekeyed, and would flow to other agencies as part of, and in support of, the day-to-day business process of the criminal justice system. In this environment, technology and case management applications are not used after the fact, but are an indispensable tool on which all criminal justice practitioners rely to handle their day-to-day responsibilities. Other than the Sheriff’s RMS and JMS, no other county justice agency has a robust case management system that supports their line of business. There are limited Access databases used to track various case activities but nothing that could be called a comprehensive system.

This vision requires that all parties within the Kane County justice enterprise develop a deep understanding of business issues and workflow, and for the enterprise to rely on contemporary case management applications that use open source and standards-based technologies to facilitate workflow and information sharing. This approach is fully supported by the national standards efforts put forward by the Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative (GLOBAL) and the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance.

To achieve this vision in Kane County, a significant shift must occur: all agencies must have the ability to create documents and share information as part of their day-to-day business process. No longer will paper documents – either from a form, scan, email, or .PDF, be sent from one agency to another with the receiving agency needing to rekey that data into their own system of record.
Once an agency inputs the information at the beginning of the process, a document can be created without re-entering the information or scanning. At any point in the process the information can be formatted and printed, if needed.

While there is widespread consensus that the existing Court CMS should be replaced, moving toward a new CMS product will require changes not only in the internal court business process, but also among other members of the criminal justice community that interact with the courts, in moving from paper to automated exchange of information. In order for the new Court CMS to be successful, users need to “buy in” to this notion of change. The new CMS needs to come from a well-established case management vendor that has a significant install base in several states to ensure long term viability and support for the technology. The lack of this ongoing relationship with the current vendor has contributed to the challenges currently being faced in Kane County with the Court CMS.

Technically speaking, Kane County should look for a case management product that has layers: database layer, business layer, and user interface layer. In many products that are commercially available, the database layer and business layer are well designed and have been adapted to meet current court requirements over time.

The business layer and data layer in the JANO system are not salvageable. The data layer was not designed well and does not allow for cross case reporting, or the addition of sophisticated business logic (layer). The system was designed top to bottom for screen entry and views of a single case, and while much of the data entry is code-based, there are many fields that are text based, with little database integrity built in.

Kane County should consider the aspects of a Differentiated Case Management (DCM) system, and determine whether this methodology is being employed today, and whether or not it should be explored for future case processing within the new court system.

**INFORMATION SHARING VISION**

One of the key recommendations for next steps in Kane County is the need to implement a Court CMS that can interface and readily share information with other justice agencies in Kane County. The true benefit of a robust CMS is the ability to electronically share information with other agency information systems, so that information is shared at key decision points throughout the justice process. Moreover, it is not just the sharing of information, or data, that is critical, but also the notation of services, and exposed functionality, that will create great efficiencies to the justice community as a whole.
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To that end, there are national standards in place regarding both the architecture, interoperability and data standards necessary to integrate justice information systems. This section will highlight overall premises of information sharing put forward by URL Integration. In addition, it will describe the benefits of information sharing, highlighting the increased efficiency and reliability of information, as well as its immediate availability to users, among others. Finally, it will briefly describe the national technical standards in justice information sharing, such as the Global Reference Architecture (GRA) and the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM).

**KANE COUNTY INFORMATION EXCHANGE ANALYSIS**

**PROJECT BACKGROUND**

As a result of URL’s initial findings (results included in this document), it was determined that a more in-depth assessment of the justice environment – agency workflow, information flow between agencies, and technical infrastructure – was required in order to determine the core issues related to the CMS.

In April of 2011, URL conducted a series of four Information Exchange Meetings with all agency representatives to identify and prioritize the near-term and wide range of information exchanges that occur within the Kane criminal justice community.

1) Session I – Focused on law enforcement-related workflows - from Calls for Service (CFS) through investigations and sending charging information to the State’s Attorney for consideration.
2) Session II – Focused on the filing/court process, up until sentencing/post-disposition court events.
3) Session III - Focused on the post-disposition court and supervision process.
4) Session IV – Prioritization of information exchanges and obstacles to implementing those exchanges.

The following documentation provides a high-level overview of Kane County’s justice environment, including observations and recommendations on the current Clerk’s CMS, core requirements and agency-specific CMS needs, information sharing and exchange requirements, and the proposed technical architecture and approach, including costs and timeline.

The Kane County CMS Assessment Project goes beyond analysis of an appropriate CMS for the Circuit Clerk’s Office in Kane County to assist the County criminal justice practitioners and leaders in planning for and implementing cross-agency information sharing between the courts and criminal justice partner agencies. The goal of this aspect of the project is to identify the workflow between agencies to prioritize cross-agency information sharing, which will increase the accuracy and timeliness of important criminal justice system information throughout the enterprise, resulting in a safer community and a more efficient administration of criminal justice resources countywide.
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To facilitate this process, URL Integration convened four meetings to discuss information exchanges within the criminal justice system. The first meeting was held on April 12th and 13th and focused on law enforcement-related workflows — from Calls for Service (CFS) all the way through investigations and sending charging information to the State’s Attorney for consideration. The second meeting, held on April 19th and 20th, focused on the filing/court process. The third meeting focused on the post-disposition process, and was held on May 3rd and 4th. Finally, the fourth meeting was held on June 16th, and looked at the criminal justice process as a whole in order to identify priority information exchanges, and obstacles to implementing those exchanges.

During the first three meetings, representatives from the Circuit Clerk’s Office, SAO, Public Defender’s Office, Sheriff’s Office, Court Services (including Juvenile Court Services), Kane County Diagnostic Center, and the Juvenile Justice Center (JJC), discussed information that is collected during the criminal justice process and how it is collected. The group talked in detail about the criminal justice partner agencies to which information is sent and how it is sent currently — whether electronically or on paper. These conversations elicited information about business process improvements that could be supported in an automated environment, as well as any gaps in the current business process.

During the fourth meeting, the group was able to set priorities. In other words, the discussion centered on the types of paper exchanges that could be automated to provide the greatest cost-savings and/or efficiencies within the County. In addition, meeting participants were able to identify obstacles and alternative approaches to implement these exchanges in the near term.

**METHODOLOGY**

Bringing together information from disparate agencies requires adherence to commonly agreed-upon goals and objectives for the integrated justice environment. According to SEARCH, Integration in the Context of Justice Information Systems: A Common Understanding, there are several fundamental principles that underlie an integrated justice environment:

- Information is captured at the originating point, rather than reconstructed later.
- Information is captured once and reused, rather than re-captured when needed again.
- Integrated systems fulfilling these functions are comprised of, or derived from, the operational systems of the participating agencies; they are not separate from the systems supporting the agencies.
- Justice organizations retain the right to design, operate, and maintain systems to meet their own operational requirements. However, as with any network capability, participants must meet agreed-upon data, communication and security requirements, and standards in order to participate.
- Whenever appropriate, standards will be defined, with user input, in terms of performance requirements and functional capabilities, rather than hardware and software brand names.
Security and privacy are priorities in the development of integrated justice capabilities and in the determination of standards. Integration builds on current infrastructure and incorporates capabilities and functionality of existing information systems, where possible.

These concepts of information sharing, along with application of national standards, provide the framework for optimum information sharing at both the county and state levels.

URL Integration uses proven methodologies to capture the information flow between agencies, leveraging the Justice Information Exchange Model (JIEM) developed by SEARCH, the National Consortium of Justice Research and Statistics. The JIEM methodology was used during this project to identify 390 criminal justice (as well as justice related) information exchanges in Kane County (see Appendix A for complete set of exchanges). For the Kane County project, URL defined the following dimensions for each of the 390 exchanges:

- One or more sending agencies
- One or more receiving agencies
- The prevailing process
- The subsequent process
- The triggering event
- The subsequent event
- Conditions under which the exchange takes place
- Documents (and a link to the structure of the documents) representing the information being exchanged

The Kane County CMS Assessment Project goes beyond the assessment of identifying a CMS solution for the Circuit Clerk. The process included the recognition and prioritization of workflow and exchanges between partnering agencies, in order to take advantage of the role information sharing now plays in the automation of court and justice processes.

4 For more information, go to http://www.search.org/programs/info/jiem/.
Exchange documentation included:

- How and what information is collected during the criminal justice process
- How and what information is sent to partnering agencies – electronically and via paper
- Gaps in the current business process
- Improvements that could be supported in an automated environment – paper to electronic, cost savings, and efficiencies
- Obstacles and alternate approaches to exchange implementation

### STAKEHOLDER IDENTIFIED EXCHANGE PRIORITIES

On June 16, 2010, representatives from the Circuit Clerk’s Office, Judiciary, Court Services, SAO, Sheriff’s Office, and Public Defender’s Office met to discuss and identify Kane County’s top priorities for information exchange. The group identified the following specific documents and processes as priorities:

- Arrest Reports /Case Reports
- Warrants
- Charging Documents (Felony, Misdemeanor)
- Traffic Citations
- Continuance Orders /Court Orders /Sentence Orders
- Pre-Sentence Investigation (PSI) Reports
- Orders of Protection
- Dispositions (including Prosecutor Disposition)
- Notification of Transport to Court
- Electronic Monitoring/GPS (removal/hookup)
- Supplemental Arrest/Case Reports
- PSI Order
- Order for Bond Report
- Defendant Status Query – LEA would query court
- Address Updates

For more detailed information on the stakeholder identified priorities, please refer to Appendix G.

For implementation purposes, we have broken these priority and the other exchanges into groups of four phases. The intention is to implement this incrementally staggering the design and implementation into consecutive years. The groups are as follows with the Circuit Clerk CMS falling under Court:
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### Phase I Exchanges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sending Agency</th>
<th>Receiving Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff/LEA</td>
<td>Court Services/SAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff/LEA</td>
<td>Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff/LEA</td>
<td>SAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Query comes from Jail</td>
<td>Query Into Court CMS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase II Exchanges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sending Agency</th>
<th>Receiving Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Court Services/SAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>PD/Sheriff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>Court Services/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>Sheriff/LEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase III Exchanges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sending Agency</th>
<th>Receiving Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Phase IV Exchanges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sending Agency</th>
<th>Receiving Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEA/Sheriff</td>
<td>SAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA/Sheriff</td>
<td>Judge/Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAO</td>
<td>Judge/Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>LEA/Sheriff/Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA/Sheriff</td>
<td>DOC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDED INFORMATION SHARING STANDARDS**

**GLOBAL REFERENCE ARCHITECTURE (GRA)**

In 2004, the US Department of Justice’s GLOBAL Infrastructure/Standards Working Group endorsed Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA) as a recommended strategy for integrating justice information systems.

SOA promises many benefits to both state and local jurisdictions. It promotes the sharing of information in a manner that maximizes the ability of partners to change business processes and technology solutions rapidly at minimum cost. It also gives justice partners a set of tools that allow them to share infrastructure by identifying where interoperability is important, thus enabling them to make smart investments. Finally, SOA offers the promise of an overarching umbrella framework that demonstrates how all of GLOBAL’s work products fit together as a cohesive approach to improving information sharing.

The GRA conceptual framework includes the following:

- A methodology for identifying what services—exchange points—a jurisdiction should develop to solve some identified business problem.
- A standard for describing services so they can be used, understood, and consumed across jurisdictions.
- Recommended requirements for infrastructure necessary to support SOA.
- Technical communications protocols based on industry standards such as web services and XML, for transmitting information as messages between justice partners and their systems.
Guidelines for governing and managing an SOA in a jurisdiction—how to assign decision rights and responsibilities for implementing elements of an SOA.\(^5\)

Reference service specifications for common capabilities within criminal justice. These references provide a baseline functionality that can be reused to enable the rapid implementation of jurisdiction specific services. A key component to these service specifications are service profiles that define the medium for messaging transport, such as web services, as well as those messaging components needed to ensure interoperability. For web service profiles for example, compliance with the Web Services Interoperability Specifications are required in addition to any other specifications set forth in the profile.

The GRA is a description of the important concepts in a justice information sharing architecture and of the relationships between those concepts. The GRA also identifies, at a high level, the kinds of components (software systems, hardware infrastructure, policies, practices, intersystem connections, and so on) necessary to bring those concepts to life in a particular context. The GRA is generally not specific enough to govern the implementation of any individual software system implementation. Rather, it is a framework for guiding implementations in general, with the aim of standardizing or harmonizing certain key aspects of those implementations to support reusability or interoperability.\(^6\)

### Capabilities:

The GRA discusses the concept of capabilities that justice system partners provide one another. Capabilities are agency-specific and should be well defined within the County, so that one agency does not impose upon another’s inherent capabilities. For instance, as part of the criminal justice process, the SAO files charging documents with the Circuit Clerk. Filing of criminal complaints, either by paper or electronically, would fall under the SAO’s capability, and should not become a function of the Circuit Clerk. In Kane County, the SAO does not currently have this capability due to the lack of a comprehensive CMS in the office. That has resulted in the Clerk’s Office development of an application to allow for filing of complaints. The Circuit Clerk has attempted to bridge an obvious gap and should be commended for doing so, but the gap must be addressed within the State’s Attorney’s Office.

The GRA is very clear on the point that it is “not possible for one partner or set of partners to dictate to others how to conduct their business, what information systems they use, how they store information, and so on.”\(^7\) Criminal justice agencies are independent and autonomous, and sharing of information between criminal justice systems should minimize implementation dependencies between them. The GRA encourages information sharing based on open industry standards, rather than on approaches that are proprietary to one specific partner.

---


\(^7\) Global Reference Architecture Specification, Version 1.8, April 2011, pages 4-5.
The GRA identifies several types of capabilities to help identify where certain capabilities should be deployed, as well as define relationships to other capabilities and services. To that end, the following discussion introduces a very specific capability, known as an intermediary.

**Intermediaries:**
An intermediary is in itself a capability, which physically resides between agency systems and facilitates the exchange of messages between those systems. Agency systems are often referred to as providers and consumers of information; the provider system makes the data available for the consumer system, and most participant agencies are both providers and consumers of information. The intermediary is responsible for five identified types of mediation: message routing, orchestration, validation, interception and transformation.

**NATIONAL INFORMATION EXCHANGE MODEL (NIEM)**
NIEM, the National Information Exchange Model, is a partnership of the U.S. Department of Justice, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. It is designed to develop, disseminate and support enterprise-wide information exchange standards and processes that can enable jurisdictions to effectively share critical information in emergency situations, as well as support the day-to-day operations of agencies throughout the nation.

NIEM enables information sharing, focusing on information exchanged among organizations as part of their current or intended business practices. The NIEM exchange development methodology results in a common semantic understanding among participating organizations and data formatted in a semantically consistent manner. NIEM will standardize content (actual data exchange standards), provide tools, and managed processes.

NIEM builds on the demonstrated success of the Global Justice XML Data Model. Stakeholders from relevant communities work together to define critical exchanges, leveraging the successful work of the GJXDM. More information is available at [http://www.niem.gov/](http://www.niem.gov/).

**SERVICE SPECIFICATION PACKAGES**
GRA solutions to information exchanges are made up of a combination of the connection method (often web services), the exchange language (use of NIEM), and the security specifications (encryption at the transport layer, data layer, etc.). These specifications are packaged into a GRA solution that can be customized to meet an individual organization’s needs. A repository of Reference Service Specification Packages (SSPs) for information exchange in the justice community is being established.

**ELECTRONIC COURT FILING (ECF) STANDARD**
ECF, the Electronic Court Filing Version 4.0, is a specification developed primarily through efforts of the OASIS LegalXML Electronic Court Filing Technical Committee (ECF TC) and endorsed by the Joint Technology Committee. Its latest version, 4.0 is based on NIEM.
The ECF standardizes general common filing behaviors for courts and defines them as a set of services that work together between courts and attorneys. The ECF TC has developed specifications for the use of XML to create and transmit legal documents from an attorney, party or pro se litigant to a court, from a court to an attorney, party or pro se litigant or to another court, and from an attorney or other user to another attorney or other user of legal documents.

It is the application of these concepts that will best facilitate sharing of information between the Circuit Clerk’s Office, Judiciary, Sheriff’s Office, SAO, Public Defender’s Office and Court Services. These concepts do, however, require that each agency has a CMS in place that will allow for the automated exchange of information between systems. The proposed architecture will allow for the ability to bring all agencies into the countywide initiative and for the staged implementation of future exchanges.

**RECOMMENDED TECHNICAL ARCHITECTURE**

This recommendation proposes a service-oriented architecture (SOA), specifically GRA conformant, that clearly delineates the functions related to the relevant stakeholders. The exchanges that Kane County has prioritized during the assessment will be used to identify common business processes across the enterprise and will be implemented as common services with identified exchanges using NIEM-conformant messages. The messages will be triggered by a business event at the sending agency, sent to the receiving agency, and processed into their application. The architecture will also support error handling, as defined by endpoint agencies involved in the exchange. In proposing this technical solution, we recommend the use of web services as the technical implementation of the GRA.

URL’s proposed solution will use products and tools that meet key standards and best practices in the justice community, and will not be dependent on any one vendor’s proprietary solution. URL firmly believes that the County’s business process is unique and while there are reusable specifications and artifacts that can be leveraged to make the job easier, the “heavy lifting” with this process is not around fitting the technology into the current business process but adapting the new technology and business process to take full advantage of the capabilities it offers. By leveraging standards, there is a much better chance that potential vendors will be able to competitively meet the County’s requirements.

We recommend that the servers and storage devices for the new systems, including any intermediaries, be housed in County IT. This will require a shift over time of resources to support the new equipment. The respective agencies will be responsible for the applications and decisions pertaining to the maintenance of these applications.
A high level architecture defining the key components is shown below with descriptions of each component.

Intermediary
Central to the ideology of service oriented architectures is the notion of an intermediary. It is the intermediary and not the applications or web portals that ultimately control the functions of message routing, guaranteed message delivery and other core functions necessary for a robust implementation of an SOA. In a services environment, these intermediaries are commonly referred to as an Enterprise Service Bus (ESB), however there are more components required in addition to the ESB that allow for all the capabilities described below. These are often packaged in a suite of tools, with the ESB being one of them. ESBs and accompanying suites are commercially available as well as available through open source organizations. URL recommends the County only consider ESBs that have demonstrated full compatibility with the current Web Services Interoperability Standards.

Intermediary Services and Registry
In addition, there are services implemented as web services conforming to the Global Reference Architecture (GRA) Service Implementation Profile. The services a business chooses to develop and expose reside in this layer. This service exposure layer also provides for the mechanism to take
enterprise scale components, business unit specific components, and in some cases, project-specific components, and externalizes a subset of their interfaces in the form of service descriptions. Thus, the enterprise components provide service realization at runtime using the functionality provided by their interfaces. The interfaces get exported out as service descriptions in this layer wherever they are exposed for use. They can exist in isolation or as a composite service.

These services can be loosely grouped into categories. The exchange web services form the backbone of integrating all of the disparate agencies across the county and also with the state. They are identified through the exchange and business process analysis efforts. The information required for the disparate systems to implement a unique exchange is defined in a Service Specification Package (SSP). SSPs are made up of a combination of the connection method (in this case web services), the exchange language (use of NIEM), and the security specifications (encryption at the transport layer, data layer, etc.). There have been some SSPs developed that can be reused from jurisdiction to jurisdiction with conformant modifications for any unique business needs. Custom exchange SSPs can reuse or extend existing NIEM Information Exchange Package Documents (IEPDs) which define the data exchanged. These are the means of communicating information across the county enterprise.

A special category of exchange services are those that implement the necessary Electronic Court Filing (ECF) 4.0 specifications. The ECF specification dictates a conceptual architecture to facilitate all of the messaging exchanges needed in support of court filings by attorneys, as well as pro se litigants in both civil and criminal cases. ECF 4.0 is the NIEM 2.0 conformant version of the specification.

Monitoring services implement common functions relevant to health and usage metrics at low levels, as well as at application levels, for providing consistent data relating to business concerns ranging from machine capacity to exchange delivery metrics. Document management services relate to those functions dealing with the storage and usage of paper documents as well as those functions that would be critical to transition into a paper on demand system when the state is ready.

Reporting services would include operations that would be common to report generation such as data collection, format conversion, printing, etc. This service could work in conjunction with a data warehouse representing a consistent view of the court database of record. Its use would be shared among the System Admin Web Application, the Public Access Web Portal and the Justice Query and Reporting Web Application, and any other applications that were identified as needing it.

In addition to the services, a registry is included to facilitate discovery of the various services in place on the intermediary by the endpoints and vice-versa. This improves enterprise robustness by eliminating configuration that would otherwise be needed for the applications to know what services they need in support of their own internal business process flow.
**Business Process Composition and Orchestration**

The business workflows and orchestration primarily implement those portions of the business processes that are relevant to actually sending data to integration partners for the purposes of enterprise-wide business process automation. Business logic relating to making routing decisions, as well as making use of any of the other services to accomplish minor or complex business processes are located here, and are implemented using the necessary web services adjunct specifications such as Business Process Execution Language (BPEL) and Choreography. These specifications assure portable logic that is not tied to a specific vendor’s intermediary. Individual services are bundled into a flow through orchestration or choreography, and thus act together as a single application. These applications support specific use cases and business processes.

**Operational Systems Level**

The Operational Systems Level is the sum total of all applications, supporting the unique business functions of the various stakeholders. It includes case management systems, records management systems, jail management systems, and other packaged web based applications for public or non-specific users, as well as business intelligence applications. Each of these operational systems has a distinct delineation of functionality based on the relevant participants in the enterprise.

The court record management application, its business layer, and database implement only those case management functions and business processes necessary for managing and retaining the court database of record and are wholly independent of the other stakeholders. This application is typically part and parcel of a court’s case management system.

The Judge Interface supports the business process of Judges related to managing their caseload and order generation. This interface should support real-time in-court interactions. This likely will be offered as a part of the CMS, but could be provided by a third party, if conformant to standards. Note that because it supports the business process of other stakeholders besides the Clerk, it is imperative that there is consensus on CMS selection between the Judges and the Clerk’s Office with regards to functionality.

The e-filing web application supports the business process of private attorneys and pro se performing the act of assembling and submitting court filings. It is the functionality that implements what is referred to as the “Filing Assembly” major design element. While this functionality can be part of a larger CMS, the attorneys whose business processes are affected should be part of an application selection process.

The System Admin web application is a standalone web application that is hosted by the intermediary for the purposes of configuration, manual message error correction (if required), and general health monitoring.
The Justice Query and Reporting web application supports the business processes of the justice practitioners relating to reporting and general system-wide information. This application would have ties to the Reporting Services.

The Public access web portal provides various clerk related services that are both informational and transactional in nature. An example of a transactional service is the ePay service.

The local law enforcement agencies, as well as the Sheriff’s Office house their own systems that facilitate their internal business processes. To enable integration, web services are placed in each of the endpoints to facilitate the automation of the manual exchanges. The e-citation application (APS currently) which is a law enforcement capability, but currently sponsored by the Clerk’s Office, will require modification to GRA standards.

In contrast to law enforcement, the State’s Attorney’s and Public Defender’s Offices do not currently have their own system. The current mode of operation to date has been to attempt and augment the existing CMS to allow some degree of web interface when interacting with the court, but does nothing to improve their internal business processes. It is for these reasons that we recommend that each of these offices procure their own CMS system to help automate their own business processes and integrate with the full enterprise. It is important to note that these CMS systems would also include some functionality for the preparation and submission of filings by means of the ECF 4.0, in addition to any other functionality to enable the exchanges of data between law enforcement and the State’s Attorney’s Office.

RECOMMENDED ENTERPRISE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

In order to create a sustainable, successful, and comprehensive countywide integration effort, several elements need to be present. There needs to be strong governance among criminal justice leaders and elected officials in order set direction and work together to achieve information sharing goals. Individuals in leadership positions within the County will need to come together to create a collaborative environment in order to move beyond the current state. We recommend establishing a justice information sharing governance structure that ensures all the disparate partners have a voice in the process. This governance group will drive how information sharing is implemented and managed, and what exchanges are priorities for the County. They will be integral in ensuring that the business process re-engineering issues that will need to occur do so before automation takes place, in order to prevent automating an inefficient paper process.

URL believes that all criminal justice partners should have their own case or records management system in order to accomplish their day-to-day responsibilities. These systems should be robust enough to support standards-based information sharing. As detailed in our year-by-year action plan below, we recommend the process of securing funds and procuring these systems happen immediately.
Moreover, we recommend that criminal justice agencies, including the Circuit Clerk’s Office, leverage the County IT Department’s infrastructure for hardware and networking, leaving the individual case management applications the responsibility of their respective agencies. Any overlapping infrastructure should immediately be discontinued and consolidated with County IT. County IT would provide connectivity and server support including back-up, disaster recovery, upgrades and maintenance to the Operating Systems (OS), while the agency would interact with the vendor on application related issues.

**COURSE OF ACTION**

**Incremental Approach to Implementation**

The architecture that URL proposes allows for the staged implementation of the solution. One of the first activities would be the development of RFPs for the Court, and if possible the SAO, Public Defender, and Court Services case management systems. The Court CMS will be the most complex and will require devoted resources to ensure the various stakeholders have had input. The other CMS RFPs can be developed in parallel but realistically may create conflicts with the same resources. Vendor selection and contracting for the agency systems should require that the vendor commits to the interoperability standards and the capability to exchange the information the County has identified.

The Service Specifications for the identified exchanges can also begin as soon as resources become available. Agency subject matter experts will provide input to the development of these specifications and determine where and to what degree existing specifications can be reused. As the specifications are developed the CMS vendors can incorporate these into the product. The specifications should be developed serially and some will be ready for deployment as the CMS systems become operational. The costs for the exchanges are spread between the agency CMS vendors and the integration work at the intermediary. Web services can be generated in most CMS environments fairly easily using the work product generated in the Service Specification.

Infrastructure procurement and implementation can begin in the second year. This would ensure the ESB is functioning when the first CMS systems begin to go live.

Exchanges, or the specific sharing of information and electronic documents between agencies, can be brought on incrementally based upon priorities set by the stakeholders. This development and implementation can occur over several years. The benefits to the County will be increased with each exchange. The section below describes these activities and costs in more detail.
TIMELINE AND RELATED COSTS

Below is a list of major tasks and their associated timelines. These dates are optimal and dependent upon many variables, funding and available resources being the primary ones. It is recommended the County contract with a consultant or an integrator to assist in the completion of these activities.

Proposed CMS Information Sharing Initiative Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Court CMS</td>
<td>10/2/2011</td>
<td>10/3/2014</td>
<td>1918d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Write RFP</td>
<td>10/2/2011</td>
<td>11/20/2011</td>
<td>55d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Release RFP</td>
<td>12/15/2011</td>
<td>12/15/2011</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Award to Vendor</td>
<td>2/15/2012</td>
<td>2/15/2012</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>4/15/2012</td>
<td>10/30/2014</td>
<td>90d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Court Services CMS</td>
<td>10/22/2011</td>
<td>2/1/2013</td>
<td>460d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Award to Vendor</td>
<td>10/22/2011</td>
<td>10/22/2011</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>1/11/2012</td>
<td>2/1/2013</td>
<td>360d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>State Attorney’s Office CMS</td>
<td>1/25/2012</td>
<td>10/1/2012</td>
<td>010d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Write RFP</td>
<td>1/25/2012</td>
<td>3/11/2012</td>
<td>45d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Award to Vendor</td>
<td>5/12/2012</td>
<td>5/12/2012</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>7/11/2012</td>
<td>10/1/2013</td>
<td>44d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Public Defender’s Office CMS</td>
<td>1/25/2012</td>
<td>12/31/2012</td>
<td>341d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Write RFP</td>
<td>1/25/2012</td>
<td>3/11/2012</td>
<td>45d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Award to Vendor</td>
<td>5/12/2012</td>
<td>5/12/2012</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>7/1/2012</td>
<td>12/31/2012</td>
<td>18d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Info Sharing Infrastructure Install</td>
<td>7/26/2012</td>
<td>7/26/2012</td>
<td>1d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Exchanges</td>
<td>5/1/2012</td>
<td>9/30/2016</td>
<td>1614d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Phase I Exchanges</td>
<td>5/1/2012</td>
<td>10/3/2013</td>
<td>52d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Phase II Exchanges</td>
<td>5/2/2013</td>
<td>10/9/2014</td>
<td>52d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Phase III Exchanges</td>
<td>5/1/2014</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td>81d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Phase IV Exchanges</td>
<td>5/1/2015</td>
<td>9/30/2016</td>
<td>815d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The activities listed below provide another way of describing the proposed solution and project. The derived costs associated with the various products are described below.

Activity 1: Project Planning and Kickoff:
The projects begin with Project Planning and Kickoff activities, which provide a forum in which the consultant and the County to develop a shared understanding of the project, the priorities and common expectations for the deliverables and timeframes. The goal of these activities is to lay the foundation for the successful and timely completion of all project deliverables.
Activity 2: Agency Case Management System Procurement:
Commercial off the Shelf Court CMS products are usually base bid at a lower cost than what ends up to be the final cost. These can take up two to three years to fully deploy. A current industry average price is approximately $12,000 dollars per user for the license fee. So with 200 users this is around $2.5 million. With a conservative number of $500,000 for customization we have estimated an average figure of $3,000,000. This number is also consistent with the sample numbers we received from vendors. The estimate of users is based upon the assumption that there will be an enterprise approach. Users on other agencies system would interact with the Court CMS through their own system via web services. If the County does not go this route the number of direct users would increase minimally by 100.

Maintenance for the Court CMS is calculated at 18% of original costs, which is an industry standard for most applications.

The cost of building a CMS from the ground up can be up to twice that number. A collar County in Illinois built a robust system which cost approximately $6 million to become operational. This number appears to be very consistent with broader experiences. Another Illinois County purchased a base system from a vendor for approximately $2 million. After customization the price has reached approximately $6 million. Details on these sites and others can be provided upon request.

Prosecutor Systems have a range as well, with an average of around $700,000 and a high end of $1,000,000. Public Defender Systems vary even more with the low end around $300,000 and high end around $700,000. Court Services has recently received bids coming in around $700,000. These systems can be deployed in a year to 18 months.

Activity 3: Intermediary ESB Installation and Set Up:
The integrator will help Kane County procure, install, and test the ESB equipment on which the integration solution will run. Kane County has many options available to it, with regard to selecting an ESB product to support integration projects. Large companies, such as Oracle, Software AG, and Information Builders provide robust, standards based ESB products that can be configured for integrated justice and are well supported by those vendors. The tradeoff is that these solutions are more expensive, approximately $300,000 for an ESB suite.

Microsoft offers there BizTalk™ server, which does not have all the features of an ESB but can serve as the message broker. This solution is less expensive than the commercial ESB solution described above.

On the other end of the spectrum, there are free ESB products available, such as Open ESB https://open-esb.dev.java.net/, Fuse www.fusesource.com, or JBoss http://jboss.org/. These products are free but may be limiting in terms of support (or charge separately for support). However, the strength of this architecture is that a free product would work for the County until it was ready to make a commitment to a more robust product; at that time, the County could procure it and install it with little or no impact to the existing information exchanges that were previously stood up.
An integrator could assist Kane County in evaluating the ESB option that suits the County needs and budget most appropriately. The remaining tasks during this activity will focus on installing and testing the software and equipment, and ensuring that the environment is ready to send and receive integrated justice exchanges.

**PER EXCHANGE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION**

As described above, all of the activities discussed in this section will need to be completed for each exchange (or document) that Kane County chooses to implement as part of this project. The endpoint agencies, or their vendors, will be responsible for developing the web service that will be used for their application, unless there is mutual agreement between the integrator and Kane County for assistance from the integrator.

In the cost matrix, exchange costs are broken out separately from the CMS costs. For a detailed breakdown of the exchange costs see Appendix H. The CMS should be designed to accept and send information externally as part of the work flow, however there will need to be development moving the data between the CMS and the web services. This cost can be considered additional customization to the CMS. The exchange costs include SSP development, endpoint agency CMS web service enabling, and the costs for development on the ESB and coordinated implementation. These vary by the complexity of the exchange and the number of agencies, averaging around $65,000.

**Activity 1: Requirements and Service Specification (SSP) Development:**
The first step in the implementation methodology is to develop the team’s business and technical analysts, and meet with the business users in the agencies that will participate in each exchange to gather information about the specific data that will be exchanged and how the receiving agency’s system will use it. From this discussion emerges the SSP that is the basis for web services development, translating the agencies business needs to the vendors and developers. The SSP contains NIEM-conformant schemas for the payload exchanged between the selected agencies. SSPs may have already been developed for the specific exchange in question. If this is the case then the cost will be reduced.

**Activity 2: ESB Configuration and Web Services Development:**
For each information exchange that is implemented, the ESB will need to be configured to conduct the orchestration and routing function for the specific exchange, based on the business rules inherent in that exchange. In addition, at this stage the team developer and technical staff develop WSDLs (Web Service Definition Language) for the selected exchange for deployment to the ESB.
Activity 3: Agency Exchange Development:
As indicated above, the endpoint agencies, or their vendors, will take responsibility for developing the enablement of the web services to further the implementation of each exchange, in the timeframes outlined by the project plan. The assumption is that the agency CMS has the essential business rules and data to support the exchange; if not there will be customization to the degree they do not.

Activity 4: Web Services Deployment and Testing:
The agencies involved in the exchange, as well as the Integration Project Manager, will work together to deploy the web services and conduct end-to-end testing for the exchange. Test plans will be created and testing will be coordinated to ensure all parties are available and active participants in the testing process.

Activity 5: User Acceptance and Signoff:
The Integration Project Manager will create test plans to support user end-to-end testing. Once end-to-end testing is completed successfully and accepted by the client, the exchange is considered demonstrated to the project stakeholders. Sign off is the last activity of the exchange implementation.

Activity 6: Governance Support (Ongoing):
Throughout the course of the engagement the Integration Project Manager assists the County Project Manager in supporting the Kane County integrated justice governance structure, if appropriate/necessary. These activities include planning, facilitating, and documenting any necessary meetings and workshops; serving as a Kane County integration subject matter expert (SME) to the stakeholders; and preparing documentation as requested by the County.

Activity 7: Project Management (Ongoing)
Throughout the course of the engagement, the Integration Project Manager monitors the overall project plan, cost, dependencies, and timeframes. The Project Manager also updates the project schedule, prepares weekly and/or monthly status/time accounting reports, and reviews it with the County Project Manager. Throughout the engagement, the Integration Project Manager works closely and collaboratively with the County Project Manager to resolve any issues that are encountered in the course of the project and to accommodate, to the degree feasible, agency needs that may affect the schedule. URL Integration maintains a library of project documentation throughout the course of the project.
As part of this study, Kane County was interested in assessing the costs associated with a new case management system, and how they compare with continuing on the current path. As part of this review, we compared the costs of a new case management system with some rough estimates of what it costs the courts – as well as other criminal justice partners – to process paper files in the current system, given that there is little or no true data integration between criminal justice system partners when it comes to the court process (from filing through court events to sentencing and case disposition).

The savings identified in this ROI represent a cost avoidance opportunity. The proposed action to purchase a new CMS and the subsequent organizational efficiencies would serve to restore a sense of balance among all criminal justice partners in the County: as articulated elsewhere in this document, currently costs, and therefore responsibility for justice-related technology, is focused within the Circuit Court Clerk’s Office, with the exception of the Sheriff’s automation. In addition, consistent with our overall recommendations, we would anticipate resources for CMS IT infrastructure support (not application support) would shift to County IT, and as such, infrastructure support resources currently in the office of the Circuit Clerk would shift to County IT as well.

Our proposal presents a fundamental paradigm shift that rather than concentrating IT responsibility with the Court Clerk, that costs are spread through the entire Kane County justice community from law enforcement to Sheriff to the State’s Attorney’s Office, Public Defender, and Private Bar to the Clerk’s Office and Judges to Court Services. We believe that if information is entered once, during the point in the workflow at which it is originated, it would save time and effort “downstream”. We believe this will have the effect of creating better quality data, less rediscovery and a real-time workflow between criminal justice partners.

Other benefits of adopting the “to be” environment URL Integration has put forth in this document include:

- Reduction in continued or backlogged court docket once documents are electronically filed, as the Judge will have all the information he/she needs to conduct the court’s business.
- Ability for the court to consider implementing differentiated case management, to be able to differentiate between cases that can be processed more quickly.
- Orders would be disseminated more quickly and with better information, reducing or eliminating data entry in receiving systems.
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SUMMARY OF OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE COSTS COMPARISON

The implementation of the Enterprise-wide solution will certainly be a large and expensive undertaking. This study projects the five (5) year costs of maintaining the existing legacy system to minimally be $5,922,345.85. This estimate does not include costs of the several ancillary systems being currently pursued by the Circuit Court Clerk’s Office, with the exception of the proposed data warehouse project. It also does not assume any funding for case management systems for the State’s Attorney, the Public Defender, or Court Services.

The projected total costs for the new Enterprise solution over five (5) years is $12,559,750.05, which includes the full implementation of the “to be” environment URL proposes elsewhere in this document. Specifically, our estimates include:

- Funds for new Court CMS, as well as CMS systems for the State’s Attorney, the Public Defender, and Court Services.
- Costs for current court staff, less the developers and IT infrastructure support, who will be critical in guiding the implementation of the new CMS system. [We assume that the developers and IT support positions will shift to County IT to support the Court’s shift of these functions to County IT].
- Maintenance and support costs for the existing system until the new CMS is operational.
- Implementation of over 25 cross-agency workflows by automating the sharing of several documents electronically, real-time, using standards for justice information sharing and best practices.
The difference between the existing legacy system costs and the projected costs for the new solution - $6,637,404.20 – represents the County's true costs over the five-year period of this study.
SUMMARY OF BENEFITS OF THE PROJECT TO THE COUNTY

Clearly the difference between the cost projections associated with maintaining the existing legacy system and those associated with the procurement and implementation of all aspects of the “to be” justice environment in Kane County – over $12 million over five (5) years – is significant and may beg the question as to why the investment in new technology is necessary. This study presents projections of both direct and indirect benefits that make the business case that the new system is well worth the investment.

To make this case, we used the number of filings per year in Kane County for criminal, traffic, and the case types in the civil court, according to the Administrative Office of Illinois Courts (AOIC), that are allowable for electronic filing. We estimated the time and cost of all parties – the Courts, State’s Attorney, and Public Defender – in filling out necessary forms, filing, and retrieving paper copies.

It is clear that these costs are high-level estimates, and that in some cases processes may take more or less time or resources, to move cases through the criminal and civil justice systems.

The figures depicted below describe the time estimates associated with processing paper on criminal felony, misdemeanor, and traffic cases. Using figures that reflect recent trends in urban/suburban Illinois Counties, we compare the number of pieces of paper filed with the number of cases filed in the jurisdiction per year. As a result, we estimate that every felony case includes 11 papers, every misdemeanor 7 papers, and every DUI 6. Clearly this will change on a case-by-case basis, but generally we believe this to be a conservative estimate.

We then extrapolate the time it takes three agencies (State’s Attorney, Public Defender/Bar, and Court) to process that piece of paper, to include retrieving it from a paper file, data entry, and re-filing. We believe this process in total takes 10 minutes. We also assume that the value of these individuals’ time is $50/hour. From these calculations, we deduce that the cost of processing a piece of paper for all three justice agencies is $25.50.

The time and cost associated with preparing these papers is high, based on Kane County’s 2010 caseload of 3,619 felony cases, 8,040 misdemeanor cases, and 2,189 DUI cases: for all three, we estimate the paper processing time to be $353,124.00/year.

---

8 Those case types include: family, divorce, law magistrate, small claims, law, arbitration, chancery.
9 $50/hr. figure is meant to represent a blended rate of clerks, judges, SAO, PD, and Probation staff. It includes salary, as well as health coverage, vacation pay, and other benefits.
The following is our logic for these estimates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Type</th>
<th>Number of Papers/Year</th>
<th>Number of Cases/Year</th>
<th>Case: Paper Ratio</th>
<th>Agencies</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
<th>Time Estimate</th>
<th>Processing Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felony</td>
<td>132,443</td>
<td>11,790</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>$25.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor</td>
<td>96,336</td>
<td>13,192</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>$25.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI</td>
<td>57,672</td>
<td>9,459</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>$25.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the same estimate of 10 minutes of processing time, and assuming that there are five (5) papers associated with each case (which we believe to be a conservative estimate), and for one agency – the Circuit Clerk’s Office – that pays someone $50/hour for this function, we estimate the costs for civil paper processing to be $923,907.50/year.

The total benefits of automating these processes are estimated at $1,277,031.50/year, assuming the full benefits of this “to be” environment would not be achieved until year three, once the new systems are up and the cross-agency information sharing has begun. Our estimated cost for new systems and exchanges will be spread over five years with cost benefits primarily following implementation of exchanges.
Kane County could expect to recover its investment ($6,637,404.20) in the new CMS environment and integration after Year VIII. We believe this estimate to be conservative, as once the new CMS systems are operational efficiencies will be immediate.

The following chart depicts our assumptions around the timing for the County to achieve the benefit of this investment:

In addition, it is possible that Kane County would not have to bear the full cost of this project. By using fees for electronic filing – especially with the civil courts and the defense bar and pro se filers – the County can compensate for some part of its costs using a convenience fee. We anticipate that these filers would gladly pay such a fee for the convenience of being able to do filing online rather than coming down to the courthouse.
APPENDIX A: CIRCUIT CLERK’S OFFICE REVIEW

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

This case study looks at Kane County’s need to share information between the Circuit Clerk of the Court’s Case Management System (referred to as Circuit Clerk’s Office or Clerk’s Office throughout this document) and the various other systems the Circuit Clerk’s Office has; as well as, the sharing of information with the various Kane County justice agencies.

Ultimately, the goal is to enable these entities to share information consistently, accurately and securely in a manner that minimizes the duplication of effort, and identifies gaps and barriers to sharing.

HIGH-LEVEL OVERVIEW

In the mid to late 1980’s, Kane County implemented mainframe-based court system applications for Civil/Family, State’s Attorney’s Office (SAO), Court Services, and the Circuit Clerk Traffic/Criminal. By the late 1990’s, the County was looking to replace these applications and began the process of integrating justice information systems. Kane County is one of three counties that comprise the 16th Judicial Circuit (with DeKalb and Kendall being the other two).

In 1998, an RFP was issued for a Case Management System (CMS) application for all three counties in the Circuit. Only a handful of responses to the RFP were received, and JANO Systems was the vendor awarded the contract. JANO’s CMS is a Clericus Magnus application, but is generally referred to simply by the name, JANO, therefore, all references to the CMS in this appendix will also be to JANO.

The selection of the vendor system was done by a committee of judicial users for the same Circuit-wide base system. The original installation was executed in 2000, with upgrades to traffic and criminal cases, civil and family cases, and child support, in 2001, 2004 and 2008, respectively. The current users of the system are the court clerks, the judges and Court Services. Case or Docket management for the judges is handled through the Circuit Clerk’s CMS.

The three counties all use JANO; the systems are separate, but each county has inquiry access into the other two counties’ CMS. Kane County Circuit Clerk’s Office also provides system backup replication for both DeKalb and Kendall counties. It is important to note, however, that these arrangements may change as the other two counties will no longer be part of the Circuit at the end of 2012.

The Circuit Clerk’s Office supports multiple divisions of the court, civil, family, criminal, traffic and juvenile, with each division assigned a team of clerks. The clerks perform the in-courtroom recording/data entry.
The processes within the court are currently a mix of manual paper processes followed by data entry, with some degree of electronic exchange of information in various stages of release for certain cases and processes. These various processes are documented later in this report. The assignment of cases to specific courtrooms is based on filing with embedded business logic in the CMS.

While the current CMS is able to handle basic court functions, such as docketing, scheduling and recording, it does have its shortcomings, to be detailed later in this report. In working with these shortcomings, the Circuit Clerk’s Office has developed a long term vision of moving toward a Paper on Demand system, and away from the current paper-based system used in conjunction with the JANO application.

The vision also does extend to sharing data outside of the Circuit Clerk’s Office with other parties involved in the broader criminal justice process. In addition to a POD based system, they also envision better automation of the business processes to minimize the amount of human intervention required to enact their business rules. In other words, increased information sharing through agency case management systems is part of the overall objective for the county. The objective extends beyond simply having Paper on Demand, to having access to the data that each agency needs at key decision points throughout the criminal justice process.

It is also understood by the Circuit Clerk’s Office that there are legislative hurdles that must be surmounted to be able to fully realize the full vision of a data driven, Paper on Demand system. There are statutory requirements to adhere to, and some paper processes are mandated and will continue to result in some paper processing of information.

### CASE TYPES

**Criminal:**
The criminal court hears felony and misdemeanor cases. In addition, it does hear what can be termed quasi-criminal cases. The majority of all business processes used are paper-based. Of the processes in the criminal court, some of the following are of note:

Misdemeanors are mostly a paper-based process with some email and fax-based data exchanges for the notification and manual follow-up by interested parties and agencies. The paper forms are scanned into the Real Vision Imaging (RVI) document imaging system that is integrated with JANO. Law enforcement agencies initiate misdemeanors and have switched to an online version of the form for data entry. The scheduling of court dates is an all manual process and is initially assigned by the arresting agency.

Law enforcement officers request felony review from the State’s Attorney Office (SAO), and once the Associate State’s Attorney (ASA) approves the charges, the law enforcement officer files the felony
complaint with the court using the same online complaint smart form as for misdemeanors. The SAO will file felony charges as part of the indictment, and will file amended complaints if charges need to be modified after initial filing.

All felonies are automatically assigned a judge and court upon case initiation. Most felonies are assigned to the prelim judge first, while specific offenses are assigned randomly to a trial judge first. The scheduling of court dates is an all manual process and is initially assigned by either the arresting agency or by the bond call judge.

The process for misdemeanor filing of charges does not require SAO review, so Misdemeanor Complaints are filed by law enforcement without the need to discuss charges with the SAO. As for the Felony Review process, this is an area that should be targeted for some level of automation, because this process is handled over the phone, and the ability to view charges electronically would assist in the flow of information between law enforcement and the SAO (this issue is discussed again later in this document).

Juvenile:
There are some similarities between the processing of juvenile and adult cases, but there are clear differences based on statutory rules related to the confidentiality of juvenile information. One major difference is that law enforcement agencies often contact Juvenile Court Services prior to the SAO, so that many cases are handled through diversion rather than the court process.

If charges are more serious and require immediate prosecutorial review, they will be shared directly with the SAO. Charging documents are known as Petitions to Adjudicate, rather than Complaints, and other naming conventions vary from the Adult process. That being said, the cases still follow the misdemeanor and felony tracks, and automation of many adult processes can be applied to the juvenile flow of information (as long as confidentiality concerns are managed properly).

Traffic/Ordinance Violations:
Citations for traffic offenses and ordinance violations are handled in traffic and misdemeanor court. The SAO is generally not involved in the filing process of traffic cases. Local prosecutors are assigned to the local cases while the SAO handles most state level charges. This is a very high-volume courtroom, and the flow of citation information is ripe for electronic sharing of information.

The Circuit Clerk’s Office has implemented an electronic citations program to automate as much of the traffic citations system as possible. The system is supported by Advanced Public Safety (APS), and contains Electronic Ticketing and ReportBeam applications, which work in conjunction with an in-house custom built application named Citation Manager. This system will be discussed in later sections of this document.
Civil:
There are 10 types of civil cases (including, Arbitration, Chancery, Tax, Wills, etc.), as well as seven family case types. Of those case types, system shortcomings were noted in the following areas:

Law Cases are civil cases where plaintiffs seek $50,000 or more in damages. With all Civil case types, the CMS case status is somewhat vague and does not adequately reflect the true status of the case, and this results in the need to view case information directly in order to determine status. The lack of designated fields for capturing data elements leads to incomplete information housed in JANO. For example, impounded status, such as a security status, is incomplete in terms of granularity and role-based security for restricting viewing and also insufficient in displaying the restricted security status for Circuit Clerk users to support the need to not release information, causing a mixed use of the case status field as a work around. The report status is dispositional in nature and tracks whether a case has met criteria to be included in state reporting requirements. With Case Participant Types, all codes are manually entered. Finally, the tracking of trusts is done manually as well.

With Small Claims (cases ranging up to $10,000 in potential damages), orders are handled in the same manner as in Law Cases. There is no current mechanism for tracking of notification of fees, where checks bounce.

Child Support cases are managed in a separate CMS module that has its own docket. The State Disbursement Unit (SDU) data is pulled as a report from a dedicated SDU workstation and then entered into the JANO child support module. Return information from the SDU includes the name of payee and the amount disbursed. Health and Social Services procedures for disbursement control do not always align, which is a problem that JANO cannot manage due to a lack of clarification regarding crediting of payments that has existed for years. A single report takes multiple days to process.

In looking at Civil as a whole, one major objective is to be able to associate disposition by party and view it in a meaningful way. The Circuit Clerk is looking at the option of moving the Electronic Court Operations (ECO) suite into the Civil arena, but there are barriers to doing so, and the ECO will be discussed in greater detail in a later section of this document.

Evidence and Exhibits Management:
Evidence and exhibit management is necessary in all case types (criminal, juvenile, traffic and civil). At this time, JANO does not support evidence management, so it is managed as a unique case type in the CMS. With evidence management, dockets are used to specify the location and other relevant information necessary to retrieve evidence for a case.

The evidence is bar-coded with the case number. While there can only be one defendant per case, the evidence is capable of being shared between cases. The process for a transfer to another case is a manual process following a court order, which results in the lack of true disposition tracking with respect to the release or destruction of evidence.
Reporting:
There are a large number of pre-defined and Ad-hoc reports that the Circuit Clerk’s Office is responsible for disseminating. There are both Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC) mandated reports and reports requested by criminal justice agencies that the Circuit Clerk is responsible for on a regular basis.

There are two different ways that Circuit Clerk staff generates reports out of JANO. There are canned reports that are auto generated from the system, and staff can produce Ad hoc reports using Crystal Reports. The canned reports are used primarily for daily operations. These reports include Court Call pull sheets, Court Call Alpha Sheets, Non Active reports and Agency filing reports. Other reports are generated to represent financial information and are created for distribution purposes.

As reporting needs have evolved, staff has found it difficult to stay within the constraints of these reports. Different criminal justice agencies within the county want to capture the data in various ways, or for varying time frames, especially in regard to financial information. Additionally, financial reports are troublesome, because it is difficult to match up money owed and paid to specific accounts, as well as totaling those accounts.

Moreover, Ad hoc reports generated in JANO can be very cumbersome. This is mainly due to the way that the database was structured. Determining a primary key within multiple data files is difficult. For instance, one would assume that a case number would be within each file, but that is not the case. JANO allows for field names within the file that are named the same but have different meanings. For instance, “status” is reused within the same or different files and each may have a different meaning.

Many of the Circuit Clerk’s reports are needed by the Judiciary and Court Services and are the most complex reports to run. Some agencies may be using a combination of the Circuit Clerk’s data, as well as data from Court Services, within one report.

In addition, Sentencing Reports are also difficult to compile, especially when trying to determine length of time, money paid or money owed, and repeat offenders. Determining case load balancing of active cases by class is also difficult, because cases indicted at a later date after the first charges were filed result in an inability to determine the active charge. JANO doesn’t capture the date field that would assist in this determination.

Another difficult report to run is a monthly report that sets out cases that have been sent to collections, which also identifies money paid prior to/ or after being sent to collections. This particular report takes three days to compile, followed by more manual sorting.

The AOIC statistical reports are canned reports that are not reliable. Staff has been recreating these as Ad hoc reports, so data is more reliable (due to the time that staff puts in to compile the data).
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Some of the reports that can be generated out of JANO are not user friendly. They are just paper generated and are very hard to read because of the font size and layout. Most agency representatives want to manipulate reports to meet their needs, but that cannot be done at this time. For instance, Cases Filed By Agency Report (report identifying the cases filed by a specific agency), is one that a law enforcement agency would want to customize to see the number of Class A cases filed, or how many cases a specific officer filed, and this is not an option at this time.

One major challenge has been gaining access to the necessary data in a consistent manner. This is because data in the Circuit Clerk’s JANO database is not often complete enough to finalize these reports, and in some cases, several JANO databases, or file libraries, for other offices must be accessed to compile a single report.

Compiling data from several databases is time-intensive, and generally involves a significant amount of manual processing. In addition, if key data has not been identified as needed for tracking by the interested party and therefore is not provided or entered into JANO (or simply difficult to locate), a report cannot be generated. Again, this is time consuming and inefficient, and it highlights the fact that reporting functionality is an important aspect of case management in the Circuit Clerk’s Office.

Here is just a sampling of reports provided by the Circuit Clerk’s Office, which illustrates the various types of information that a CMS should be tracking to facilitate the reporting process:

- The distribution of collected fines at the end of the month.
- Case management throughput metrics.
- Ad-hoc, especially financial reports
- Warrant statistics
- The financials report (Report “J”) for the State in Excel format mandated by the AOIC
- Outstanding liabilities report, unclaimed bond money

Existing System Architecture and Assessment:
This section describes the physical characteristics of the various systems, applications, and architecture related to the original system, as well as a snapshot of the currently planned applications that are being developed to address shortcomings and evolved business needs since the CM was first introduced.

Existing CMS Description:
JANO is linked to an Imaging/Document Management System (DMS), known as Real Vision Imaging (RVI). The CMS and DMS were sold together, and have been supported together, so we generally refer to the RVI as being part of JANO. JANO was built to run on the IBM AS/400 midrange servers, now known as the iSeries. JANO is a transaction based system and manages all related data for activity on cases, based on the data entry and the scanning of documents.

Documents filed with the court are assigned a “receipt number” and an “item number”. The receipt and item numbers for a given case uniquely identify actions that occur within a case. Case information is also
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entered in the CMS, which (as mentioned above) is integrated with RVI to support the need for court record-keeping. RVI only supports scanning to TIFF files. There is a need to move to an archival system that supports PDF for digitally signed orders.

All documents since March 2006 have been scanned into the system with the exception of the backs of traffic jackets, which change with every appearance. The RVI application is installed and runs on two leased IBM AS400 servers. Both servers currently have approximately 2 years left on the lease term. The machines received upgrades at the start of this term of the lease and, at the end of the lease, require replacement of the servers, an intensive migration process.

3G scanning is a tool that was started in November 2004 with the JAN4 add-on application, Image Display Tool. Documents are scanned prior to being recorded and the deputy clerks work from the image of a document instead of using the original document. This approach allows documents to be entered from any location within the domain, improving productivity for courtroom clerks. Documents are sorted prior to scanning by priority of the document and scanned into separate queues by document type and court team. The original document is placed in the court file immediately, which improves access to records.

Documents are entered into the system in one of four ways: two manual and two automatic. In the first method, the document is recorded into JAN4 and the docket entry creates a “patch” sheet (a document containing a bar code with the docket that is a receipt number) that is printed. The patch sheets are used as the lead page to a document and when scanned, the receipt bar code triggers the linkage between the case entry in JAN4 and its corresponding image file(s). The second method of entry is that the documents are scanned into a work queue. The document is displayed from the work queue and the docket entry is made into JAN4 which then automatically ties the image to the receipt. Opened documents are displayed in a separate JAN4 window to allow the form to be referenced during data entry into JAN4 without having to switch between screens.

In those cases where Adobe® LiveCycle® (described later) is used for document creation, the document metadata is automatically pushed into JAN4 with a web service creating the docket entry and attaching the image without manual intervention. Access to the forms is dependent on the security level of the user. The ECO application (described later), also pushes metadata and images without user handling of the document for scanning.

Requirements related to the audit trail and constraints in JAN4 that do not allow displaying six initials in compliance with County ITD configuration with regards to the use of the Windows passwords have resulted in three passwords that must be updated at the same time. Failure in updating all passwords at the same time affects the ability to view any images. All of the images are stored for the long term with optical recording that is managed with the IBM 3995 Optical Library.
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Systems Strengths:
JANO is capable of handling complicated dispositions related to cases. In addition, it has a macro capability that allows for the programming/customization by users to further reduce the amount of data entry time by being able to perform lookups and pre-populate certain screens, particularly with dispositions. Therefore, management of disposition data is accurate and efficient, and allows for high volume processing of that information.

In addition, over the years, many efficiency customizations were added to the product by the vendor at the request of the Circuit Clerk’s Office, which now allow for the ability to copy entries to multiple cases, to enter multiple pieces of information in one entry, and for mass rescheduling of cases. That being said, many system challenges offset these efficiencies.

SYSTEM CHALLENGES

Data Access Challenges:
While the CMS is very good at storing data to support the normal day to day business process of managing court cases, it has significant shortcomings in terms of access and management of data in support of the administrative processes needed to manage those court cases. Both Crystal Reports and IBM Query400 are currently used to access the data for both canned and Ad-hoc reporting. The key issues with data access for reporting are the CMS file structure not lending itself well to optimized reporting, and a lack of database documentation regarding both the data dictionary and structure. In addition, the transactional nature by which a good deal of data is organized makes reporting on cases with multiple dispositions needlessly difficult. The result is that case management requirements (including reporting, scheduling, document management) are extremely time consuming for both users and IT staff supporting the system.

A somewhat related issue is that the CMS, in both the database and the application, use common terms with multiple definitions based on a context which is not always obvious to the user. For example, there are screens for case details where the term “status” appears multiple times, and it is not obvious as to what status is being referred to. This is a true challenge, because it has resulted in unreliable data, which currently makes it difficult to create necessary reports without the need for significant validation, and will require extensive data conversion/cleansing in the future.

Dispositions and Tracking Challenges:
JANO stores data in multiple files, for instance sentence codes are in two files, and it is therefore difficult to pull reports for dispositions and sentencing when the request is to combine lengths of time and/or money for analysis by another Judicial System Office. As mentioned above, this has had the negative effect of increasing validation time for report integrity.
As noted in a previous section, evidence tracking is also an issue. The CMS does not contain a module supporting any evidence tracking. As a result, the Circuit Clerk’s Office has implemented a non-ideal workaround by which evidence tracking is managed as a case type where the docket information specifies the location. In addition, evidence is bar-coded with the case number. Consequently, there is no means of tracking or managing the evidence once a case is disposed. There is also a need to share evidence with co-defendants in different cases, which the system cannot accommodate.

Recording the disbursements for child support paid through the Illinois State Disbursement Unit (SDU) are time consuming without an SDU interface. Several attempts at an interface were unsuccessful as all the data did not appear to convert into the CMS. As a result, Circuit Clerk staff manually manages the disbursements.

Child Support is a separate module within the CMS. Recording the disbursements for child support paid through the SDU are time consuming. Several attempts at an interface with the SDU were unsuccessful. As a result, Circuit Clerk staff manually manages the disbursements. There is no interest calculated by the system but interest is added per court ordered arrearage settings and entered into the system. At present, there is no good way to handle delinquent cases.

There is no means of tracking bonds and trusts within the civil CMS. In addition, there is no automated means to facilitate financial reconciliation on a daily basis.

The court does have the ability to share data with vendors related to DUI programs supporting remote monitoring. In particular, these are for SCRAM (Secure Continuous Remote Alcohol Monitor) and ARM (Alcohol Remote Monitoring). However, this sharing is not directly integrated with the CMS.

Other Challenges:
There are several miscellaneous pain points with the daily usage of the CMS. These are summarized as follows:

- Scheduling in the CMS is an issue in that there is a lack of access classification for cases to be able to support different levels of viewing related to court hearings, case load management and administrative purposes. There is also no means to be able to limit case event codes to specific rooms, which would be very desirable. In addition, JANO doesn’t allow for blocking a time frame for a court hearing – staff must block out the entire day, and then override that blocked time to schedule a hearing within the day.
- All appeals are still managed with paper and do not use the Document Management System (DMS) – however, a scanner is utilized to bates stamp the original file, eliminating a significant portion of manual processing.
- Docket searches are limited and should allow for searching by sub-case type. Currently, judges may view defendant’s criminal case in the system, yet not be aware of pending civil matters for that same defendant. The CMS does not have the capability to lock out the secondary cases
from recordkeeping functions when consolidating cases or designating multiple types of relationships between cases. The absence of this capability increases the administrative overhead of managing multiple related cases.

- All court records retention is fully managed with paper and is not electronic. Evolution to a Paper on Demand system is seen as being desirous.
- The CMS is somewhat weak in the area of data entry validation. This lack of robustness means that data errors must be manually located and corrected.
- There is no summary screen for civil cases. This is in contrast to criminal cases that do contain a summary screen. There is no easy way to capture which civil party has been disposed or even should have a disposition when cross complaints exist. The lack of consistency results in additional overhead when searching through civil cases.
- The security levels in the CMS are not detailed enough which makes controlling access of case information problematic.
- There is no means for controlling how to spell businesses and the like. Furthermore, there is no master system to be able to manage “frequent fliers” such that the forms and screens can be automatically populated.

Logistical Challenges:
There are also some logistical challenges with the current system. These are:

- The two AS400’s supporting RVI and JANO are leased and have approximately 2 years left on the lease. There is a limited window in which to replace the system.
- The original contract provided for delivery of source code with every upgrade. JANO Systems had an internal split which led to the Kane County Circuit Clerk’s Office maintaining the CMS source code and managing it themselves, which is RPG. They also update the application themselves. The antiquated application code base poses a significant long term risk for the viability of the CMS as a whole. This issue must be addressed very soon because of its potential adverse effects to the quality of case management in the county.
- The 3995 optical library is also antiquated and poses long term threats to the viability of the case management system being able to keep up with the increasing demand being placed upon it.

Adjunct Applications to the CMS:
Since the original installation of JANO, the Circuit Clerk’s Office has progressively added individual applications to compensate for shortcomings in the CMS. While these adjunct applications were originally reactive to alleviate specific issues, the Circuit Clerk’s Office has recently developed a more proactive and strategic approach to supplement the existing case management capabilities (all of which are internally funded). If JANO is replaced with a new CMS, it is very important that these applications capabilities are subsumed by the new CMS, replaced with agency to agency exchanges, or can be integrated with the new CMS where applicable using current justice standards.
A consolidated overview of the applications, some of which are still in planning stages, along with other elements of the overall system topography is summarized here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsystem</th>
<th>CMS Integration</th>
<th>Prod</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Intelligence</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal History from ICCIC</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Counter</td>
<td>No (Silo)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECO SUITE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Citations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Payment / ePay</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eGuilty</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>X(2012Q3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent Forms with workflow</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent Scanning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invoicing</td>
<td>No (Silo)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVR</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiosk Services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online eServices Portal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Electronic Filing (XFile)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>X(2011Q4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• iScheduling</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>X(2011Q4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• eSummons &amp; Restricted Forms</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>X(2011Q4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection Order Filing Wizard</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Web</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Access to JANO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiki</td>
<td>No (Silo)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the following are listed in alphabetic order as designated or referred to by the Clerk’s Office.

Business Intelligence:
The Business Intelligence is a long term planned project to add a data analytics platform to work with the planned Data Warehouse or new CMS for the purposes of better trending analysis and other types of Ad-hoc investigations. The details of any business analytics software are yet to be decided.

Customer Counter:
The customer counter is a standalone application that is run by the Circuit Clerk’s Office on a virtual machine. Its sole function is to literally count the numbers of people who physically come into the Clerk’s Office and are assisted by staff.
Criminal History from Illinois Court Clerks’ Information Center (ICCIC):
This application is to allow the import of criminal history for each defendant in traffic/misdemeanor court to be parsed by defendant and presented electronically in ECO. This functionality will make use of a statewide offering from the Secretary of State. The connectivity and web access is supported by the county IT infrastructure and not the Clerk’s Office IT infrastructure.

Electronic Citations:
The Clerk’s Office has implemented an electronic citations program to automate as much of the traffic citations system as possible. The system is based on the Electronic Ticketing and ReportBeam applications from Advanced Public Safety (APS) and works in conjunction with an in-house custom built application named Citation Manager.

The Citation Manager gets the batch citation uploaded from the APS ReportBeam server and allows a clerk to review, validate and import the citations into the CMS, or simply accept the batch data without review. Validation of the citations is manually accomplished to ensure accuracy of last names sent over from ReportBeam.

The Electronic Citations project has been envisioned in three phases:

1. The batch import of citations comes from ReportBeam into CMS via the Citation Manager. This phase is now deployed.
2. The real-time return of court case numbers back to the citation issuing agency.
3. The real-time return of Citation Case dispositions back to the originating agency. Presently, dispositions are a weekly process and are sent to the DMV via the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts by running a report on the CM and sending the results to the DMV using FTP over SSL. In addition, the Insurance Division of the Secretary of State’s Office also receives that data via the DMV.

The Kane County Clerk’s Office purchased enterprise licensing for the ReportBeam and common APS software. However, the agencies are required to purchase the units and software for the patrol cars, which is an estimated $1,000.00 per car.

Data Warehouse:
The data warehouse project is a planned project that is intended to support all of the reporting functions that are lacking in the CMS with a data warehouse and also a normalized case management repository from which the data warehouse is populated.

It must be understood that there is a need to clean/scrub the current data in JANO due to issues mentioned above, and this may require some level of manual intervention. With reliable data to work
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with, it will be much easier to convert the data into a new CMS. Furthermore, reliable data will allow for more accurate reports.

To that end, the primary business drivers for implementing a data warehouse and repository are:

- Eliminate the recurrent hours spent each month manually aggregating data for the reports.
- Reduce the demands on the CMS.
- Provide a common normalized view of the case management system for transitioning to a new CMS.
- Provide a means of On Demand report generation (dashboards) of pre identified reports by other stakeholders in the court data.

Prior to settling on a data warehouse and general approach, the Clerk’s Office executed a proof of concept for working with collections data. The Warehouse Proof of Concept successfully demonstrated that data can successfully be extracted from the CMS database and placed into a normalized relational data repository and warehouse. The estimated cost for the data warehouse has been quoted at approximately $800,000.00.

The proposed architecture for the aforementioned quote is shown below:

![Planned Data Warehouse Architecture](image)

In the proposed architecture, the two main components are a CMS Data Repository and the Clerk’s Office Data Warehouse. The CMS Data Repository is a normalized representation of the full content of the JANO database.

It is structured to serve two purposes: The first is to enable more robust Ad-hoc reports on a case-by-case basis. The second is to serve as a common intermediate database to facilitate migration of all legacy data into a new CMS, when the time comes.
The Circuit Clerk Office’s Data Warehouse is a subset of the CMS Data Repository organized to facilitate efficient access to relevant data and other common business analytic and statistical information that judges and other executive users would commonly want without having to request reports from the Clerk’s Office.

Electronic Court Operations (ECO) Suite:
The Intelligent Forms application (as described later in this document) used to facilitate the automation of the Order of Protection (OP), while fully functional, was not enough of a front-end solution that would scale to the real time needs in the high volume courtroom. For this reason, the Clerk’s Office came up with an approach to meet those needs and named it the Electronic Court Operations (ECO) suite, as it facilitates incremental growth to automate in-court processes. ECO is implemented using Adobe® Flex® for the user interface in conjunction with Adobe® LiveCycle®, which supports the workflow. It is important to note that forms that are entered using the ECO Suite push the necessary data into JANO using a web service.

The court file data that is displayed on the screen corresponds to the data on the traffic jacket, and is also the data that is most commonly accessed during a court hearing. Images are pulled based on the courtroom and displayed upon request. Drag and drop technology in conjunction with the use of templates allows for orders to be quickly written in real time without impacting attorney and/or judge’s time.

Within the court, attorneys can suggest desired orders to the judge which places the item in the judge’s “To Do” list. Judge reviews the “To Do” list and can accept, modify or reject the suggestion. When complete, the orders can be digitally signed. The digital signature is applied using an HSM (Hardware Security Manager), specifically Cosign Central Appliance Edition by Algorithmic Research (ARX). This signature is secured by both the user’s domain credentials and a secondary password using a Juniper Steel Belted Radius server. Signatures can be applied to orders individually or to collections of orders depending on the type of order and any relevant legislative constraints. The order is automatically docketed with a copy of the image sent to the DMS.

The system is currently implemented for judges, clerks, SAO, and the Public Defender’s Office. Initial short term plans are to expand this to allow the defense bar access to the system within the courtroom. Subsequent plans are to gradually expand into other divisions of the court system, with volume of court calls being a basis for prioritization.

Check-In:
There is a check-in process of case parties. It can be used to access reports and cases for a collective court call based on case type, defendants present, those needing interpreters, etc. The check in process involves the defendants presenting themselves to the clerk outside the courtroom, giving the court room participants a current list of defendants present in court. The check in process feeds the ECO.
court room clerk has the ability to update a payment module on cases with certain types of information about the order, including payment. Payments can be taken in the court or with use of the payment app, by another clerk outside of the court room.

System Administration:
The ECO suite has an administrative component that allows for error tracking and correction, as well as device status and other operational measurements relating to system health and usage.

Electronic Payment/ e-Guilty:
Electronic Payments is an online payment application formally launched in late December 2010 and supersedes the JANO Justice Systems ePay online payment website that was in use at that time. Payments are processed via the same credit card processor used for other payment programs throughout the Circuit Clerk’s Office. This application pushes data into JANO through a web service interface.

This application has also incorporated the eGuilty application which has the ability to take a defendant’s plea online along with any payments due. The AOIC currently does not allow a plea of guilty to be entered online, therefore customers are required to print their plea, sign it, and mail it to the office. An application for AOIC approval for online plea acceptance is expected to be submitted in 2011 and the online capability will be enabled once approval has been granted.

Intelligent Forms:
The Intelligent Forms application is based on the Adobe® LiveCycle® Suite and is used to automate internal electronic filing within the Judicial and Public Safety System. While a precursor to the ECO suite, many of the underlying components are shared with the ECO suite. Currently, Protection Orders and Court Services reports are supported along with other forms. Data from the forms are also used to pre-populate the judge’s orders.

The Protection Order process has evolved into a complete process to handle the entire Order of Protection return court call.

Expungement requests have also been implemented. A request is sent to SAO, who may contest the request. If the SAO does not contest, an Assistant State’s Attorney selects an order for expungement, fills it out, and forwards it to the Chief Judge for a digital signature. After 7 days, if the judge does not sign, a reminder email is sent. After 14 days, if still not signed, an email is sent to the SAO who can either do nothing, which results in email notification to all parties that the order request is not being processed, or the SAO can re-submit. Expungements must also be propagated to State Police. ISP fees for expungement are manually collected up front and reimbursed if not processed.
The Clerk’s future plans include adding the ability to submit Court Services reports to the courts. Initially, the following reports are among those implemented:

- Community Service Hours Documented and terminations
- Conditional Discharge
- Electronic Home Monitoring
- Kids In A Divorcing Society (KIDS) Divorce Education Program completions
- Juvenile court room processes

Intelligent Scanning:
Intelligent scanning would be an adjunct application to replace the existing 3G functionality and augment it by using facial recognition technology to read unconstructed documents. The intent is that the system would be trained to understand the codes used in the Circuit Clerk’s Office and would make recommendations to the user, complete with docketing codes and metadata. The execution of this project is anticipated to occur after the replacement of the JANO, should the new CMS not have a comparable function.

Invoicing:
Due to an inability of the CMS to allow entry and tracking of unpaid amounts, a stand-alone application to handle invoicing for statutory fees was implemented in 2009, including issuance of the invoice. While using the stand-alone application solves the immediate need, it requires manual issuance and follow up tracking that should otherwise be automated. Additionally, the ability to run quality assurance reports to identify avoided fees is not available and should be integrated with the invoice capability.

Integrated Voice Response (IVR):
The IVR System is a legacy system originally implemented in 1995. Over the years, it originally evolved to support:

- Traffic/Criminal and Civil Inquiries
- Child Support Payment Inquiries

Note that Child Support Inquiries were discontinued for the following reasons:

- There is no real-time access to the SDU information and,
- Having a means, other than with the use of Social Security numbers, to restrict information to be delivered to either the payee or payer and provide the appropriate information based on the party. Furthermore, the complexity of JANO data structure, and the need to access multiple files that contain relevant data, has hindered the advancement of a solution.
Online Portal for eServices:
This project has been initiated and is in development. The solution uses XML messaging and is a web portal based application with various SOA components, using the ISS Integrated Justice Enterprise Exchange Broker (iJEEB™), to facilitate electronic services to filing parties and attorneys. Use of the online services requires registration of a user with the Circuit Clerk’s Office and agreeing to terms and conditions for each component.

It is envisioned that the online portal starts with key activity centers and links them into a cohesive process from starting with automating the cover sheet used to file a new case to online scheduling to electronic issuance of the summons. These activity centers are described below.

Expedited Filing (xFile™):
This project is planned for the future and is not currently in production. A desired and planned expectation is the eventual ability to accept electronic civil filings. The current Supreme Court policy regarding electronic submissions currently prevent true electronic filing capability without an extensive application process but there are areas where the manual process can be automated and still maintain compliance with policy while the Supreme Court evaluates the future of electronic filing.

Under manual processes, new civil case filings are dropped off in bulk filings by courier. The delays that occur in processing these bulk filings result in rework and additional expense for filing parties because of scheduling conflicts that must be corrected before a case can be initiated.

Expedited Filing (xFile) is based on the filing practice that has been in place in Kane County since 1984, which requires a New Case Information Sheet (NCIS) to be provided when a new case is filed. Automating the preparation of this required form for filing parties brings multiple efficiencies to the Circuit Clerk’s Office and acts as the bridge to electronic filing in Kane County. However, by itself it does not in itself bring all of the desired efficiencies for filing parties.

Paperwork filed using an xFile New Case Information Sheet guarantees that a filer will receive their case numbers the same day that they file the case. For those sending filings by courier, the case numbers are returned by email and the new case number is sent to the online scheduling application (iSchedule) in real time.

A companion to xFile is the internal Manager that displays the data captured from the online completion of the NCIS, allowing the clerk to quickly match the NCIS by receipt number, and use the data to initiate the new case.

iSchedule™:
This project is planned for the future and is not currently in production. Within the court, there is a need to manage schedules to ensure better case load balancing among judges. In addition, a utility to allow filing parties to manage court scheduling for their cases allows for improved efficiencies. To this
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end, the iScheduling application was developed. It is an outsourced application development built for the court. Through use of this application, the court schedule is accessible to filers.

Judicial assignments can get complicated and the application will have the ability to limit schedules by event codes, find open dates and allow scheduling based on judges’ rules, which also include judge availability as well as rules based on the courtroom.

Within the context of the Online Portal for eService, this component provides filers the ability to self-schedule civil cases online. It also opens up the ability for attorneys to select dates based on multiple factors, supporting their needs around the clock while keeping the court in control of each court room’s calendar and unique scheduling rules.

This component interacts with JANO in real time, allowing a law firm to schedule an existing case or new case as soon as they have a case number.

eSummons:
This project is planned for the future and is not currently in production. This component facilitates the automatic preparation of a new summons document after a user has received a case number and scheduled the first appearance date. Once the scheduled date has been accepted and saved into JANO, the summons is sent to the clerk for automated issuance and then returned to the requesting attorney. The cost of the initial summons is covered with the new case filing. As part of the eServices work flow, this component eliminates rework from closed court dates. The summons form and other restricted access documents planned for this activity center are developed as Adobe® LiveCycle® solution.

Kane Online Case Inquiry System (KOCIS):
This project is planned for the future and is not currently in production. The KOCIS system (also referred to as Attorney of Record Images) is a component of the services web portal application that allows for attorneys and litigants to electronically access and print documents associated with a case for a fee in conformance with Supreme Court policy. There are a limited number of fields that a user can search on. The application directly accesses the CM and the RVI to access the filed documents related to a case and present them to a user who can then review and/or print the documents. This project is under development but does not have a set delivery date as it is developed only when time permits.

Protection Orders Filing Wizard:
Kane County does not have a separate protection order agency. The Protection Order Filing Wizard is a public facing application accessible from the main Public Web Access page at URL http://www.cic.co.kane.il.us:8080/WizardService/opWizard.html. The EOP (civil and criminal and as part of domestic cases) has been automated using the Adobe® LiveCycle® Enterprise Suite in conjunction with Java-based supporting applications to manage data entry by user (advocate or State’s Attorney).
A victim uses the online wizard to enter basic information and is guided through a series of questions. Upon starting the wizard, the user receives a receipt number. When the user entry is completed, the data is saved in a database. The user then sees an advocate who uses the application to retrieve the user-prepared data with the receipt and then finishes filling out the LiveCycle® form with the user. Physical signatures for the form are captured using ePads (but the process is in place for judges to provide digital signatures). The advocate then submits the petition. There are no fees associated with the petition.

The data from the petition on LiveCycle® is automatically docketed into the CMS and the electronic form is put into RealVision. A copy of the form is emailed to the Circuit Clerk’s Office, a copy is printed for the victim and a copy is emailed to both, the assisting attorney (State’s Attorney or Prairie State Legal Aid) and Kane County Sheriff’s Office. The Sheriff’s Office manually enters into LEADS. Plans include the Sheriff’s Office importing XML data from the forms.

Certification never occurs on original documents, so when the forms are populated in CMS, they are not certified versions. However, the electronic copies sent to the Sheriff’s Office are certified for service purposes and entry into LEADS. As with warrants, the order is enforceable by agencies without the physical paper. The service and enforcement of the order can be performed by the Sheriff’s Office (or any agency).

The full process is illustrated on the next page:
Since the introduction of the wizard, only 5% of users pre-populate the order information with the wizard and most go to see the advocate directly. This is because the advocates are very helpful and take an active role in assisting users through the process.

Criminal Orders of Protection follow the same process that as civil cases. In an Emergency Order of Protection (EOP), the use of an advocate is not optional. Control of the order can pass between different advocates including the SAO for criminal cases.

One difference in the process that is not shown above is that if there is already an entry in the LEADS system, the arresting officer will fill out a short form.
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Public Web Access:
The public web site is located at http://www.cic.co.kane.il.us/index.htm and provides access to Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), Forms, and a variety of other information. It is also the means by which the other customer applications are accessed. These are as follows:

- Web Access to JANO
- Protection Order Filing Wizard
- Electronic Payment (ePay) / ePlea
- Web Schedule Search

According to the Clerk’s Office staff, there have been many complaints with the public access system. In reviewing the site and the different applications, it would appear that most would be related to the web access to JANO.

One desired capability would be the ability to publish directly to the website from the CMS.

Web Access to JANO:
The Web Access to JANO is a web portal interface to the mainframe and is accessed via URL: http://www.cic.co.kane.il.us/OnlineCourtInformation.asp.

It is implemented using the Rocket Seagull Software J Walk Client. It emulates the JANO screens via the web and allows users to search the court database either by name or by case type. As an application for public use, it is somewhat clunky, does not render the graphics consistently in all browsers and since it is emulating the JANO screens, assumes the knowledge of the case types, and has no user help to help guide public users to find information that they are looking for.

Three examples of the interface are shown below:
Figure 3: Login Screen

Figure 4: Initial Search Screen
Wiki:
The Circuit Clerk’s Office has a stand-alone WIKI that is used as a Knowledge Base, Communication System, and Collaboration Tool. It also has good search capabilities allowing staff the ability to search for procedures and answers to customer questions. The Wiki serves as an internal portal, single source where clerks access all applications from icons on the Wiki, including the Help Desk (the office utilizes the County’s Help Desk software for internal issues).

Future Goals:
Future goals and visions of the Clerk’s Office are many and varied and continue to take into account the overall court process and the interactions with systems other than the CMS. These are listed below and are not prioritized:

- Full courtroom automation
- Evolve to a Paper on Demand (POD) system
- Maintain/preserve integration with Court Services
- Better integration with the State’s Attorney’s Office
- Integrate with the:
  - Public Defender
  - Arresting Agencies
  - State Agencies
  - Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)
  - Health and Family Services
Existing Hardware Topography:
The Circuit Clerk’s Office IT environment links to the courthouse using a fiber system and connects to the two branch offices in Elgin and Aurora, Illinois, which are using T1 carriers. The Circuit Clerk’s Office is dependent on the county IT for infrastructure, cabling and network. The switches, VoIP equipment and VPN concentrators are all Cisco Systems.

The server hardware includes two leased IBM AS/400’s hosting JANO and the RVI application (excluding the hardware in DeKalb and Kendall). Note that the lease on the AS400’s expires in two years and does pose some time constraints for migrating to a new case management system. There are 12 Windows servers that host the majority of all of the other applications. Most of these servers are configured as file servers and run with a RAID 5 configuration. The server that hosts the Adobe® LiveCycle® also has a RAID 5 configuration, but has a dual quad processor for performance.

The applications described throughout this document are logically represented below with an indication as to the machine type that the application runs on. Note that this bears no relevance to the specific physical machines used in the network. Also note that the Circuit Clerk’s Office purchased ISS’s Enterprise Exchange Broker, iJEEB™ for the purpose of going away from point to point integrations and adopting a more Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) centric approach for greater flexibility and a plug and play environment. While iJEEB™ has many components such as the Enterprise Services Bus, Admin Security Module, Rules Engine, ETL Engine, etc., it is not reflected in the diagram below:
Figure 6: Logical Application Topography
There are several point-to-point web services implemented that support the interaction between the various applications. The diagram below is a high level view of the main web services that are used to implement the adjunct applications. Most of these facilitate the interactions needed to automate the business processes and the corresponding interactions with JANO, ECO Suite and LiveCycle®.

Figure 7: Logical Relationships Between Applications and Web Services
The purpose of this case study is to obtain feedback on the current system and determine the future outlook of technology in the courtroom by the Judiciary. Ultimately, the scope is to identify initial system functionality requirements necessary to support the Judges and their staff.

System performance over the past few years has raised questions regarding the stability of the current case management system (JANO) and the expected remaining life. The Judiciary is eager to create and work toward a long term technology strategy and determine the most efficient short term steps to ensure the best final solution.

Applications created to assist the Judiciary in performing daily activities are often not utilized as their presence is not well known. The following describes the most predominant technology interfaces and the impact/use from a Judiciary standpoint.

JANO:
Kane County began integrating in the late 1990’s by seeking a replacement to the mainframe application that had been in use up to that time. In 1998, an RFP was issued for a Case Management System (CMS) application for all three counties in the Circuit (Kane, DeKalb, and Kendall). As a result, the Kane County Circuit Clerk brought in a CMS known as JANO. Case management for the Judges is almost entirely a Circuit Clerk’s Office function. That being said, the reporting features of JANO are very important to the Judiciary, as there are critical reports that must be prepared for the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC).

JANO has the ability to breakdown and report fines and fees based on Judge’s order, which was agreed to be a strength of the system. Exception reports, such as identifying people assigned to Probation who did not report to the Probation Officer, are the only other standard reporting information deemed usable by the Judges and their support staff. The existing reports on statistics such as jury trial counts and aged cases are not utilized as the data has been proven erroneous.

When this type of information is required, an Ad Hoc report request is submitted to the Circuit Clerk’s Office. A single person is responsible for providing reports to the Judiciary. Due to the workload, reports received serve more of a historical data purpose rather than provide planning assistance. Day-to-day operations cannot be managed based on the information obtained from existing system reports.

An example of the use of exception reports is in the slaughter calls held in a number of courtrooms.
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Staff sends notices for any cases that have not had any activity on them in nine months and no future court date is set. Parties are responsible for coming before the Judge to explain the inactivity. Any cases without a representative party will be disposed.

The integrity of the data currently housed by JANO has been questioned, including both loss and the quality of the information. Previously, a Quality Assurance Manager position in the Circuit Clerk’s Office was tasked with the primary responsibility of ensuring the integrity of the system processes/data. Since the absence of this position, a noticeable difference in reporting has been noted, including the existence of more codes which many attribute to creating new types when existing ones are hard to lookup. The creation of multiple fields representing the same information in multiple files is not only inefficient, but results in the unreliability of information maintained within JANO.

Document Imaging System – RVI:
The RVI is a document imaging system currently available to retrieve and review the case file from any location, including the courtroom, via a secure sign on process. Currently, pulling up files in the imaging system requires more time than flipping through the paper file provided by the Circuit Clerk’s Office. According to Judges interviewed, navigation is difficult as there is currently no mechanism for easy scrolling and direct access to documents, further increasing the time to review the documentation. The lack of user-friendly alternatives has prevented the use of this system on a routine basis.

Moreover, it was pointed out that if there is a delay in scanning documents, images may not available when needed; this results in staff from various agencies going to paper files for information, rather than using RVI. Furthermore, images in RVI may be hard to read, especially if the image is taken of a copy of an original document. Finally, RVI requires a password that matches the JANO password, but the RVI password is linked to the computer log-in password, which is changed every 90 days. This requires users of RVI to update their password regularly in order to synchronize both the RVI and JANO passwords, which can be quite burdensome.

Electronic Court Operations (ECO) Suite:
Electronic Court Operations (ECO) Suite is in the initial phase of rollout. The application provides courtroom check-in, payment, and order preparation functionality. Judge Hallock volunteered to perform beta testing given the volume of cases that currently flow through his courtroom. Although in the early stages, the application was praised for its overall ease of use.

Other Applications:
The Courtrooms are not strangers to using current technology to speed along the justice process as they perform video arraignments throughout the week and video bond calls on weekends. However, calendars are currently kept in journals by each of the Judges. iSchedule, an application currently underway for online court case scheduling, enforces rules based on courtroom and the benefits are to include assistance in balancing case load and eliminating rework of rescheduling due to overbooking. Furthermore, there is no mechanism in JANO to block a specific time frame for a court hearing.
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Currently, staff must block the judge’s entire day, and then override that entry with other scheduled events. This is inefficient and should be addressed by the CMS.

In addition, judges expressed a need to tie a defendant’s cases together, whether criminal or civil, so that all cases could be scheduled for the same time, if appropriate. At this time, there is no ability to look up a defendant’s cases in JAN0 that are not related to a criminal manner. For example, if defendant has a child support obligation on a divorce case, but is in court on a criminal matter, the judge is unaware of the pending civil case.

There is currently no central location for attorneys and pro se litigants to get information regarding their case and associated courtroom when arriving for court. A significant amount of people’s time at the Court and in the Circuit Clerk’s Office is spent retrieving and reporting this information.

Technology Goals and Aspirations:
The overall theme throughout the meetings for a long-term goal was to work cohesively as a team and reduce the overhead associated with putting paper files together and reduce the opportunity for files to be misplaced between the Circuit Clerk’s Office and the Courtrooms.

Statistical Reporting:
The Judges and their staff aspire to obtain accurate reports in a timely manner. Rather than relying on a single point of contact to provide historical statistics, they would like the ability to review courtroom data on demand. Reports such as case dispositions, number of jury trials, cases pending (complex versus simple), and cases by status (set for trial, pre-trial, etc.) or attorney name, would assist in daily courtroom operations. Also, current caseload reports (type of case by Judge name) would assist the Chief Judge in managerial duties, such as assigning cases to balance the workload. The need to manage cases through visiting all courtrooms rather than reviewing active caseloads from a system report would be removed and increase overall efficiency.

Another aspect of reporting would be the ability to determine the financial position of Courts that collect money to confirm that Judges are ordering what is statutorily required. The Court Administrator would like data regarding fines owed, as well as information regarding fines/fees assessed by judges to ensure that each judge is assessing fees required by statute. Hard data would assist in enforcing the Court’s financial obligations to other organizational units, such as Probation. Non-financial obligations owed, such as community service hours, would also be beneficial to review in summary to get a quick glimpse of the outstanding commitment.
Screen Layout:
The Judiciary would like a screen created that is easily navigated and customizable to the data required by a particular Judge, but consistent enough that Judges can rotate courtrooms and not be uncomfortable with how to maneuver through the information quickly and efficiently. Some of the functionality discussed was the ability for a touch screen interface for ease of use and access links to move quickly between sections of a case file.

System Access and Role Capabilities:
In order to take the step toward a paper on demand courtroom, the Judges requested that the system contain a virtual way to mark a file without leaving the information as part of the public record. A Judge may review a case the day before presented and would like to be able to note and retrieve information, but ensure that anything added would only be accessible to him/herself or other Judges.

Another common theme was the ability to securely access files from a remote location to allow Judges ample time to prepare prior to the case being presented in court. There appeared to be confusion as to whether this option is currently available. If available, training on the use of this functionality would be the next step.

Technological Workflow Support:

General:
Electronic signatures are currently being used by the county on documents such as the Order of Protection (OP), through a signature pad positioned on the Bench in the courtroom. In addition, the Electronic Courtroom Operations (ECO) mentioned above is currently allowing for digital signatures on Court Orders signed in Judge Hallock’s courtroom.

Criminal:
Criminal scheduling, including motion hearings done from the office, is done by the Clerk’s Office. Civil motion scheduling is done by the Chief Judge’s Office, while civil orders are handled by the Clerk’s Office. However, no weight is given to cases pertaining to higher crime charges.

An application was created to handle the input of Order of Protection forms, which allows efficiency from inception through judgment. The Petitioner can quickly fill out the associated information and the findings and proposed order are sent to a queue, which is accessible for Judges to search by Petitioner last name.

The Judge is able to quickly retrieve and review the information, make changes to a proposed order (if necessary), and order the OP. The forms then flow electronically to the Sheriff’s Office, removing the need for the manual transport of the document. The forms are printed and entered into LEADS on the Sheriff’s side.
Traffic:
A check in process is in place that assists with case organization by notifying the Judge when parties are present in the courtroom. The application reduces the amount of time Judges spend calling cases where parties have not yet arrived. However, there is currently no plan to roll out this process to the remaining courtrooms for additional case types.

HARDWARE AND IT SUPPORT

The availability and use of hardware and IT Support to move the paper on demand system forward was also discussed. Upgrades to the current hardware, such as additional power outlets and dual monitors were suggested. Also, IT Support dedicated to maintaining the daily systems and ensuring a quick turnaround for outages and upgrades was agreed to be highly beneficial.
APPENDIX C: COURT SERVICES OFFICE REVIEW

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

This case study looks at the Kane County Court Services need to share information with other Departments such as SAO, Public Defender, Kane County Diagnostic Center (KCDC), Circuit Court, Circuit Clerk of Court, Sheriff’s Department and Juvenile Justice Center; as well as the sharing of information within the various Court Services units.

Ultimately, the challenge is to enable the various departments and units to share information consistently, accurately and securely in a manner that minimizes the duplication of effort, and identifies gaps and barriers to sharing.

TECHNICAL ENVIRONMENT

Court Services:
Probation Officers supervise defendants in the community by monitoring the defendants’ activities, referring to special programs and community agencies and reporting violation to the States Attorney’s Office (SAO). Throughout a defendant’s tenure with Court Services, he/she can be assigned to more than one of the various units within Court Services. This requires the consistent and accurate sharing of information to assure the terms of the defendant’s probation are identified and satisfied.

In the case of adults and some juveniles, a defendant’s assignment to Court Services begins with an agreement between the State’s Attorney and defense attorney as to the terms of probation. This agreement is documented on a Judgment Order which is then signed by a judge. The Judgment Order has hand written information on the bottom containing orders for the defendant’s probation.

Adult Probation:
The defendant’s personal information and Court Orders on the Judgment Order are entered into the Court’s case management system, JANO, by the Circuit Clerk. Court Services support staff first gets the paperwork from the court. They search by court case number on the Circuit Clerk side of JANO to see if the defendant has other cases in the court. If other cases are found, they then search the probation side of JANO to determine if the defendant already exists on the probation side. If other cases are found in JANO, this new case is assigned to the defendant’s P#, otherwise a new case is started.

The support staff then assigns the defendant to the probation area where the defendant lives. The defendant is assigned to a Probation Officer and their supervision begins.
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At the first, second and third Intake appointments the following tasks will be completed:

- Picture of defendant is taken
- Defendant signs Court Orders again after secondary review by Probation Officer and defendant
- Defendant signs probation rules and office rules
- Defendant signs release of information for third party contacts
- Demographic data is collected and corrected address information is emailed to Circuit Clerk
- Complete financial form
- Discuss payments/envelopes
- Pre-screen scoring instrument (IPI) is completed to determine risk level and reporting standards
- If needed, the LSI-R Scoring instrument is completed to determine risk level and reporting standards
- Case supervision plan is completed
- If required, DNA is collected and sent to Illinois State Police
- Urinalysis is collected and sent to lab / results posted online
- Applicable Interstate or Intrastate supervision fees are assessed by Probation Officer, per departmental standards
- Corrected financial information is emailed to Circuit Clerk
- Criminal History Request form is submitted to LEADS operator, Criminal History is printed and returned to PO
- If CRS is ordered, CRS application is completed by PO and defendant, and forwarded to CRS coordinator. Paper copy is retained by both PO and Coordinator
- PO requests copy of SAO file
- SAO sends file to probation, support staff scans file for PO to print and returns file to SAO.

A home visit is a must for every probationer when they first come into the system. It is important for the Probation Officer to check that the address they were given actually exists. When the defendant’s address is added or updated on the Court Services side of JANO, the change does not flow over to the Circuit Clerk side of JANO; therefore addresses can be out of sync on the two sides of JANO. Once the defendant completes the terms of probation successfully, the case is closed. The file is sent to the IT department for scanning and retention as PDF in Archive.

Juvenile Probation:
A minor’s first contact with Court Services may be due to a referral by the police department following an arrest. The case will be assigned to a PO by the support staff. PO receives the case with a cover letter that includes the established JF# and the police department referral packet.

The packet includes; juvenile referral form, copy of police report, victim information, and any other information the police deem necessary.
To establish the case, the following tasks are completed:

- PO contacts victim (if necessary) by letter or phone call
  - PO may collect restitution to be paid to victim
  - PO schedules preliminary conference with minor and parents
- PO completes preliminary conference with minor and parents
  - PO completes Pre-screen Youth Assessment Screening Instrument (YASI)
  - PO has releases of information signed and sent out (school, treatment providers, etc.)
  - PO completes LEAD and JANO check for criminal history
  - PO contacts referring police department for additional information
- PO staffs case with Supervisor
  - PO and Supervisor complete referral staffing sheet
  - Supervisor and PO determine outcome of the referral
    - Minor’s case intake closed or
    - Minor’s case diverted or
    - Minor’s case referred to SAO with petition to file
  - Minor’s case intake closed
    - PO sends notice to parents and minor stating case is closed
    - PO sends copy (via mail) of juvenile referral form back to police department
    - PO updates the status in JANO and forwards closed case to supervisor
- Minor’s case diverted
  - PO schedules appointment with minor and parents to go over diversion
  - PO has diversion agreement signed by minor and parents
  - PO updates status in JANO
  - PO sends copy (via mail) of juvenile referral form back to police department
  - Collateral agency contacts are made as deemed appropriate per individual diversion
  - Diversion is completed and case is closed
- Minor’s case referred to SAO
  - PO sends notice to parents and minor through JANO that case has been referred to SAO
  - PO updates status in JANO
  - PO completes petition request to the SAO, scans and emails petition request, police report, victim information to SAO
  - No petition is filed by SAO
    - PO updates JANO to close out case
  - Petition is filed by SAO
    - PO receives a copy of petition filed by SAO
    - PO updates JANO with details
    - PO monitors case through the court process
    - PO may have to complete Social History (SHI) for the case
When SAO determines a detention hearing is required, the office may request that a SHI be completed for the minor by the PO. The SHI is a complete representation of the minor and his/her family. Sections of the SHI are: Legal History, Family and Environment, Family Composition, Parents Marital History, Siblings, Family Members (Criminal History, mental illness, and/or physical problems), School, Community and Peer Relationships, Alcohol and Other Drugs, Mental Health, Aggression or Violence, Attitudes, Skills, Employment or Use of Free Time. The YASI full screen is completed and the results are attached to the SHI.

The minor and parents appear in court for the scheduled hearing. The PO monitors the case via Court Orders until disposition of the case. Court Orders are received via interoffice mail and logged in case notes. If Court Orders must be given attention immediately, they may be faxed over, or scanned and received via email. Similarly, Court Services will sometimes scan the Court Orders and email those orders to outer offices, if necessary.

If the minor is sentenced to probation the PO will schedule an intake appointment and the standard probation supervision is initiated. At the first, second, and third Intake appointments the following tasks will be completed:

First Appointment

- Sentencing Orders are reviewed and initialed
- Contact information updated in JANO
- Minor’s picture taken for face sheet
- Release of information forms signed
- PO completes CRS application
- Minor name and address placed on Home Visit List
- If minor has been ordered gang conditions a copy of the order is emailed to APD gang unit
- Financial form is reviewed (Verbal payment instructions and Circuit Clerk envelopes provided
- Case Notes completed for file

Second Appointment

- YASI is updated to determine supervision level
- Minor submits to observed urinalysis
- PO makes any necessary referrals to collateral agencies
- DNA Indexing completed if appropriate
- Case Notes completed for file
Third Appointment

- Case supervision plan drafted with input from minor and parents
- Plan printed and signed by minor and guardian
- PO reviews UA results, If positive minor is eligible for Sanction Process
- Schedules next appointment based on minor’s supervision level
- Collateral contacts are made based on supervision level and individual case needs

YASI re-assessments are completed every four months. Using the results, supervision level is reviewed and an acknowledgement form is signed by minor. If the minor is in compliance, a term court report is completed six days before term date recommending case closure. If not in compliance, a Petition to Revoke may be requested from the SAO, and the PO will continue to review the case, as deemed appropriate based on Court Orders.

Support Staff:
Support staff initiates new cases at the reception window, log paper workflow between offices, and scan the paper copy of SAO files when received. The paper copy of SAO file is returned to the SAO. The scanned SAO file is later printed by the Probation Officer so that the complete file can be imaged by the IT department for archival. Support staff also collects copies of sentencing orders from the courtroom clerk on a daily basis. The paper copies are then distributed to the appropriate Probation Officer.

States Attorney’s Office (SAO):
Probation Officers rely heavily upon receipt of the SAO files in a timely manner. The SAO files contain the police report, which is needed to complete the supervision level scoring instruments and development of the defendant’s case plan.
Probation Officers routinely file Violation of Probation requests with SAO by emailing the request as an attachment. The request is printed with the delivery receipt and placed in the defendant’s file. Along with the request, they must send police reports and a criminal history from LEADS. It is the PO’s responsibility to follow up with SAO, or research the court records in JANO to see if the SAO filed the case. Further action by SAO is noted by the PO in the defendant’s case file.

Generate Appointment Notices:
Probation Officers must send appointment notices to inform the probationer when to appear for their appointments. These notices are generated as a tri fold letter in JANO when the officer enters the specific code for the notice. A docket is created in the defendants file in JANO when the notice is sent out. Currently, these notices are mailed out by the Circuit Clerk saving Court Services a considerable amount of time and expense. It is very important that this mailing process is available after a new CMS is installed for Court Services.
Report Writers:
Court Services report writers generate Pre-trial reports, Pre-trial Bond reports, Pre-Sentence Investigation (PSI) reports, and Pre-plea PSI reports. Every morning they produce a list of cases from JANO that have a PSI or Pre-Trial ordered. Requests for report can also come from SAO or other parties involved with a case. These reports will include a criminal history, family interviews, education and employment history, medical and mental health history, military history, drug and alcohol treatment and will now include the LSI-R.

The defendant is interviewed and release forms signed. Release forms signed by the defendant are completed and letters are typed and sent to the appropriate facilities. The officers request additional information: SAO file, LEADS criminal history, Driving abstract, victim information and other records checks. If applicable, a referral is sent to the KCDC for a sex offender evaluation to be completed. At the time of writing the report, all the information obtained from the defendant as well as returned information from releases sent out are typed into the report. Also put into the report, if appropriate is the defendant statement, PO input, victim information, and Sex Offender evaluation.

Once the PSI or Pre-plea PSI report is completed, the judge gets the original copy; additional copies go to SAO, defendant’s attorney and Court Services keeps a copy for their file. The copy that Court Services keeps is initialed and dated by each office as their copy is delivered. If the defendant has a private attorney, attorney’s copy is certified mailed.

After the PSI report is submitted to the court, if additional information is received, it is submitted to the court in addendum form. The addendum is copied and distributed in the same manner as the original report.

Circuit Clerk’s Office:
Probation Officers communicate regularly by email with the Circuit Clerk’s office. When the PO updates or adds sentencing, charging, and/or address information for the defendant, the updated information is emailed to the Circuit Clerk so their files can be updated as well. Entry of information into the Probation side of JANO does not automatically populate the Circuit Clerk side of JANO, even though this is one system.

Current financial information is also routinely communicated via email. Court Services must assess probation fees for interstate (and likely soon, intrastate fees) based upon the defendant’s ability to pay. Community Service (CRS) fees are also assessed based upon the defendant’s timeliness of completion. The Circuit Clerk needs to know what fees are owed, and if and when they are paid. Financial coordination with the clerk can be a complicated process when communicating via email.

Drug Court Workflow (DRC):
Application is made in courtroom by attorney. The completed application is forwarded to the DRC supervisor for assignment, assessment and interview. Applicant’s information is used by DRC supervisor
to contact the arresting police agency for approval into the DRC program. This is completed via phone or email.

If the defendant is accepted to the DRC program, case supervision follows the same standards and procedures as a regular probation case. The only exceptions are:

- Treatment information is communicated either by email or phone on participants.
- Case Notes, whether taken in court or outside of court, are handwritten or typed, and filed by the PO assigned to the case.

Pretrial Release Unit Workflow:
The Pretrial Release unit will receive a Court Order to complete a Pre-trial Report for a Bond Reduction Motion Report for a defendant. The report contains: criminal history from LEADS, interview with defendant, verification of interview information with collateral contact and complete Risk assessment. The report will be hand delivered to judge, SAO and defense attorney on the day of the hearing. If the Bond Reduction Motion is granted, the defendant may be assigned to Pretrial Release unit. The PO receives orders via interoffice mail. The defendant’s case is managed much like a standard probation case.

Kane County Diagnostic Center (KCDC):
KCDC receives a request for diagnostic evaluation of a defendant. These requests can come from Court, Probation Officer, State’s Attorney, Public Defender or private attorney. KCDC requires specific pieces of information from the requestor; such as KCDC Referral form, copy of Court Order, and Police Reports. In addition, a signed release from each agency at which the client has ever received any of the following: inpatient or outpatient mental health services, psychological testing, drug/alcohol evaluation or treatment, treatment for a severe medical disorder, special educational or vocational services. This paperwork is usually delivered via interoffice envelope or fax. Evaluations are communicated back to the requestor via paper copy.

The Referral form and Court Order are required before the defendant can even be placed on their waiting list. Getting a police report and referral can take a week or longer. Risk assessments need to be done immediately, but are held up until the paperwork is received. KCDC also requires a copy of Order of Protection, if one exists. These are very difficult to get especially if it is in a different county.

Community Restitution Services (CRS) Program:
This program is a sentencing alternative in which defendants can work at not-for-profit organizations in lieu of paying fines, or as compensation to the community. CRS Coordinators monitor defendants in the north end, tri-city area, and south end of the county. Coordinators schedule offenders into worksites, recruit worksites and train worksite personnel, and report offenders’ compliance to the court. If CRS is ordered, a CRS application is completed by PO and defendant, and then forwarded to CRS coordinator, or the application can be completed solely by the defendant when he/she arrives at the
office, and support staff then routes the application to the proper PO, which is then forwarded to the CRS coordinator. Paper copy is retained by both PO and Coordinator.

Probation Officer receives orders for CRS through interoffice mail or they pick up at the branch courts. An Order for CRS contains a start date, number of hours ordered and end date. A copy or image of the Order is added to the defendant’s case file. A case note is added to defendants file with date of order, number of hours, start date and end date in JANO.

If the defendant is a transfer in, a new case is entered in JANO for the defendant. PO will send the requesting county confirmation of transfer via email or fax. Defendants file is updated with the CRS Order and case note in JANO.

If the defendant is a transfer out, a packet of information is sent either by mail, fax or email to defendants’ residing county. The packet contains copies of Court Order, transfer request and CRS application. A letter is sent to defendant notifying them whom to contact in the transfer county.

The defendant submits hours worked to the PO. PO verifies hours and enters them in JANO. A monthly Worksite Report is generated out of JANO by the Tri Cities office and sent out to Elgin and Aurora offices through interoffice mail. The PO’s then mail, email, or fax the report to the worksite to be completed. The worksite then sends back the report to the PO in the same manner as received. The PO then enters the hours, and other pertinent information, into JANO.

A weekly fees report is generated by the Circuit Clerk and sent to the Probation Office. Each Probation Officer verifies accuracy of CRS fees and contacts the Circuit Clerk for various adjustments, if necessary. This is all completed through emails or faxes.

Cases can be closed if defendant has successfully completed hours – that is reported to the court, and the case is closed in JANO. Cases can be closed if a Court Order is received via interoffice mail, or picked up from the Court, and the Court Order states that the case should be closed. Once that Court Order is received, the case is closed on the probation side of JANO.

Statistical Reporting:
The Administrative Offices of Illinois Courts requires monthly statistical reports from Court Services. Currently there isn’t a method within JANO to generate these reports. It is up to each Probation Officer to gather the statistics on their case load. To help compile the statistics, an Excel spreadsheet was created where each PO can enter their workload data.

Interstate and Intrastate Transfer:
In the case of intrastate or interstate transfers, it is imperative that the probationers’ documents are received in a timely manner; as transfer materials are to be forwarded from the sentencing jurisdiction
within ten working days following the receipt of the reporting instructions. Transfer materials must include the following:

- defendant’s criminal history,
- prior probation supervision and treatment,
- signed Court Order,
- police report,
- instruction for payment of monies owed,
- verification of completion or schedule for DNA testing, sex offender registration and STD/HIV testing if applicable,
- any special instructions,
- photograph of the defendant.

This entire packet of documents is in paper format and is scanned and/or printed many times as it moves throughout the units.

Juvenile Homebound Detention/(EM):
There are three levels of homebound detention that can be ordered for minors: (HBI/EM) Homebound I, (HBII) Homebound Detention Level II or (HBIII) Homebound Detention Level III.

For all levels of Homebound the following information must be provided: minor’s address, phone number, Court Orders with case number, charge, date of birth, parent or guardian information and picture.

HBI/EM requires the installation of electronic equipment in the minor’s home and a minimum of one face-to-face contact in the home per week. The equipment is activated on the BI Monitoring website. HBII does not require electronic equipment, but must have a minimum of two face-to-face contacts in the home per week. HBIII only requires a weekly telephone contact.

Each minor will have a folder that contains completed intake forms, case notes documenting all contact with minor, Court Orders, court reports, a map to minor’s residence, school information, violation reports, BI Monitoring summaries, drug test results, and warrant affidavits if applicable. Homebound Probation Officers tape record their home visit notes and then support staff types the notes into Word, and the Word document is printed and manually placed in a paper file. The Homebound Probation Officers also write case notes into that paper file.

Electronic Home Monitoring (EHM/GPS):
Adults may be ordered to serve their detention on EHM or GPS. The PO will receive a copy of the Court Order: faxed from the jail, sent by attorney or from the defendant. If the order is a condition of Bond, the defendant’s electronic monitoring equipment must be hooked up within 24 hours; or else it must be done within two weeks. EHM cases are activated and monitored on the BI Monitoring website. GPS cases are activated and monitored on Pro Tech website.
PO will create a folder for each defendant that contains the following: completed intake forms, case notes documenting all contact with defendant, Court Orders, court reports, a map to their residence, work information, violation reports, BI Monitoring summaries, drug test results, and warrant affidavits if applicable.

PO’s supervision of the defendant will include at least one face to face visit per week, and daily review of in and out ranges on BI or Pro Tech websites. If it is deemed the defendant had unauthorized movement, the PO will file a Violation of Probation request with SAO by emailing the request as an attachment. The request is printed with the delivery receipt and placed in the defendants file. EHM Probation Officers tape record their home visit notes and then support staff types the notes into Word, and the Word document is printed and manually placed in a paper file. The EHM Probation Officers also write case notes into that paper file.

Intensive Probation Supervision (IPS)
IPS is ordered for those defendants who require more stringent supervision than is provided on standard probation. Their supervision will include unscheduled home visits and curfew checks one to four times a week. All documentation needed for standard probation is also required for IPS. IPS Probation Officers tape record their home visit notes and then support staff types the notes into Word, and the Word document is printed and manually placed in a paper file. The Probation Officers also write case notes into that paper file.

Adult Sex Offender:
Defendants who are Court Ordered to be supervised as Sex Offenders are assigned to the Sex Offender Program. The defendant’s intake into this program requires additional testing: STATIC-99 and ACUTE 2007 are scored. If no sex offender evaluation, a referral is made to KCDC for an evaluation. In addition, a referral may be made to additional treatment providers for substance abuse, vocational training and sex offender therapists. Finally, the offender is directed to register with police agency.

At each office visit, the Probation Officer collects/reviews daily activity/mileage logs, collects paystub and other paperwork, reviews progress in treatment, drug test (per policy), refers for polygraph (per policy) and completes ACUTE 2007.

At each home visit, the PO ensures no risk factors/violations of probation/illegal activities are present. Every month, the PO checks on the offender’s compliance with the program by contacting: police agencies, sex offender therapists, polygraphist, SAO, other treatment providers and verify attendance at sex offender therapy sessions.

Adult Sex Offender Probation Officers tape record their home visit notes and then support staff types the notes into Word, and the Word document is printed and manually placed in a paper file.
Juvenile Sex Offender:
A minor can be referred to the Sex Offender program by the court or police department. Once referred, a Social History Investigation (SHI) must be completed on the minor. The minor and/or parents will sign release forms for school and/or counseling. A request will be sent to school for grades, attendance, disciplinary reports, etc. The SHI information will be inputted into Youth Assessment and Screening Instrument (YASI). The full YASI is saved as a Word document and incorporated into the SHI. Once the SHI is complete, a scanned copy is emailed to the SAO or faxed to the private attorney.

The PO will case note all future Court Orders until minor is placed on probation or case is closed. If the minor is placed on probation or supervision, his/her case will be supervised in much the same manner as a standard probation. All documentation needed for standard probation is also required for Sex Offender supervision.

Juvenile Sex Offender Probation Officers tape record their home visit notes and then support staff types the notes into Word, and the Word document is printed and manually placed in a paper file.

Juvenile Justice Center:
The Juvenile Justice Center (JJC) serves those juveniles who have been accused of committing a crime and are awaiting trial both in adult and juvenile court, minors sentenced up to thirty days as a court disposition, or minors held in contempt of court.

Juvenile Detention:
In addition to Court Ordered detention, police officers can call JJC and request a detention. A Question & Answer is completed on the phone to determine if the juvenile qualifies for detention. If the juvenile qualifies for detention, the intake screening sheet is completed electronically using Excel and is printed for staff. It is later filled out in Word and printed for the staff. This intake form is not in their Juvenile Intake System (JIS).

JJC staff enters the juvenile’s information in their JIS, which was created by County IT. They also enter the defendant’s charges, probation status, demographics and address in the electronic Juvenile Monitoring Information System (eJMIS) state system.

The detained juveniles will be in court the next day or on Monday if it is a weekend. There is an average of 1,000 admissions per year, with an average daily population of 48 residents. The majority stay past the detention hearing. A court report is generated in Word for the juvenile’s court appearance. While a juvenile is in residence at the JJC, Special Incident reports are auto generated from JIS and emailed to JJC supervisors. Probation Officers are faxed or emailed Critical Incident reports written by a supervisor. A Population report is emailed each day, and all Release forms are automated via the JIS. When a juvenile is released from JJC to Electronic Home Monitoring (EHM), the staff, parents and minor fill out a packet of information, and the minor is fitted with the transmitter. Copies of the packet are sent to the EHM Homebound department.
Challenge Program:
The Challenge Program is a 26 week placement within JJC, ordered by a judge. The Challenge Program is designed to meet the behavioral and educational needs of court-ordered male residents. Their intake process is the same as other juveniles into JJC. All information goes into the JJS; except tracking the weeks and their points, which is housed in an automated Excel spreadsheet.

The residents are required to earn privileges, furloughs, and successful completion of the program through a point system. A certain number of points must be earned each week. The points necessary to comply with completing their detention are tracked on an Excel spread sheet. The entire Excel spreadsheet containing every week of a resident’s stay is printed at the end of the week.

Information Sharing Example:
The required information to process an individual through the system originates with the court. Once the court establishes a case, essential pieces of information are provided to Court Services; for example, defendant demographics, charges, court dates and Court Orders. The Circuit Clerk enters the case information into the JANO case management system. The JANO system is available to some of the units; but is only viewable in many cases.

For the information to be shared between the units it will be written on designated forms and the forms emailed or faxed to the appropriate unit.

One example of duplication of data entry can be seen when there is a request for a diagnostic evaluation on the defendant.

KCDC Receives Request for Diagnostics:
Kane County Diagnostic Center (KCDC) receives a request for diagnostic evaluation of a defendant. These requests can come from court, Probation Officer, states attorney, public defender or private attorney. KCDC requires specific pieces of information from the requestor; such as KCDC Referral form, Court Order and Police Reports.

All the documents and information they receive are in paper form. To supplement the information provided on the documents, they use JANO to search for additional information and verify written facts. To start a case on the defendant, they enter the same information into their KCDC system that already exists in JANO. Example of shared data items include;

- Case Number
- Defendant Name
- Demographics (Gender, Race, SSN, Spoken Language)
- Defendant Date of Birth
- Defendant Addresses and Phone Numbers
Kane County Case Management System (CMS) Assessment Project

- Type of Evaluation Requested
- Next Court Date and Event
- Judge Name
- Warrant status and Date
- Prior Court Cases for the Defendant

The completed report is sent to Judge, States Attorney, Probation Officer and Public Defender as requested. All are sent by mail in paper form and also faxed.

HARDWARE AND IT SUPPORT

The majority of the agency uses PC’s running Windows XP to use various desktop software packages and access the JANO system. These PC’s are primarily supported by the County IT staff. County IT will provide support for the hardware that was installed by its staff, but if a piece of equipment is purchased by the department or an outside vendor then the County will not be responsible for the upgrades and maintenance.

Court Services has installed several printers that are connected directly to various PC’s. During the meetings with staff, they had real concerns about the impact to their job if they were to lose their local printer. As the county is upgrading the PC’s they cannot guarantee that the older printers will be compatible with the newer PC’s.

The county maintains shared drives, and the Tri Cities, Aurora and Elgin offices can access and share information and common files. The shared drives have a folder structure for each person and also common places to access common forms.

The Juvenile Justice Center has a Juvenile intake system. It is a browser based application that was created by the County using SQL Server and .NET. The system would need to be expanded to meet all of the requirements of the Juvenile Justice Center. Similarly, the Kane County Diagnostic Center (KCDC) has a browser based system created/maintained by the county using SQL server and .NET.
APPENDIX D: SHERIFF’S OFFICE REVIEW

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this case study is to obtain feedback on the current system and determine the future outlook of technology in the Kane County Sheriff’s Office. Ultimately, the scope is to identify initial system functionality requirements necessary to support this office.

On March 15-16, 2011, URL staff met with several members of the Sheriff’s Office to better understand the current environment. This review is based on notes gathered during that site visit.

EXISTING TECHNOLOGY OVERVIEW – SHERIFF’S OFFICE

The following describes the most predominant technology interfaces and the impact/use from a Sheriff’s standpoint.

Current Environment/Interfaces:
Currently, an important point in the justice system process is the Bond Call. This occurs at the court, and critical information is collected regarding bond amounts, next court date, charges, etc. Court enters that data into their system, JANO, and the Sheriff currently gets a printout of that information. The Sheriff then has to retype that information into AEGIS. It was noted that an interface that would allow for that information to come over electronically would save redundant data entry.

Similarly, the handling of bond fees is a very critical step in the process, whether the fees are collected from a patrol officer who has written a citation in the field or at the time that a defendant bonds out of custody. The tracking of money, as well as the number of agencies involved in the collection of that money, is very important. If a defendant bonds out at the jail, there is an additional booking fee to pay. By law, the jail cannot hold that person for an administrative fee, but the defendant still owes that money.

The fact that the defendant has not paid the booking fee needs to be shared with the Circuit Clerk, so that the fee is entered into the court file. Otherwise, if the money is not collected on the front end, it may never be collected as the defendant’s case moves through the court process, and this will result in lost revenue for the county. There is also a new Failure to Appear warrant fee of $75 that should be tracked as well.

Patrol officers would also benefit from Warrants and other basic Court data at the outset of a case, but there is no current interface between JANO and AEGIS to allow for such electronic sharing of
information. Currently, patrol officers request warrant information from Dispatch. Staff at the jail can access JANO for basic bond call and court date information, but that interface is very limited.

The Circuit Clerk does have an eCitation system in place through APS (vendor). APS allows for crash/accident reporting, and that is very useful. In addition, the tickets printed are easy-to-read and transmit directly to the Circuit Clerk of Court. The problem is that officers have to be trained on the system, and the Sheriff’s Office would need to add printers in their vehicles at a current cost of approximately $70,000 (there are over 100 vehicles that would need those printers installed). There simply isn’t money in the budget to support that process. The Fox Valley Park District is using the APS system, but there are only 8 officers in that agency, so the costs are relatively manageable.

New World/AEGIS System Functionality:
The AEGIS system incorporates Jail Records, Law Enforcement Records Management System (LRMS), and Mobile/CAD. The system interfaces with both the National Criminal Information System (NCIS) and LEADS for criminal history information. AEGIS was developed in .NET, and provides a secure Web-based environment that supports federal and state initiatives for information sharing, such as NIEM (National Information Exchange Model) and N-DEx (Law Enforcement National Data Exchange).

There are two sides to AEGIS – Mobile Computing and Desktop. Mobile side is the one that connects to LEADS, NCIS, but there is very little communication between the Mobile and Desktop sides of AEGIS.

AEGIS Link provides real-time access to information through industry-standard web services based on the Global Justice XML Model (GJXDM). It allows for secure information exchange of warrant, arrest, accident, ticket and corrections information. It also allows agencies to securely share RMS information. AEGIS Link Web CAD Monitor provides the dispatch center with real-time information from a Web-based Call and Unit Monitor.

Furthermore, AEGIS Decision Support allows the Sheriff’s Office to pull CAD, Records Management and Corrections information into meaningful reports and complete critical trend analyses. Using SQL Server technology, the Sheriff’s Office can utilize data mining/data warehousing to create both standard and Ad-hoc reports, as well as GIS mapping, and detailed analysis of crime activity.

Outside laws enforcement agencies can subscribe to AEGIS, but there is very little IT support in these agencies, so they don’t connect to the primary database at this time. There are 175 officers connected on the Mobile side, and approximately 100 are from the Sheriff’s Office. County IT is responsible for supporting officers from the local law enforcement agencies, because those agencies don’t have the money to pay for IT support of their own.

Access to Jail information is provided to outside agencies. For instance, the Special Prosecutor is provided with reports that allow for more efficient jail management. IT Support can provide access
based on permission rights to multiple agencies in Kane County. There are security issues, as well as business rules involved, but providing access is a simple process within the database.

Court Services can view certain screens in AEGIS, because IT Support has created a virtual environment that sits on the Sheriff’s network. Court Services can access the network to view data, but cannot enter data into AEGIS. In addition, there is a proposal in place to allow high-volume law enforcement agencies to view data as well (i.e., Elgin, Aurora and Tri-Cities). AEGIS provides Crime Analysis Tools that pull data from law enforcement agency records. This allows for plotting of high-crime areas as well as GIS mapping.

The process of implementing AEGIS began 5 years ago, the Jail went live with the system 3 years ago, and the Records portion went live 2 years ago. There have been three major upgrades since initial implementation. The jail/corrections module was brought up in 90 days. This module was built first, and then the Mobile/CAD modules were built – there have been conversion issues to overcome, because data in these separate modules did not mesh well. They are still working through conversion issues to this day.

Information Sharing Priorities
On March 15, 2011, URL staff met with Lieutenant Ron Grommes, who shared his top three information sharing priorities. In other words, automating these paper processes would result in the highest benefit to the county: 1) Citations; 2) Warrants; and 3) Orders of Protection.

Citations are primarily being sent to the Circuit Clerk’s Office via paper. The Circuit Clerk is looking at eCitations, but as mentioned above, the proposition is costly. Lt. Grommes suggested that if citation data entered into AEGIS could be pushed into JAN0, that would save a good deal of redundant data entry. As a security measure, the Sheriff’s Office could create a “shell” that could be validated prior to acceptance into the Circuit Clerk system.

Similarly, Warrant information is critical to law enforcement, whether it be local law enforcement agencies or the County Sheriff’s Office. Currently, Lt. Grommes creates a Warrant Summary Sheet, which is emailed out to agencies, such as Aurora PD, once a week. This document is so helpful, because it provides a list of Active Warrants for a specified date range. The report can be run to show specific types of Warrants (i.e., Felony Warrants, Bench Warrants, Failure to Pay Fine Warrants, etc.) The report provides detail regarding the defendant, bond amount, date issued, etc. These reports could be made available on the County’s Sharepoint Web Portal, and they are currently Web-based.

As with citations, Lt. Grommes suggested that the Circuit Clerk could create a shell with Warrant information to be validated by the Sheriff’s Office, before acceptance into AEGIS. The Sheriff could then enter data into the system when warrants are served that would then be shared electronically with the Circuit Clerk. Currently, when warrants are served, the Circuit Clerk of Court is notified via paper, so
that the court can cancel the warrant. It would be of great value to the County to automate this process.

Finally, Orders of Protection are shared regularly. Orders of Protection are 7-page forms that are filled out by victims (built in Adobe). Forms go to the judge electronically and the Sheriff at the same time and are entered into each system concurrently. Data may be incorrect on initial forms, and Sheriff has to validate much of the information on the forms. If data is changed at the Sheriff’s Office, it may no longer comply with what is entered at the Circuit Clerk’s Office.

The judge often signs an Order of Protection and sends it to the Sheriff’s Office via paper. The Sheriff has to re-type that information into AEGIS – again, having that data automatically populate the AEGIS system would greatly reduce redundant data entry.

Clearly, business rules, security concerns, and data ownership/validation would have to be considered in order to make such automated information sharing a reality.

**Other Exchanges/Information Sharing Opportunities**

Subpoenas/summonses come through the Circuit Clerk’s Office, often times via paper. Once served, the completed documents are sent back to the State’s Attorney’s Office, but not any other agencies. The summonses have been entered into JAN0 before being sent to the Sheriff’s Office, and Sheriff’s staff retypes the summons information into AEGIS.

There is quite a bit of data that local law enforcement agencies would like to view in AEGIS, but connectivity is an issue, because these agencies are not on the same network as the Sheriff’s Office. That being the case, the Sheriff’s Office can’t set up a virtual environment where these agencies can view the data. By contrast, Court Services and the State’s Attorney’s Office are on the same network and have access to view some data currently.

Some local law enforcement agencies are using the CAD functionality within AEGIS (i.e., Campton Hill, Gilberts, Hampshire and Maple Park PDs). As mentioned previously, the Mobile side of AEGIS isn’t communicating with Records directly, but since those are both New World products, communication should not be an issue. The issue is that the Sheriff’s Office would have to pay a licensing fee to get the two sides to share information.

With increased connectivity, local law enforcement agencies would be able to access AEGIS to run reports with valuable statistics, such as number of arrests, types of arrests, and locations of arrests. Lt. Grommes noted that reports related to specific crimes, such as burglaries, would be very helpful to law enforcement officers. If officers could identify areas that are prone to burglaries, they could use that information to patrol those areas more regularly.
Field-based reporting was also discussed – AEGIS does not currently support such reporting in regard to Citations and Accidents. Sheriff’s Office staff still has to report such statistics through use of pen and pad. Currently, accident reports are scanned and a private company (DocView) maintains a document management system that has a public facing component – accident reports are made available on-line for a fee of $8/report.

Corrections/Local Jail
Staff from Corrections joined in near the end of our meeting, and provided information regarding the flow of information at the jail. Corrections has custody and release information that would be very useful to the State’s Attorney’s Office, Public Defender, Court Services and the Circuit Clerk. Currently, such information is often shared via phone. It would be much more efficient to share that information electronically, if possible.

Corrections gets criminal history information from LEADS, and has a need to know if there are any holds on the defendant from other jurisdictions. That information is not readily available through JANO, and Corrections only sends charging document to Bond Calls.

With Warrants, the Jail Management System (JMS) just contains bond call data and charges. When defendant is taken into custody, the Jail only sends the hard copy of the Warrant to Circuit Clerk, which may not contain the charge information. When going to court with defendants in custody, Corrections staff has to look up bond and court information on paper files, and that should be readily available electronically to save time and potential confusion. Staff would like to view scanned documents in JANO, but those documents are not always scanned in a timely fashion, so staff continues to rely on paper files.

The Sheriff’s Office website does post charge data, bond amounts and next court dates, so that information is available to other agencies via the web.

HARDWARE AND IT SUPPORT

In order to get a complete picture of the current environment at the Sheriff’s Office, URL staff first met with Roger Fahnestock, County IT. County IT supports the Sheriff’s Office, and controls the networks/security in place at the Sheriff’s Office. In other words, County IT supports the infrastructure at the Sheriff’s Office. There is a dedicated staff of four people assigned to the Sheriff’s Office, all of which report to the County IT Department for technical support, but organizationally report to the Sheriff’s Office.

The environment at the County IT Department is scalable, and sits on a SAN Architecture with over 10 gigs of memory available (as many as 128 processors in place). Up-time at County IT is very high, and the environment is able to support the AEGIS System relatively easily. They are currently creating a virtualized environment with servers in the IT Department’s office.
APPENDIX E: STATE’S ATTORNEY’S OFFICE REVIEW

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this case study is to obtain feedback on the current system and determine the future outlook of technology in the State’s Attorney’s Office. Ultimately, the scope is to identify initial system functionality requirements necessary to support this office.

On February 9, 2011, URL staff met with several members of the State’s Attorney’s Office, including representatives from the Civil, Child Advocacy Center, Child Support, Criminal, Juvenile, Second Chance Divisions, Office Manager and IT staff (as well as State’s Attorney, Joe McMahon).

EXISTING APPLICATION SUPPORT OVERVIEW

The following describes the most predominant technology interfaces and the impact/use from a State’s Attorney standpoint.

Civil Division:
Civil is responsible for representing County-elected officials (similar to the Attorney General’s Office, but on the county level). Civil acts as a private attorney, not a prosecutor for the most part. There are certain tax and administrative cases where they seek prosecution, but that is not the general focus of that division.

Civil advises County Clerk in terms of elections, and there are additional interfaces with the County Clerk on various civil matters. Moreover, expungements are filed with the County Clerk, and they are working on a paperless approach with routine cases, but that information exchange is done via email and Excel, as well as PDFs.

Civil also handles Development/Health Department ordinance violations. In addition, on Civil Rights cases, Civil exchanges information with the Sheriff’s Office. Civil also asks the Sheriff’s Office to serve Emergency petitions (via phone), which are completed on paper so there is opportunity for automation of several processes.

Civil interfaces with Human Resources for Worker’s Compensation cases, which is mostly handled via email. The primary focus, however, is civil litigation, so staff acknowledged that their integration needs may not be as direct as that of the Criminal division.

Staff does have to access JANO for personal injury, tax, remedy and environmental case information, but she sees ways to improve the exchange of information.
Currently, notices of court hearings are mailed or set in court. Court dates are entered into the inter-office calendar in Outlook. Subpoenas are created in Word. Civil is not responsible for reporting statistics, so staff didn’t discuss any reporting needs, which is much more of an issue in the Criminal context.

Child Advocacy Center:
The Child Advocacy Center (CAC) investigates sexual abuse and severe physical abuse of children. The current “system” was created three years ago and developed within the SAO (not created by County IT). It collects Victim/Witness/Suspect information, and once a case is charged, an Assistant State’s Attorney gets the file.

Cases come to the CAC from law enforcement and the Department of Child and Family Services (DCFS). Once charged, those cases are presented to the attorneys in the SAO for prosecution. The CAC does the initial investigation, and it has a staff of approximately twenty, with only five having access to change information, and the others having only viewing rights of the investigation information.

The Child Advocacy System is accessible via the Web, and it is supported within the office. In other words, if a new field needs to be added, or if one is to be dropped, staff lets IT know and those fields are added/dropped within a day.

The system is important for statistical purposes, because the CAC has to meet reporting requirements and provide statistics to the State. Staff shared both screen shots of the current system, as well as statistical reports generated within the Child Advocacy System.

CAC shares information with the Diagnostic Center, which does the sex offender assessments, as well as Court Services, which needs the sex offender information for probationary purposes. Police reports are received by fax or email. There are a couple of examples in Elgin and Carpentersville, where police reports are provided electronically through email.

When the CAC files charges, the complaint and warrant goes to the Criminal Division, and the State’s Attorney assigned approves the charge. There are cases where the CAC goes directly to a grand jury.

Within the current system, staff said that streamlining the processing of charging documents, subpoenas, and search warrants would be very critical. The current database was set up for internal purposes, as well as to collect information for statistical purposes so that reports could be provided to granting agencies. That being said, simple things like the identity of the Assistant State’s Attorney assigned to a case are not available at this time.

Currently, evidence logs, attorney dispositions, and the time defendants are sentenced to, are completed on paper. Staff would like to see the information automated. With the paper based system the Staff may wait up to two weeks to discover if a defendant is in custody.
Staff sees great value in reducing the enormous amount of paperwork that goes along with the complaint and the warrant – they have to keep that paperwork for three years after cases are closed, and in murder and other sexual abuse cases that paperwork is never destroyed. Reducing the need to create and store so many paper files would be of great value to their division.

Criminal Division:
URL staff met with representatives from Adult Felony/Misdemeanor DUI, Training, Juvenile and the First Assistant, Jody Gleason, as well as Joe McMahon (State’s Attorney).

Currently, there are approximately 56 prosecutors in the SAO, and about 30 – 35 are criminal prosecutors. In Kane County, law enforcement is generally responsible for misdemeanor filing of charges, and those are all paper-based. The SAO receives all felony cases from law enforcement for felony review/filing of charges. As part of that process, law enforcement provides a Synopsis of Facts and Law Enforcement Charging Document to the SAO.

Currently, law enforcement officers call the on-duty Assistant State’s Attorney for that review, and the State’s Attorney authorizes specific charges to be filed. The law enforcement officer then completes the Charging Document and files it with the court in PDF form housed on the Web. The problem is that officers often select the wrong wording and those selections are not being reviewed by the SAO before the Bond Call, which is conducted every single day of the year (365 days, no exceptions).

Training Supervisor suggested that the SAO review that Charging Document before it is filed with the court, but other attorneys at the meeting saw that as cumbersome as well. That being said, the current process leads to mistaken wording on the Charging Documents being filed, and the SAO has to amend charges before appearing at the Bond Call to determine defendant’s bond/custody status.

Once the Bond Hearing occurs, the bond information comes from the court and the case file is created. This information is collected in an Access database called the “Incoming Database”, which is only used for internal processes. The only information changed/updated in that database is courtroom/court date information.

The Incoming database does not produce reports. Staff would like to see the following reports created. Many of the reports would require information that is not currently captured in the Incoming database.

- Caseload per courtroom
- Caseload per attorney
- Case names by attorney
- Case type by attorney
- Case disposed by attorney
- Case type by geography/Police Dept.
• Case numbers by geography/Police Dept.
• Case total by charge
• Cases disposed by courtroom
• Trials by courtroom
• Verdicts by courtroom
• Bench/jury numbers by courtroom
• Average age of cases by courtroom
• Average age of cases by attorney
• Number of Noelle Pros (no prosecution) by courtroom
• Numbers of reducers by attorney
• Conviction rate
• Yearly verdict rate

The point was made that the creation of a Case File within the database would be beneficial to track and maintain the following components as they are created/become available:

• Case number
• Charges
• Offenses
• Parties involved
• Assistant State’s Attorney assigned/involved in the case
• Police reports attached to file
• Probation/pre-trial services report
• Criminal History
• Internal disposition sheet
• Pen Letter to the Illinois Dept. of Corrections
• Evidence disposition sheet
• Notification to Immigration, if defendant is to be deported

The exchange of information between Court Services and SAO was mentioned as an area that would benefit from sharing information electronically. Probation Officers routinely file Violation of Probation requests with SAO by emailing the request as an attachment. Along with the request, they must send police reports and a criminal history from LEADS. SAO will determine if the violation should be filed with the court. It is the PO’s responsibility to follow up with SAO, or research the court records in JANO to see if the SAO filed the case.

There were other examples of case types/reporting needs mentioned, including the need to track information regarding forfeitures, better reporting to the State Police and even tracking the DUI program and the Theft-awareness program to measure success rates.
The Juvenile representative had many of the same issues, but brought up privacy and confidentiality as a major concern. She also brought up the issue of redundancy and the fact that the same information regarding a case is entered into multiple databases within the court, SAO, Court Services, etc. She also pointed out that restitution is extremely hard to track, especially in the case of multiple defendants. If one defendant pays restitution, that does not show up on related defendants’ record.

The Juvenile division has an Access database that tracks open and closed cases, but other than updating new addresses, they do not maintain other information. There is a separate Access database to track dispositions. Finally, they have another Access database that addresses Violations of Probation and Petitions to Revoke.

Child Support Division (CSD):
CSD does use JANO and CSD staff shared screen shots of the current system, which is accessible via the Web and allows for statistical reporting.

CSD’s cases generally come from Health and Family Services (HFS), and double-entry issues abound, because CSD must enter data into its own system as well as the State system. CSD does not enter information into JANO, but takes information from JANO and enters it once again into the Child Support database.

As a side note, CSD will make warrant requests directly to the Sheriff’s Office – doesn’t have to seek out an Assistant State’s Attorney from the Criminal Division.

The primary agencies that CSD looks to regarding payments of child support are the Court and the State’s Disbursement Unit. The problem is that JANO doesn’t always accurately reflect the correct amount, and neither does the State’s Disbursement Unit (SDU). In addition, the numbers reflected in each database may be different, so there is a sense of confusion as to how much child support has been paid on a given case.

Staff wants to see a case number called a “C” number associated with each case – this is the Health and Family Services number, and it should be used to track the status of cases, along with all payment information. Currently, when the payment information is in doubt, staff has to file a motion to get that payment information.

Staff also mentioned that they’d like the ability to view court orders in JANO, so they know exactly why cases are being calendared. Child Support may arrive in court without knowing why the case is in court on that particular day.

Staff would like better information regarding support and paternity, and an alert when a payment is missed. If the alert of missed payment was made within 90 days, that would assist them in processing their cases.
Abuse and Neglect Division:
Abuse and Neglect deals with juvenile cases, so there are confidentiality issues. DCFS is the primary agency that Abuse and Neglect interacts with. Some cases come from law enforcement, but that is rare. At this time, Abuse and Neglect uses Excel spreadsheets to identify and provide detail regarding contested cases.

Staff brought in a two-page document setting out the primary bits of information that they’d like to know about a case:

Service (adjudication and termination)

- Consents
- Legal Father
- Parties
- Addresses (i.e., parent, guardian, case worker, etc.)
- Court date information

Staff made the point that information is currently entered in JANO, and then re-entered into Excel and Access as well. Much time is wasted re-entering case names, numbers, addresses, etc. It would be helpful to collect that information in JANO and merge it into documents that are filed back with the court.

Orders are now being imaged, so there is a push to go somewhat paperless. Staff would like to have access to a database with those orders, and have multiple agencies access that database so they can all see the same information.

Staff would like to see more statistics, but the fact that reports are run in Access, and the data is so unreliable, their statistical reports leave much to be desired at this time. They’d like to track treatment programs to see which are more successful, but that is not an option right now.

Both Child Support and Abuse and Neglect made the point that Court dockets are not always accurate, and having correct courtroom information provided in real-time would be very helpful.

Second Chance Program:
Some first time, non-violent offenders get the opportunity to utilize the Second Chance Program, which is a pre-disposition diversion program. It includes a drug/alcohol program, and there are many interfaces with private mental health and drug/alcohol treatment providers. There are over 500 felony offenders in this program currently.
Second Chance runs both State and National criminal histories to determine eligibility. It also accesses JANO to view the Court Call to determine what defendants are eligible as well, based on their charges. At this time, community service hours/restitution data is entered into JANO as images, and Second Chance staff is able to view those images.

Approximately one year ago, County IT created a database for the Second Chance Program that is Web-based, and has a SQL Server back-end. Meaningful reports can be generated from the SQL database, and staff can track significant information, such as felony and misdemeanor cases, money generated/revenue collected, etc. Community service is not easily tracked, but overall the system has been very helpful.

Office Manager and IT:
The Office Manager met with us in the afternoon to reiterate that most everyone in the office was working on an Access database and no single case management system exists in the office. The Office Manager, who is no longer with the office at the time of writing this report, created the Access databases used in the office (i.e., Juvenile, Abuse and Neglect, Drug Unit, Disposition and Felony Case Tracking) and she maintained the disposition statistics.

Staff would like access to the JANO system for reporting purposes, but that is not the current situation. Redundant data entry was also discussed, and it was believed that Name, Case Number and Court Date are the most redundantly entered elements.

All software must be purchased by County IT, and the SAO doesn’t have the budget to purchase new software and that is why the Access databases have been created piecemeal. The County does take care of all hardware needs (provides computers).

The SAO’s IT Manager left the week before our site visit after being with the office for 10 years, and that has left a void. The remaining IT resource has been there for 10 years as well, but he is more focused on making sure that everything is up and running, taking care of data tape problems, cabling, etc. – he’s never focused on the administrative issues. The IT Manager was the one that focused on security of information and business-related issues. She would have been the person to provide us with more detailed information regarding technology choices and directions.

Merges, such as mail merges, are in place, but they are done through Access and Excel. County databases have been converted into browser-based, SQL databases out of Access, wherever possible. They are working on an interface so that users can view the information in those databases. The SAO relies heavily on email to receive and send case information and documents. Outlook is used with Exchange being the email server. Most information is stored on the County system (shared drives) and the County maintains back-ups.
HARDWARE AND IT SUPPORT

County IT supports the State’s Attorney’s Office at this time. As previously noted, County IT created a database for the Second Chance Program that is Web-based, and has a SQL Server back-end. County IT maintains the database and backups. As mentioned above, all software must be purchased by County IT, and the State’s Attorney’s Office doesn’t have the budget to purchase new software, which is why the Access databases have been created piecemeal. County IT provides and maintains the office computers, and does take care of all hardware needs.
APPENDIX F: PUBLIC DEFENDER’S OFFICE REVIEW

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this case study is to obtain feedback on the current system and determine the future outlook of technology in the Public Defender’s Office. Ultimately, the scope is to identify initial system functionality requirements necessary to support this office.

On February 10, 2011, URL staff met with Public Defender’s Office staff, including the Office Manager, as well as the Interim Public Defender, Tom McCulloch.

EXISTING TECHNOLOGY OVERVIEW

Tom McCulloch has only been the Interim Public Defender since January (but he has been with the office since 1976). There are 35 lawyers in his office and about six support staff. He was very supportive of improving the efficiency of his office and expressed interest in the notion of integrated justice.

The office manager is satisfied with the current system, which has been in use since 2008, but it is limited and does not meet the needs of the attorneys. The Office Manager shared screen shots and showed us the interface. The system was developed by County IT, and it is Web-based with a SQL Server back-end and does provide a clean and easy-to-use interface. The Office Manager mentioned, however, that when glitches occur, it does take some time to address those glitches.

The system tracks basic information, such as Court Date, Charges, Public Defender Assigned, Dispositions, Sentences, etc. It would also be helpful to track Charge Types/Class of Charge, but that is not currently done.

Aside from Charge and Sentence fields being text fields, the system seemed to capture the necessary information properly. Case Type, Status and Disposition information were all provided through drop-down entries. Public Defenders were tied to their cases and queries could be run to show each Public Defender’s current and closed cases.

The current system does not produce documents or forms – Office Manager provided URL staff with several motions and other forms used by the attorneys in the office and all are available in Word.

The system does allow for creation of reports, such as types of cases, caseload per month, attorney-specific caseload, etc. Some are not accurate because of data entry issues, based on the attorney’s view of the value of the system, they do not make timely accurate entry a priority.
Public Defenders use the system to enter next court dates, or they hand files to the support staff that then enter those dates into the system.

The Public Defender’s office has one more internal system used by the Multiple Defendants Division (or Conflicts Division). It is also a Web-based, SQL Server database, and it shows pending cases assigned to specific Public Defenders within the office.

As for the future, Mr. McCulloch would like to track other statistics, such as fees paid by defendants, types of cases defended, dispositions, etc. In addition, pending cases/trends should be reported to the county, but are not being reported at this time.

Email has been the number one form of electronic information sharing, and Mr. McCulloch will email motions to the SAO prior to court dates. The bulk of exchanges continue to be paper-based, however.

JANO was set up to identify conflicts ASAP, and that is an important piece of information to the Public Defender’s office. As for criminal histories, since LEADS/NCIC/JANO all provide criminal history information, there is quite a bit of redundancy and confusion related to criminal history information.

Mr. McCulloch agreed that being able to pull information directly out of JANO and into his system would be of great value, because they currently re-enter data or double-check the same information in JANO that they have entered into their system. Specifically, data already entered by law enforcement should be used directly on the Public Defender’s Bond Motion.

Another top priority would be the Calendaring function. It would be helpful to have the calendar synched up with the court, so that the Public Defender is in the right courtroom at the right time. Finally, Mr. McCulloch expressed an interest in getting better data into the system, so that he could use that data for statistical and reporting purposes.

**HARDWARE AND IT SUPPORT**

County IT supports the Public Defender’s Office at this time. The current system in place was developed by County IT, and it is Web-based with a SQL Server back-end and does provide an easy-to-use interface. It provides basic information at this time, but can definitely be expanded to address many more case management and reporting needs.
APPENDIX G: SHAREHOLDER IDENTIFIED PRIORITIES

1. Arrest/Case Reports:
The Arrest Report is known as the Case Report in Kane County, and it is a very critical document in terms of criminal justice workflow. The Case Report is needed by several agencies at key information exchange points throughout the criminal justice process.

The issue is that the other Law Enforcement Agencies (LEA’s) are not providing their Case Reports through their Case Management Systems. Nearly 70% of the LEA’s are using the New World CMS, so the functionality is in place to have these agencies send their reports via email through their CMS.

There is a Chief of Police Association in Kane County that brings together all Municipal Law Enforcement Agencies, which could authorize the sharing of these Case Reports via a New World connection among those agencies. This has not been suggested and may be met with resistance due to control/turf obstacles, but the issue should be brought up to the committee for consideration. That being said, with proper business rules in place, so that restricted information is not shared, the Chiefs of Police may see the benefit of sharing this information more readily.

In addition, Court Services must have the Case Report in order to transfer a probationer to another county or state. They have 10 days to transfer a case, and often there is no Case Report in the file within the 10 day limit. Court Services staff has to go to the SAO and request a Case Report in order to have one in the file in time for transfer. If the Case Reports were made available via the New World system, or a central repository, that would alleviate the pressure of running down these reports right before the deadline passes.

Similarly, the Kane County Diagnostic Center (KCDC) is responsible for preparing Mental Health Evaluations, Risk Assessments, and other evaluations. KCDC must have the Case Report in order to begin these evaluations. Often, staff must chase down these reports at the SAO, so the ability to view these reports as they are completed would be of great value to that agency.

The SAO wants Case Reports as soon as they are available as well, especially on felony cases, because they would like to have complete information when making offers at defendant’s first appearance in court. The SAO could then more readily share these reports with the Public Defender’s Office as part of the discovery process. In addition, they are very interested in collecting Supplemental Reports as well.

At this time, there is no way to know if a Supplemental Report has been filed, after the initial Case Report is completed. The New World system does have an “Activity” button on the screen that allows the user to view all activity related to the case. So, if a Supplemental Report is filed, this should be viewable through the Activity field. This functionality is available to 70% of LEA’s, but is not being put to
Kane County Case Management System (CMS) Assessment Project

use at this time, because there is no view access allotted to the SAO. This should be discussed along with the issue of making original Case Reports viewable through the New World system.

2. Arrest Warrants:
Automating the entire warrant process and having judges sign warrants at the bench would be of great value. Not only are efficiencies critical to this process to ensure that defendants are arrested when warrants are issued, but it is also critical to clear these warrants after their service, so that people are not arrested on inactive warrants. There are liability issues to consider when a person is arrested on a warrant that should have already been cancelled in the system. At this time, a warrant cannot be deemed served or cancelled without the service copy of the warrant. If this process were automated, this lack of clarity around warrant service would no longer be an issue.

The Sheriff’s Office shares a good deal of warrant information currently, but most of that sharing is conducted via email, upon request from another agency. Moreover, only warrant information on warrants generated out of the Sheriff’s Office is maintained in the Sheriff’s New World system. If warrant information can be moved into the Sheriff’s New World system electronically, it can be shared electronically as well. Therefore, the issue of Centralized Warrants was brought up during the meeting. Centralized Warrants would save time on recalling warrants, and the Sheriff’s Office would be interested in discussing this issue in greater detail, if the process can be automated.

Participants in the exchange prioritization meeting agreed that the Arrest Warrant process should be examined as a Proof of Concept exchange. Automating this process would result in great efficiencies and provide tremendous public safety benefits. On the Court side, a business process re-engineering issue that must be overcome is having judges open to the idea of signing warrants at the bench, so that the information can move electronically from the outset.

3. Charging Documents:
Sheriff’s deputies enter charging data into their New World RMS, and that data has to be re-entered into JANO, and this takes significant time. It would be of great value to have the data entered once into the Field-based Reporting System, and then have that data populate the Circuit Clerk’s CMS.

While JANO could accept the data directly from the Sheriff’s New World system, there is a lack of coordination between the two offices regarding this data. If an exchange could be architected to show how this data can move from one system to another without leading to redundant data entry, inaccurate data, or posing security issues, this could be an exchange that has solid potential for implementation in the near future. In fact, initial discussions are underway between the Circuit Clerk’s Office and the Sheriff’s Office regarding moving this information electronically. It is important, however, that this exchange of information is implemented as part of a larger, standards-based architectural approach, in order to build upon this information exchange in future implementations.
4. Citations:
Citations are important due to the large number being issued on a yearly basis. The sheer bulk of citations written makes the citation a high priority exchange in most jurisdictions. Automating the citation process would be of great value to the criminal justice system in Kane County, but the issue surrounding citations is the need to install printers in the patrol cars so that citations may be issued electronically. That is not a minor issue, because funding for printers is not available at this time. So, the notion that this process should be automated in the near future is currently being met with the barrier of limited funding.

5. Continuance Orders/Court Orders/Sentence Orders:
Court orders contain critical information regarding court dates, conditions of bond, specific orders that defendants must abide by, financial information, among others. Often, a defendant is released on bond from the jail, and there are conditions of bond that should be shared with Court Services, which does not always occur immediately at release.

From the Public Defender’s perspective, if a judge appoints the office to represent a defendant, it is important to have that order available right away so that the office is aware of the appointment at the outset of the case. In the branch courts, the Public Defender’s Office may be appointed, but not see a Court Order from that court, which means that the office is unaware of the appointment. Electronic exchange of Court Order information would be very beneficial in that regard.

From the Sheriff’s Office perspective, Orders to Transport are used to bring defendants to Court – these orders have future dates on them. If, however, a person is arrested on a new offense, then there is no current way to know about that future court date. If Court Order information was electronically sent to the Sheriff’s Office, that data would be available to the Sheriff’s deputies when the arrested person is brought to jail.

Finally, Sentence Orders are another form of Court Order that contains critical information, and often there are handwritten orders that are very difficult to read. Further standardization of the language on the form to better capture these orders would be helpful, and having these orders available electronically would be helpful to Court Services, when defendants are placed on probation. Often, probationers arrive at the probation office claiming to be on probation, but there is no Sentence Order available in JANO to confirm that fact. Automating the exchange of sentencing information, as well as all other Court Order information, is something that should be investigated further in the near future.

6. Pre-Sentence Investigation (PSI) Reports:
PSI Reports are sealed and presented to the judge that ordered the PSI. That sealed copy is then filed with Circuit Clerk’s Office, after the case goes back to court. The current issue is that these PSI Reports are not always making it over to the Circuit Clerk’s Office. If judges don’t file those sealed copies, then the PSI Report is never scanned and made available to other agencies.
Kane County Case Management System (CMS) Assessment Project

If the PSI Report was shared electronically with both the judge and the Circuit Clerk’s Office, then the problem would be alleviated. The issue, however, is that judges will often modify the PSI Report in court, and those modifications must be shown on the version filed at the Circuit Clerk’s Office. So, modifications would have to be done electronically in order to ensure that the copy on file reflects changes made in court. This is an issue that would require a good deal of business process re-engineering before it could automated.

7. Orders of Protection:
Currently, Orders of Protection are entered electronically into the Circuit Clerk’s CMS. Where there is a need for automation is on the Sheriff’s side of the exchange. At this time, Orders of Protection cannot be inputted into the Sheriff’s Office New World CMS. So, staff at the Sheriff’s Office must re-enter data that is already created on the Order of Protection.

It would be very useful to create an automated exchange from the Circuit Clerk’s Office to the Sheriff’s Office with all necessary data moving electronically to the Sheriff’s Office. This exchange is ripe for automation, and should be considered a high-priority exchange for implementation purposes.

8. SAO Disposition Forms:
SAO staff has to complete Disposition Forms upon disposition of each case. The form goes to local law enforcement agencies and the Sheriff’s Office, letting officers know what to do with evidence associated with the closed case, as well as to the State’s repository, LEADS, for disposition reporting purposes. In addition, if a defendant is sentenced to state prison, SAO staff must complete Official Statements of State’s Attorney and Trial Judge, commonly referred to as Pen Letters, for the Department of Corrections. Finally, Internal Disposition forms are completed to set out the reasons why a case was disposed of in the manner that it was disposed.

All of these steps take a while, and often are not completed until a supervising attorney makes a request to have these documents completed. Therefore, this process can take approximately one month after the case is resolved to complete. Court Services may need this information, and simply has to wait until the process is completed before getting the file. Automating the disposition reporting process would be important to the SAO, but didn’t seem to be of equal value to the other justice agencies involved in the discussion. So, while this exchange is not at the top of the list of priority exchanges, but one that should be considered for future implementation.

9. Notification of Transport to Court:
Court Services, SAO and the Public Defender’s Office would like to be notified when a subject with an active file is being transported to court.

10. Electronic Monitoring/GPS:
Circuit Clerk would like to be notified when Court Services either hooks up, or removes equipment from a defendant, so the proper fees can be assessed.
11. Supplemental Arrest/Case Reports:
The SAO, and Courts Services would like to be notified when the Sheriff’s Office, or LEA, submit a supplemental case report.

12. Order for PSI:
Court Services may not be in court when the order is made, so they need to be notified immediately when the PSI is ordered.

13. Bond Report Ordered:
As with the PSI Order, Court Services may not be in court when the order is made, so they need to be notified immediately when Bond Report is ordered.

14. Defendant Status Query – LEA would query Court:
When Sheriff’s deputies bring a person to the jail, it would be useful to have the ability to view any/all pending cases on that person. This would be a query into the Circuit Clerk’s CMS regarding pending cases; that information could be used to inform other interested agencies that the defendant is being booked.

15. Address Updates:
Court Services verifies an address with a client, and that information should be sent to the Court system to keep the address up-to-date.
# APPENDIX H: EXCHANGE COST DETAILS

## Phase I – Service Specification and Exchange Implementation Costs (span Years 1 and 2):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I Service Specifications</th>
<th>Sending Agency</th>
<th>Receiving Agency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrest/Case Reports</td>
<td>Sheriff/LEA</td>
<td>Court Services/SAO</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charging Documents</td>
<td>Sheriff/LEA</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest Warrant</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant Quash</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Arrest/Case Reports</td>
<td>Sheriff/LEA</td>
<td>SAO</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defendant Status Query</td>
<td>Query comes from Jail</td>
<td>Query Into Court CMS</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$90,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Phase I Exchanges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I Exchanges</th>
<th>Sending Agency</th>
<th>Receiving Agency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrest/Case Reports</td>
<td>Sheriff/LEA</td>
<td>Court Services/SAO</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charging Documents</td>
<td>Sheriff/LEA</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest Warrant</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant Quash</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Arrest/Case Reports</td>
<td>Sheriff/LEA</td>
<td>SAO</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defendant Status Query</td>
<td>Query comes from Jail</td>
<td>Query Into Court CMS</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$210,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Phase II – Service Specification and Exchange Implementation Costs (span Years 2 and 3):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase II Service Specifications</th>
<th>Sending Agency</th>
<th>Receiving Agency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court Orders</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Court Services/SAO/ PD/Sheriff</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Orders</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Court Services/Sheriff</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Updates</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposition Form Evidence</td>
<td>SAO</td>
<td>Sheriff/LEA</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport to Court</td>
<td>Jail</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Report Order</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$105,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Phase II Exchanges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Sending Agency</th>
<th>Receiving Agency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court Orders</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Court Services/SAO PD/Sheriff</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Orders</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Court Services/ Sheriff</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Updates</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposition Form Evidence</td>
<td>SAO</td>
<td>Sheriff/LEA</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport to Court</td>
<td>Jail</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Report Order</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 270,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase III – Service Specification and Exchange Implementation Costs (span Years 3 and 4):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase III Service Specifications</th>
<th>Sending Agency</th>
<th>Receiving Agency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Monitoring/GPS (removal/hookup)</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orders of Protection</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI Order</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase III Exchanges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Sending Agency</th>
<th>Receiving Agency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Monitoring/GPS (removal/hookup)</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>$ 45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orders of Protection</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>$ 60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI Order</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>Court</td>
<td>$ 60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 195,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Phase IV – Service Specification and Exchange Implementation Costs (span Years 4 and 5):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase IV Service Specifications</th>
<th>Sending Agency</th>
<th>Receiving Agency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sworn Synopsis</td>
<td>LEA/Sheriff</td>
<td>SAO</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsigned Order for Probable Cause</td>
<td>LEA/Sheriff</td>
<td>Judge/Court</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsigned Order for Probable Cause</td>
<td>SAO</td>
<td>Judge/Court</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed Warrant</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>LEA/Sheriff/Court</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant – Service of Process</td>
<td>LEA/Sheriff</td>
<td>Court/LEADS</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEN Letters</td>
<td>SAO</td>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$90,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase IV Exchanges</th>
<th>Sending Agency</th>
<th>Receiving Agency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sworn Synopsis</td>
<td>LEA/Sheriff</td>
<td>SAO</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsigned Order for Probable Cause</td>
<td>LEA/Sheriff</td>
<td>Judge/Court</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsigned Order for Probable Cause</td>
<td>SAO</td>
<td>Judge/Court</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed Warrant</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>LEA/Sheriff/Court</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant – Service of Process</td>
<td>LEA/Sheriff</td>
<td>Court/LEADS</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEN Letters</td>
<td>SAO</td>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$270,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I: KANE COUNTY JIEM EXCHANGES

Process:
A Process is a group of logically related events that trigger and follow after information exchange. There are two processes associated with an information exchange, a Prevailing Process (the business process in which the Triggering Event occurs), and a Subsequent Process (the business process in which the Subsequent Event occurs). Processes have the following characteristics:

- They extend over time.
- They begin and end with an event.
- They may contain multiple events.

Processes may also exist concurrently with other processes. For example, in the justice domain, a subject may be detained while being tried, and exchanges in both the Detention and the Pre-disposition Court processes may occur at the same time.

Processes may also exist consecutively with other processes. For example, in the justice domain, the Pre-disposition Court process ends where the Post-disposition Court process begins.

Event:
There are two kinds of events associated with an information exchange, triggering events and subsequent events. The Triggering Event is a decision or action that causes the exchange of information. The Subsequent Event is the next logical step in the business process that results from the information exchange. Very often the Subsequent Event is a Triggering Event for yet another information exchange.

For instance, in the justice domain, a Prosecution Charging Decision occurs when the prosecutor reviews law enforcement charges and determines whether to file an official charging document with the court or to reject prosecution. Similarly, a Court Appearance is an action by the court that also leads to information exchange in the justice system. Similarly, when the prosecutor files charges with the court, the court accepts charges and schedules a court event. The calendaring of the court event triggers communication of that scheduling information, which constitutes additional information exchange.

There are occasions when an agency receives information and takes no action that results in information exchange. For example, one business partner may send a message to another, and upon receipt the sending agency generates a paper document and places it in its case file. When this occurs, the Subsequent Event describes an internal activity - updating the case file - rather than a Triggering Event.
Events have the following characteristics:

- When used as Triggering Events, they are the primary reason for the information exchange.
- They represent an activity that is instantaneous or a slice in time (occurs in an instant, within several hours, or within several days at the most).

Agency:
An agency in JIEM is a business organization within an information sharing enterprise that either provides information to other agencies, consumes information from other agencies, or both. An agency can be any subdivision or sub-unit of a larger enterprise (such as a county or state government) that owns or controls information or the technology assets (systems) that manage that information. The term "agency" is applied generically to branches of government, divisions, departments, and all other organizational units, and sometimes to major functions within an organization.

Each exchange in JIEM includes one or more Sending Agencies and one or more Receiving Agencies. Examples of agencies in the justice domain are: Law Enforcement, Prosecutor, Defense, Court. These entities include traditional justice agencies, as well as justice-related organizations (i.e., diversion provider, mental health, social services) that send or receive information in paper, electronic or other forms as part of the justice process. In addition, the JIEM Adult Felony Reference Model 1.0.1 divides the traditional functions of a sheriff's office into three agency identifiers: law enforcement, for duties similar to those performed by police departments; jail, for detention and incarceration functions; and sheriff, for warrant and service of process activities.

Conditions:
A condition is a factor that affects the content or direction of the information exchange. Multiple exchanges may be spawned by a single triggering event; it is the combination of conditions that determines which exchanges occur.

Conditions have the following characteristics:

- Conditions may help to determine who gets what.
- Conditions must be true for a particular exchange to occur.
- Absence of a condition is acceptable in the model, but is not allowed by the software.
- Conditions have a subject and a predicate and usually refer to a decision, action, situation, or state of being.

Each condition must contain a subject and a predicate, and the model should not represent the condition in the passive voice. In other words, the condition must specify who is taking the action or making the decision. The only exceptions are when the condition defines that state of a person or object (e.g., if subject is an adult), or the expression of the condition is overly complex or vague if stated in the
active voice ("if law enforcement, court, probation, parole, or other justice organization captures subject" is stated as "if subject is captured").

Information/Documents:
Information is defined as the actual data that is exchanged between the sending and receiving agencies. It includes documents - paper, electronic, or other forms of communication. A single information exchange may include multiple documents, but must contain at least one. For example, in the justice domain, when a law enforcement agency forwards a case to the Prosecutor for the Prosecution Charging Decision, it may send an Arrest Report and an Offender Tracking Form. All documents associated with a single transfer decision should be included in the exchange.

JIEM Exchanges:
An Exchange in JIEM brings together all the other dimensions (Process, Event, Agency, Condition, and Information) and represents an actual instance of information sharing between business partners.

Exchanges represent the lifeblood of criminal justice, public safety, intelligence, homeland security, and other public sector business domains: the sharing of mission-critical information between autonomous but collaborating organizations within the same enterprise. Exchanges may manifest in the sending/receiving of paper documents, batch file transfers, inter-system message exchanges, shared database transactions, or other technological approaches. The important aspect of the Exchange dimension in JIEM is that it reflects the business requirements around these technology implementations.

Each exchange identifies:

- One or more sending agencies
- One or more receiving agencies
- The prevailing process
- The subsequent process
- The triggering event
- The subsequent event
- Conditions under which the exchange takes place
- Documents (and a link to the structure of the documents) representing the information being exchanged
## APPENDIX J: 390 IDENTIFIED KANE COUNTY EXCHANGES

### INVESTIGATION

**Law Enforcement Initiates a Call for Service**

**LAW ENFORCEMENT 31200**

Description: Law Enforcement Sends a Call For Service to Dispatch Center

During the Investigation process, at the Law Enforcement Initiates a Call For Service event, if no condition specified, Law Enforcement sends Call For Service Information to Dispatch Center for the Call For Service event in the Investigation process.

**Call for Service**

**DISPATCH CENTER 74200**

Description: Dispatch Center Sends Law Enforcement a Call For Service

During the Investigation process, at the Call For Service event, if the dispatch center assigns a call for service to law enforcement, Dispatch Center sends Call For Service Information to Law Enforcement for the Respond to Call For Service event in the Investigation process.

**Respond to Call for Service**

**LAW ENFORCEMENT 72150**

Description: Law Enforcement Sends Call For Service Disposition to Dispatch Center

During the Investigation process, at the Respond to Call for Service event, if law enforcement closes a call for service, Law Enforcement sends Call For Service Disposition to Dispatch Center for the Close Call For Service event in the Investigation process.

**Incident**

**LAW ENFORCEMENT 73600**

Description: Law Enforcement Sends Case Report to State’s Attorney for Review

During the Investigation process, at the Incident event, if law enforcement does not make an arrest while investigating an incident, and if law enforcement wants the State’s Attorney to review an incident for charges, Law Enforcement sends Case Report to State’s Attorney for the Prosecution Charging Decision event in the Investigation process.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT 73603**

Description: Law Enforcement Sends Juvenile Referral to State’s Attorney

During the Investigation process, at the Incident event, if the subject is a juvenile, and if law enforcement wants the State’s Attorney to review an incident for charges, Law Enforcement sends Case Report, Arrest Synopsis, and Juvenile Referral Form to State’s Attorney for the Prosecution Charging Decision event in the Investigation process.
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**LAW ENFORCEMENT 73601**
Description: Law Enforcement Sends Juvenile Referral to Court Services
During the Investigation process, at the Incident event, if law enforcement does not make an arrest while investigating an incident, and if the subject is a juvenile, Law Enforcement sends Case Report, Arrest Synopsis, and Juvenile Referral Form to Juvenile Court Services for the Diversion Decision event in the Pre-disposition Supervision process.

**Cite and Release**
**LAW ENFORCEMENT 71150**
Description: Law Enforcement Sends Citation to Court Clerk
During the Investigation process, at the Cite and Release event, if law enforcement chooses to route a citation through court, if a citation is issued, and if a citation is not for DUI, Law Enforcement sends Citation, and Citation Transfer Sheet to Court Clerk for the Initial Appearance event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT 76600**
Description: Law Enforcement Sends Racial Profiling Form to Secretary of State
During the Investigation process, at the Cite and Release event, if the department of motor vehicles will receive information on the citation, and if a citation was issued, Law Enforcement sends Racial Profiling Form to Secretary of State for the Update Records event in the Investigation process.

**Arrest**
**LAW ENFORCEMENT 21700**
Description: Law Enforcement Detains Felony Arrest in Jail
During the Investigation process, at the Arrest event, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, if the charge is a felony, if the subject is held in the county jail, if the State’s Attorney approved the felony charge, and if law enforcement does not have its own holding facility, Law Enforcement sends Arrest Synopsis, Felony Complaint, and Unsigned Order for Probable Cause to Jail for the Intake event in the Detention process.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT 22100**
Description: Law Enforcement Detains Felony Domestic Arrest in Jail
During the Investigation process, at the Arrest event, if the charge is domestic related, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, if the charge is a felony, if the subject is held in the county jail, and if the State’s Attorney approved the felony charge, Law Enforcement sends Victim Notification Form, Felony Complaint, Arrest Synopsis, and Unsigned Order for Probable Cause to Jail for the Intake event in the Detention process.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT 21703**
Description: Law Enforcement Detains Misdemeanor Arrest in Jail
During the Investigation process, at the Arrest event, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, if the charge is a misdemeanor, and if the subject is held in the county jail, Law Enforcement sends Arrest Synopsis, Unsigned Order for Probable Cause, and Misdemeanor Complaint to Jail for the Intake event in the Detention process.
LAW ENFORCEMENT 21753
Description: Law Enforcement Detains Misdemeanor Arrest in Jail After Medical Release
During the Investigation process, at the Arrest event, if a medical release is required for the subject to be detained, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, if the charge is a misdemeanor, and if the subject is held in the county jail, Law Enforcement sends Jail Medical Release to Admit, Arrest Synopsis, Unsigned Order for Probable Cause, and Misdemeanor Complaint to Jail for the Intake event in the Detention process.

LAW ENFORCEMENT 22101
Description: Law Enforcement Detains Misdemeanor Domestic Arrest in Jail
During the Investigation process, at the Arrest event, if the charge is domestic related, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, if the charge is a misdemeanor, and if the subject is held in the county jail, Law Enforcement sends Victim Notification Form, Arrest Synopsis, Misdemeanor Complaint, and Unsigned Order for Probable Cause to Jail for the Intake event in the Detention process.

LAW ENFORCEMENT 22151
Description: Law Enforcement Detains Misdemeanor Domestic Arrest in Jail After Medical Release
During the Investigation process, at the Arrest event, if the charge is domestic related, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, if a medical release is required for the subject to be detained, if the charge is a misdemeanor, and if the subject is held in the county jail, Law Enforcement sends Victim Notification Form, Jail Medical Release to Admit, Arrest Synopsis, Unsigned Order for Probable Cause, and Misdemeanor Complaint to Jail for the Intake event in the Detention process.

LAW ENFORCEMENT 21702
Description: Law Enforcement Detains Misdemeanor Arrest in Holding Facility
During the Investigation process, at the Arrest event, if the charge is not domestic related, if no medical release is required for the subject to be detained, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, if the charge is a misdemeanor, and if the subject is held in a local holding facility, Law Enforcement sends Arrest Synopsis, Unsigned Order for Probable Cause, and Misdemeanor Complaint to Holding Facility for the Intake event in the Detention process.

LAW ENFORCEMENT 21752
Description: Law Enforcement Detains Misdemeanor Arrest in Holding Facility After Medical Release
During the Investigation process, at the Arrest event, if a medical release is required for the subject to be detained, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, if the charge is a misdemeanor, if the subject is held in a local holding facility, and if the charge is domestic related, Law Enforcement sends Jail Medical Release to Admit, Arrest Synopsis, Unsigned Order for Probable Cause, Misdemeanor Complaint, and Victim Notification Form to Holding Facility for the Intake event in the Detention process.

LAW ENFORCEMENT 22103
Description: Law Enforcement Detains Misdemeanor Domestic Arrest in Holding Facility
During the Investigation process, at the Arrest event, if the charge is domestic related, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, if the charge is a misdemeanor, and if the subject is held in a local holding
facility, Law Enforcement sends Victim Notification Form, Arrest Synopsis, Misdemeanor Complaint, and Unsigned Order for Probable Cause to Holding Facility for the Intake event in the Detention process.

LAW ENFORCEMENT 22153
Description: Law Enforcement Detains Misdemeanor Domestic Arrest in Holding Facility After Medical Release
During the Investigation process, at the Arrest event, if the charge is domestic related, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, if a medical release is required for the subject to be detained, if the charge is a misdemeanor, and if the subject is held in a local holding facility, Law Enforcement sends Victim Notification Form, Jail Medical Release to Admit, Arrest Synopsis, Unsigned Order for Probable Cause, and Misdemeanor Complaint to Holding Facility for the Intake event in the Detention process.

LAW ENFORCEMENT 71253
Description: Law Enforcement Sends DUI Arrest to State’s Attorney
During the Investigation process, at the Arrest event, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, if the charge is a misdemeanor, if a citation is for DUI, and if the subject is released on bond, Law Enforcement sends Warning to Motorist, Law Enforcement Sworn Affidavit of Arrest, and Citation to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Investigation process.

LAW ENFORCEMENT 71254
Description: Law Enforcement Sends DUI Arrest to Court Clerk
During the Investigation process, at the Arrest event, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, if the charge is a misdemeanor, if a citation is for DUI, and if the subject is released on bond, Law Enforcement sends Warning to Motorist, Law Enforcement Sworn Affidavit of Arrest, and Citation to Court Clerk for the Initial Appearance event in the Pre-Disposition Court process.

LAW ENFORCEMENT 73602
Description: Law Enforcement Sends Juvenile Detention Report to State’s Attorney
During the Investigation process, at the Arrest event, if a juvenile is held at the juvenile justice center, Law Enforcement sends Case Report, Arrest Synopsis, and Juvenile Referral Form to State’s Attorney for the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event in the Investigation process.

Law Enforcement Referral
LAW ENFORCEMENT 71600
Description: Law Enforcement Sends Case Report to State’s Attorney
During the Investigation process, at the Law Enforcement Referral event, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, if the case is to be prosecuted by the State’s Attorney, and if the charge is not for DUI, Law Enforcement sends Case Report, Felony Complaint, Unsigned Order for Probable Cause, and Sworn Synopsis to State’s Attorney for the Prosecution Charging Decision event in the Investigation process.

LAW ENFORCEMENT 72801
Description: Law Enforcement Sends DUI Case Report to State’s Attorney
During the Investigation process, at the Law Enforcement Referral event, if a citation is for DUI, if a citation is issued, and if the case is to be prosecuted by the State’s Attorney, Law Enforcement sends
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DUI BAC Report Form, and Case Report to State’s Attorney for the Prosecution Charging Decision event in the Investigation process.

Law Enforcement Charging Decision
LAW ENFORCEMENT 78200
Description: Law Enforcement Sends Felony Review Request to State’s Attorney
During the Investigation process, at the Law Enforcement Charging Decision event, if the charge is a felony, Law Enforcement sends Arrest Synopsis to State’s Attorney for the Felony Review event in the Investigation process.

Prosecution Charging Decision
STATE’S ATTORNEY 25100
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Misdemeanor Complaint to Law Enforcement
During the Investigation process, at the Prosecution Charging Decision event, if a State’s Attorney decides to file a charge, if the charge is a misdemeanor, if law enforcement does not make an arrest while investigating an incident, if the complainant comes to the State’s Attorney to file charges, and if the victim comes to State’s Attorney with case report requesting prosecution, State’s Attorney sends Misdemeanor Complaint to Law Enforcement for the Update Case File event in the Investigation process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 25101
Description: State’s Attorney Files Misdemeanor Complaint With Court Clerk
During the Investigation process, at the Prosecution Charging Decision event, if a State’s Attorney decides to file a charge, if the charge is a misdemeanor, if law enforcement does not make an arrest while investigating an incident, if the complainant comes to the State’s Attorney to file charges, and if the victim comes to State’s Attorney with case report requesting prosecution, State’s Attorney sends Misdemeanor Complaint to Court Clerk for the Initial Appearance event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 76250
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Request for Direct Indictment Hearing to Grand Jury
During the Investigation process, at the Prosecution Charging Decision event, if the charge is a felony, and if a State’s Attorney decides to file a charge, State’s Attorney sends Bill of Information to Grand Jury for the Grand Jury Indictment Decision event in the Investigation process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 31201
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Petition to Adjudicate to Court Clerk
During the Investigation process, at the Prosecution Charging Decision event, if a State’s Attorney decides to file a charge, and if the subject is a juvenile, State’s Attorney sends Petition to Adjudicate to Court Clerk for the Initial Appearance event in the Pre-disposition Court process.
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STATE’S ATTORNEY 31202
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Petition to Adjudicate to Juvenile Court Services
During the Investigation process, at the Prosecution Charging Decision event, if the subject is a juvenile, and if a State’s Attorney does not file a charge, State’s Attorney sends Notice of No Petition to Juvenile Court Services for the Update Case File event in the Investigation process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 73100
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Indictment to Court Clerk
During the Investigation process, at the Prosecution Charging Decision event, if a Grand Jury issues a true bill, State’s Attorney sends Indictment to Court Clerk for the Status Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 22500
Description: State’s Attorney Files No Bill Nolle With Court Clerk
During the Investigation process, at the Prosecution Charging Decision event, if a Grand Jury issues a no bill, and if the court has assigned a case number, State’s Attorney sends Nolle Prosequi to Court Clerk for the Update Case File event in the Investigation process.

Grand Jury Indictment Decision
GRAND JURY 23700
Description: Grand Jury Sends Indictment to State’s Attorney
During the Investigation process, at the Grand Jury Indictment Decision event, if a Grand Jury issues a true bill, Grand Jury sends Indictment to State’s Attorney for the Prosecution Charging Decision event in the Investigation process.

GRAND JURY 51700
Description: Grand Jury Sends No Bill to State’s Attorney
During the Investigation process, at the Grand Jury Indictment Decision event, if a Grand Jury issues a no bill, Grand Jury sends No Bill to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Investigation process.

Search Warrant Request
LAW ENFORCEMENT 71151
Description: Law Enforcement Sends Request for Search Warrant to Judge
During the Investigation process, at the Search Warrant Request event, if law enforcement decides to pursue a search warrant, Law Enforcement sends Complaint, and Search Warrant to Judge for the Search Warrant Review event in the Investigation process.

Search Warrant Review
JUDGE 71802
Description: Judge Sends Search Warrant to Law Enforcement
During the Investigation process, at the Search Warrant Review event, if a Judge signs a search warrant, Judge sends Signed Search Warrant to Law Enforcement for the Search Warrant Service event in the Investigation process.
Search Warrant Service
LAW ENFORCEMENT 71152
Description: Law Enforcement Sends Search Warrant Execution to Judge
During the Investigation process, at the Search Warrant Service event, if the search warrant was executed, Law Enforcement sends Search Warrant, Inventory List, and Return of Service to Judge for the Search Warrant Signing event in the Investigation process.

Search Warrant Signing
JUDGE 71804
Description: Judge Sends Signed Return of Service to Law Enforcement after Service of Search Warrant
During the Investigation process, at the Search Warrant Signing event, if a Judge signs a search warrant, and if the search warrant was executed, Judge sends Return of Service to Law Enforcement for the Search Warrant Return event in the Investigation process.

Search Warrant Return
LAW ENFORCEMENT 71153
Description: Law Enforcement Sends Search Warrant Execution to State’s Attorney
During the Investigation process, at the Search Warrant Return event, if the search warrant was executed, and if a Judge signs the return service on a search warrant, Law Enforcement sends Search Warrant, Inventory List, and Return of Service to State’s Attorney for the Search Warrant Filing event in the Investigation process.

Search Warrant Filing
STATE’S ATTORNEY 73101
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Search Warrant to Court Clerk
During the Investigation process, at the Search Warrant Filing event, if the search warrant was executed, State’s Attorney sends Search Warrant, Inventory List, and Return of Service to Court Clerk for the Assignment of MR# event in the Investigation process.

Request Protection Order
STATE’S ATTORNEY 73102
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Request for Protection Order (arrested) to Court Clerk
During the Investigation process, at the Request Protection Order event, if the charge is domestic related, if a police report has been filed, if the victim requests a protection order, and if the defendant has been arrested, State’s Attorney sends Summons, Court Findings, Petition for Protection Order, and Protection Order to Court Clerk for the Protection Order Hearing event in the Investigation process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 73103
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Request for Protection Order (no arrest) to Court Clerk
During the Investigation process, at the Request Protection Order event, if the charge is domestic related, if a police report has been filed, and if the victim requests a protection order, State’s Attorney sends Summons, Court Findings, Petition for Protection Order, Protection Order, Complaint, and Signed Order for Probable Cause to Court Clerk for the Protection Order Hearing event in the Investigation process.
Protection Order Entry
SHERIFF’S OFFICE 21804
Description: Sheriff’s Office Sends Protection Order to LEADS
During the Investigation process, at the Protection Order Entry event, if a Judge signs a protection order, Sheriff’s Office sends Protection Order Information to LEADS for the Update Records event in the Investigation process.

SHERIFF’S OFFICE 21802
Description: Sheriff’s Office Sends Protection Order Update to LEADS
During the Investigation process, at the Protection Order Entry event, if the protection order was served, Sheriff’s Office sends Protection Order Information to LEADS for the Update Records event in the Investigation process.

Protection Order Service
SHERIFF’S OFFICE 21803
Description: Sheriff’s Office Sends Protection Order Service to Court Clerk, State’s Attorney
During the Investigation process, at the Protection Order Service event, if the protection order was served, Sheriff’s Office sends Return of Service to State’s Attorney, and Court Clerk for the Update Case File event in the Investigation process.

AT LARGE

Arrest on Warrant
LAW ENFORCEMENT 78100
Description: Law Enforcement Sends Arrest Warrant Service to Court Clerk
During the At Large process, at the Arrest on Warrant event, if the subject was arrested on a warrant, Law Enforcement sends Service Copy of Arrest Warrant to Court Clerk for the Bond Call event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

LAW ENFORCEMENT 28100
Description: Law Enforcement Detains Warrant Arrest in Jail
During the At Large process, at the Arrest on Warrant event, if bond cannot be posted, if the subject was arrested on a warrant, and if the subject is held in the county jail, Law Enforcement sends Service Copy of Arrest Warrant to Jail for the Intake event in the Detention process.

LAW ENFORCEMENT 28102
Description: Law Enforcement Detains Warrant Arrest in Holding Facility
During the At Large process, at the Arrest on Warrant event, if bond cannot be posted, and if the subject is held in a local holding facility, Law Enforcement sends Service Copy of Arrest Warrant to Holding Facility for the Intake event in the Detention process.
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LAW ENFORCEMENT 28150
Description: Law Enforcement Detains Warrant Arrest in Jail After Medical Release
During the At Large process, at the Arrest on Warrant event, if bond cannot be posted, if a medical release is required for the subject to be detained, and if the subject is held in the county jail, Law Enforcement sends Jail Medical Release to Admit, and Service Copy of Arrest Warrant to Jail for the Intake event in the Detention process.

LAW ENFORCEMENT 28152
Description: Law Enforcement Detains Warrant Arrest in Holding Facility After Medical Release
During the At Large process, at the Arrest on Warrant event, if bond cannot be posted, if a medical release is required for the subject to be detained, and if the subject is held in a local holding facility, Law Enforcement sends Jail Medical Release to Admit, and Service Copy of Arrest Warrant to Holding Facility for the Intake event in the Detention process.

LAW ENFORCEMENT 21801
Description: Law Enforcement Sends Arrest Warrant Cancellation to LEADS
During the At Large process, at the Arrest on Warrant event, if law enforcement is responsible for LEADS warrant entry/cancellation, and if an arrest warrant needs to be cancelled in LEADS, Law Enforcement sends Arrest Warrant Information to LEADS for the Update Records event in the At Large process.

SHERIFF’S OFFICE 21801
Description: Sheriff’s Office Sends Arrest Warrant Cancellation to LEADS
During the At Large process, at the Arrest on Warrant event, if the Sheriff’s Office is responsible for LEADS warrant entry/cancellation, and if an arrest warrant needs to be cancelled in LEADS, Sheriff’s Office sends Arrest Warrant Information to LEADS for the Update Records event in the At Large process.

Arrest Warrant Request
LAW ENFORCEMENT 76100
Description: Law Enforcement Sends Request for Felony Arrest Warrant to Judge
During the At Large process, at the Arrest Warrant Request event, if law enforcement decides to pursue an arrest warrant, if the State’s Attorney approved the felony charge, and if the court has assigned a case number, Law Enforcement sends Unsigned Order for Probable Cause, Felony Complaint, and New Case Information Sheet to Judge for the Probable Cause Hearing event in the At Large process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 76100
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Request for Misdemeanor Case Number to Court Clerk
During the At Large process, at the Arrest Warrant Request event, if a State’s Attorney decides to file a charge, and if the charge is a misdemeanor, State’s Attorney sends Unsigned Order for Probable Cause, and Misdemeanor Complaint to Court Clerk for the Case Number Assignment event in the At Large process.
LAW ENFORCEMENT 76101
Description: Law Enforcement Sends Request for Misdemeanor Arrest Warrant to Judge
During the At Large process, at the Arrest Warrant Request event, if law enforcement decides to pursue an arrest warrant, and if the court has assigned a case number, Law Enforcement sends Unsigned Order for Probable Cause, Misdemeanor Complaint, and New Case Information Sheet to Judge for the Probable Cause Hearing event in the At Large process.

LAW ENFORCEMENT 76102
Description: Law Enforcement Sends Request for Felony Case Number to Court Clerk
During the At Large process, at the Arrest Warrant Request event, if law enforcement decides to pursue an arrest warrant, if the charge is a felony, and if the State’s Attorney approved the felony charge, Law Enforcement sends Unsigned Order for Probable Cause, and Felony Complaint to Court Clerk for the Case Number Assignment event in the At Large process.

LAW ENFORCEMENT 76103
Description: Law Enforcement Sends Request for Misdemeanor Case Number to Court Clerk
During the At Large process, at the Arrest Warrant Request event, if law enforcement decides to pursue an arrest warrant, and if the charge is a misdemeanor, Law Enforcement sends Unsigned Order for Probable Cause, and Misdemeanor Complaint to Court Clerk for the Case Number Assignment event in the At Large process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 76400
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Request for Misdemeanor Arrest Warrant to Court Clerk
During the At Large process, at the Arrest Warrant Request event, if a State’s Attorney decides to pursue an arrest warrant, if the charge is a misdemeanor, and if the court has assigned a case number, State’s Attorney sends Misdemeanor Complaint, Unsigned Order for Probable Cause, and New Case Information Sheet to Court Clerk for the Probable Cause Hearing event in the At Large process.

LAW ENFORCEMENT 22105
Description: Law Enforcement Sends Request for Arrest Warrant to State’s Attorney
During the At Large process, at the Arrest Warrant Request event, if law enforcement seeks an arrest warrant, and if the subject is a juvenile, Law Enforcement sends Sworn Synopsis to State’s Attorney for the Arrest Warrant Request event in the At Large process.

JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 22100
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Request for Arrest Warrant to State’s Attorney
During the At Large process, at the Arrest Warrant Request event, if Juvenile Court Services seeks an arrest warrant, Juvenile Court Services sends Sworn Affidavit to State’s Attorney for the Arrest Warrant Request event in the At Large process.
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STATE’S ATTORNEY 22200
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Request for Juvenile Arrest Warrant to Judge
During the At Large process, at the Arrest Warrant Request event, if a State’s Attorney decides to pursue an arrest warrant, if the court has assigned a case number, and if the subject is a juvenile, State’s Attorney sends Sworn Affidavit, Sworn Synopsis, and Petition for Warrant to Judge for the Probable Cause Hearing event in the At Large process.

Case Number Assignment
COURT CLERK 15450
Description: Court Clerk Sends Case Number to State’s Attorney
During the At Large process, at the Case Number Assignment event, if the State’s Attorney seeks an arrest warrant, and if the charge is a misdemeanor, Court Clerk sends Case Number to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the At Large process.

COURT CLERK 15451
Description: Court Clerk Sends Case Number to Law Enforcement
During the At Large process, at the Case Number Assignment event, if law enforcement seeks an arrest warrant, and if the charge is a misdemeanor, Court Clerk sends Case Number to Law Enforcement for the Update Case File event in the At Large process.

Generate Warrant
COURT CLERK 15600
Description: Court Clerk Sends Arrest Warrant to Judge
During the At Large process, at the Generate Warrant event, if no condition specified, Court Clerk sends Unsigned Arrest Warrant to Judge for the Arrest Warrant Issued event in the At Large process.

Arrest Warrant Issued
JUDGE 71801
Description: Judge Sends Arrest Warrant to Court Clerk
During the At Large process, at the Arrest Warrant Issued event, if a Judge signs an arrest warrant, Judge sends Signed Arrest Warrant to Court Clerk for the Warrant Distribution event in the At Large process.

Warrant Distribution
COURT CLERK 15601
Description: Court Clerk Sends Arrest Warrant to Law Enforcement
During the At Large process, at the Warrant Distribution event, if law enforcement is responsible for LEADS warrant entry/cancellation, Court Clerk sends Service Copy of Arrest Warrant to Law Enforcement for the Warrant Entry event in the At Large process.
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COURT CLERK 15602
Description: Court Clerk Sends Arrest Warrant to Sheriff’s Office
During the At Large process, at the Warrant Distribution event, if the Sheriff’s Office is responsible for LEADS warrant entry/cancellation, Court Clerk sends Service Copy of Arrest Warrant to Sheriff’s Office for the Warrant Entry event in the At Large process.

COURT CLERK 15603
Description: Court Clerk Sends Arrest Warrant to State’s Attorney
During the At Large process, at the Warrant Distribution event, if a Judge signs an arrest warrant, Court Clerk sends Arrest Warrant to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the At Large process.

COURT CLERK 15608
Description: Court Clerk Sends Bench Warrant to Sheriff’s Office
During the At Large process, at the Warrant Distribution event, if the Sheriff’s Office is responsible for LEADS warrant entry/cancellation, Court Clerk sends Bench Warrant to Sheriff’s Office for the Warrant Entry event in the At Large process.

COURT CLERK 15609
Description: Court Clerk Sends Bench Warrant to State’s Attorney
During the At Large process, at the Warrant Distribution event, if a Judge issues a bench warrant, Court Clerk sends Bench Warrant to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the At Large process.

COURT CLERK 15610
Description: Court Clerk Sends Bench Warrant to Law Enforcement
During the At Large process, at the Warrant Distribution event, if law enforcement is responsible for LEADS warrant entry/cancellation, Court Clerk sends Bench Warrant to Law Enforcement for the Warrant Entry event in the At Large process.

Warrant Entry
SHERIFF’S OFFICE 21800
Description: Sheriff’s Office Sends Arrest Warrant to LEADS
During the At Large process, at the Warrant Entry event, if an arrest warrant needs to be entered into LEADS, and if the Sheriff’s Office is responsible for LEADS warrant entry/cancellation, Sheriff’s Office sends Arrest Warrant Information to LEADS for the Update Records event in the At Large process.

LAW ENFORCEMENT 21800
Description: Law Enforcement Sends Arrest Warrant to LEADS
During the At Large process, at the Warrant Entry event, if an arrest warrant needs to be entered into LEADS, and if law enforcement is responsible for LEADS warrant entry/cancellation, Law Enforcement sends Arrest Warrant Information to LEADS for the Update Records event in the At Large process.
SHERIFF’S OFFICE 21850
Description: Sheriff’s Office Sends Bench Warrant to LEADS
During the At Large process, at the Warrant Entry event, if a bench warrant needs to be entered into LEADS, and if the Sheriff’s Office is responsible for LEADS warrant entry/cancellation, Sheriff’s Office sends Bench Warrant Information to LEADS for the Update Records event in the At Large process.

LAW ENFORCEMENT 21851
Description: Law Enforcement Sends Bench Warrant to LEADS
During the At Large process, at the Warrant Entry event, if a bench warrant needs to be entered into LEADS, and if law enforcement is responsible for LEADS warrant entry/cancellation, Law Enforcement sends Bench Warrant Information to LEADS for the Update Records event in the At Large process.

Probable Cause Hearing
JUDGE 71800
Description: Judge Sends Order for Probable Cause to Court Clerk
During the At Large process, at the Probable Cause Hearing event, if a Judge finds probable cause to issue an arrest warrant, Judge sends Signed Order for Probable Cause to Court Clerk for the Generate Warrant event in the At Large process.

Summons Request
STATE’S ATTORNEY 77150
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Request for Summons to Judge
During the At Large process, at the Summons Request event, if the State’s Attorney decides to pursue a summons rather than an arrest warrant, State’s Attorney sends Misdemeanor Complaint, and Unsigned Summons to Judge for the Summons Issued event in the At Large process.

Summons Issued
JUDGE 71803
Description: Judge Sends Summons to Court Clerk
During the At Large process, at the Summons Issued event, if a Judge signs a summons, Judge sends Signed Summons to Court Clerk for the Summons Distribution event in the At Large process.

Summons Distribution
COURT CLERK 15605
Description: Court Clerk Sends Summons to Law Enforcement
During the At Large process, at the Summons Distribution event, if the summons is to be served by law enforcement, Court Clerk sends Signed Summons to Law Enforcement for the Summons Service event in the At Large process.
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COURT CLERK 15606
Description: Court Clerk Sends Summons to Sheriff’s Office
During the At Large process, at the Summons Distribution event, if the summons is to be served by the Sheriff’s Office, Court Clerk sends Signed Summons to Sheriff’s Office for the Summons Service event in the At Large process.

Summons Service
LAW ENFORCEMENT 77800
Description: Law Enforcement Sends Summons Service to Court Clerk
During the At Large process, at the Summons Service event, if a summons is served on a subject, Law Enforcement sends Return of Service to Court Clerk for the Status Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

SHERIFF’S OFFICE 77800
Description: Sheriff’s Office Sends Summons Service to Court Clerk
During the At Large process, at the Summons Service event, if a summons is served on a subject, Sheriff’s Office sends Return of Service to Court Clerk for the Status Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

DETENTION

Intake
JAIL 31500
Description: Jail Sends Felony Complaint to Court Clerk
During the Detention process, at the Intake event, if the charge is a felony, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, and if the subject is held in the county jail, Jail sends Felony Complaint to Court Clerk for the Bond Call event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

JAIL 31501
Description: Jail Sends Misdemeanor Complaint (detained) to Court Clerk
During the Detention process, at the Intake event, if the charge is a misdemeanor, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, and if the subject is held in the county jail, Jail sends Misdemeanor Complaint to Court Clerk for the Bond Call event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

JAIL 31502
Description: Jail Sends Felony Complaint to State’s Attorney
During the Detention process, at the Intake event, if the charge is a felony, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, and if the subject is held in the county jail, Jail sends Felony Complaint, and Arrest Synopsis to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.
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**JAIL 31503**  
Description: Jail Sends Misdemeanor Complaint (detained) to State’s Attorney  
During the Detention process, at the Intake event, if the charge is a misdemeanor, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, and if the subject is held in the county jail, Jail sends Arrest Synopsis, and Misdemeanor Complaint to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Detention process.

**JAIL 31504**  
Description: Jail Sends Warrant to Court Clerk  
During the Detention process, at the Intake event, if the subject was arrested on a warrant, and if the subject is held in the county jail, Jail sends Service Copy of Arrest Warrant to Court Clerk for the Bond Call event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

**JAIL 31505**  
Description: Jail Sends Warrant to State’s Attorney  
During the Detention process, at the Intake event, if the subject was arrested on a warrant, and if the subject is held in the county jail, Jail sends Service Copy of Arrest Warrant to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Detention process.

**HOLDING FACILITY 31501**  
Description: Holding Facility Sends Misdemeanor Complaint (detained) to Court Clerk  
During the Detention process, at the Intake event, if the charge is a misdemeanor, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, and if the subject is held in a local holding facility, Holding Facility sends Misdemeanor Complaint to Court Clerk for the Bond Call event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

**HOLDING FACILITY 31503**  
Description: Holding Facility Sends Misdemeanor Complaint (detained) to State’s Attorney  
During the Detention process, at the Intake event, if the charge is a misdemeanor, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, and if the subject is held in a local holding facility, Holding Facility sends Arrest Synopsis, and Misdemeanor Complaint to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Detention process.

**JUVENILE JUSTICE CENTER 22200**  
Description: Juvenile Justice Center Sends Warrant to Sheriff’s Office  
During the Detention process, at the Intake event, if a juvenile is held at the juvenile justice center, and if the subject was arrested on a warrant, Juvenile Justice Center sends Service Copy of Arrest Warrant to Sheriff’s Office for the Warrant Entry event in the At Large process.
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JUVENILE JUSTICE CENTER 22300
Description: Juvenile Justice Center Sends Intake Form to Juvenile Court Services
During the Detention process, at the Intake event, if a juvenile is held at the juvenile justice center, Juvenile Justice Center sends Detention Intake Form to Juvenile Court Services for the Update Case File event in the Detention process.

Booking

LAW ENFORCEMENT 25500
Description: Law Enforcement Sends Fingerprints to State Police
During the Detention process, at the Booking event, if law enforcement is responsible for booking, Law Enforcement sends Arrest Fingerprint Card to State Police - BOI for the Update Records event in the Detention process.

JAIL 31508
Description: Jail Sends Misdemeanor Complaint (released) to Court Clerk
During the Detention process, at the Booking event, if the charge is a misdemeanor, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, and if the subject is released on bond from the county jail, Jail sends Misdemeanor Complaint, and Bond Sheet to Court Clerk for the Initial Appearance event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

JAIL 31509
Description: Jail Sends Misdemeanor Complaint (released) to State’s Attorney
During the Detention process, at the Booking event, if the charge is a misdemeanor, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, and if the subject is released on bond from the county jail, Jail sends Arrest Synopsis, Misdemeanor Complaint, and Bond Sheet to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Detention process.

HOLDING FACILITY 31508
Description: Holding Facility Sends Misdemeanor Complaint (released) to Court Clerk
During the Detention process, at the Booking event, if the charge is a misdemeanor, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, and if the subject is released on bond from a local holding facility, Holding Facility sends Misdemeanor Complaint, and Bond Sheet to Court Clerk for the Initial Appearance event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

HOLDING FACILITY 31509
Description: Holding Facility Sends Misdemeanor Complaint (released) to State’s Attorney
During the Detention process, at the Booking event, if the charge is a misdemeanor, if the subject was not arrested on a warrant, and if the subject is released on bond from a local holding facility, Holding Facility sends Arrest Synopsis, Misdemeanor Complaint, and Bond Sheet to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Detention process.
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Special Bond Call Request
STATE’S ATTORNEY 63500
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Special Bond Call List to Court Services
During the Detention process, at the Special Bond Call Request event, if jail population reaches a critical level, State’s Attorney sends Special Bond Call List to Court Services for the Bond Eligibility Review event in the Detention process.

Transport Subject to Court
JAIL 17700
Description: Jail Sends Detained Inmate Court Schedule to State’s Attorney
During the Detention process, at the Transport Subject to Court event, if a subject is in jail, and if a subject has a hearing scheduled, Jail sends Court Schedule to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Detention process.

JAIL 17600
Description: Jail Sends Detained Inmate Court Schedule to Public Defender
During the Detention process, at the Transport Subject to Court event, if a subject is in jail, if the defendant has a Public Defender, and if a subject has a hearing scheduled, Jail sends Court Schedule to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Detention process.

JAIL 31450
Description: Jail Sends In Custody List to Court Clerk
During the Detention process, at the Transport Subject to Court event, if there are jail inmates that need to be seen by a Judge, Jail sends Court Custody List to Court Clerk for the Bond Call event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

JAIL 31451
Description: Jail Sends In Custody List to Public Defender
During the Detention process, at the Transport Subject to Court event, if there are jail inmates that need to be seen by a Judge, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, Jail sends Court Custody List to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Detention process.

JAIL 31452
Description: Jail Sends In Custody List to State’s Attorney
During the Detention process, at the Transport Subject to Court event, if there are jail inmates that need to be seen by a Judge, Jail sends Court Custody List to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Detention process.
HOLDING FACILITY 31450
Description: Holding Facility Sends In Custody List to Court Clerk
During the Detention process, at the Transport Subject to Court event, if there are holding facility inmates that need to be seen by a Judge, Holding Facility sends Court Custody List to Court Clerk for the Bond Call event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

HOLDING FACILITY 31451
Description: Holding Facility Sends In Custody List to Public Defender
During the Detention process, at the Transport Subject to Court event, if there are holding facility inmates that need to be seen by a Judge, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, Holding Facility sends Court Custody List to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

HOLDING FACILITY 31452
Description: Holding Facility Sends In Custody List to State’s Attorney
During the Detention process, at the Transport Subject to Court event, if there are holding facility inmates that need to be seen by a Judge, Holding Facility sends Court Custody List to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

JUVENILE JUSTICE CENTER 31451
Description: Juvenile Justice Center Sends In Custody List to Public Defender
During the Detention process, at the Transport Subject to Court event, if a juvenile is held at the juvenile justice center, and if the Public Defender represents the juvenile, Juvenile Justice Center sends Court Custody List to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Detention process.

JUVENILE JUSTICE CENTER 31450
Description: Juvenile Justice Center Sends In Custody List to State’s Attorney, Juvenile Court Services
During the Detention process, at the Transport Subject to Court event, if a juvenile is held at the juvenile justice center, Juvenile Justice Center sends Court Custody List to State’s Attorney, and Juvenile Court Services for the Update Case File event in the Detention process.

JAIL 31453
Description: Jail Sends In Custody List to Court Services (To-Be)
During the Detention process, at the Transport Subject to Court event, if there are jail inmates that need to be seen by a Judge, Jail sends Court Custody List to Court Services for the Update Case File event in the Detention process.
Release
JAIL 31460
Description: Jail Sends Release From Custody List to Court Services
During the Detention process, at the Release event, if the subject is released on bond from the county jail, Jail sends Release From Custody List to Court Services for the Update Records event in the Detention process.

JAIL 31400
Description: Jail Sends Release Order to Court Services
During the Detention process, at the Release event, if the court issues a release order for the subject, if the court order involves GPS/EHM restrictions, and if the subject is held in the county jail, Jail sends Release Order to Court Services for the Intake event in the Pre-disposition Supervision process.

HOLDING FACILITY 31400
Description: Holding Facility Sends Release Order to Court Services
During the Detention process, at the Release event, if the court issues a release order for the subject, if the court order involves GPS/EHM restrictions, and if the subject is held in a local holding facility, Holding Facility sends Release Order to Court Services for the Intake event in the Pre-disposition Supervision process.

PRE-DISPOSITION COURT

Bond Call
COURT CLERK 12451
Description: Court Clerk Sends Personal Recognizance Order to Jail
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Bond Call event, if the court sets bond, if a subject is in jail, and if the subject is released on own recognizance, Court Clerk sends Personal Recognizance Order to Jail for the Release event in the Detention process.

COURT CLERK 12450
Description: Court Clerk Sends Personal Recognizance Order to Holding Facility
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Bond Call event, if the court sets bond, if a subject is in a holding facility, and if the subject is released on own recognizance, Court Clerk sends Personal Recognizance Order to Holding Facility for the Release event in the Detention process.

COURT CLERK 12452
Description: Court Clerk Sends Continuance Order at Bond Call to State’s Attorney
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Bond Call event, if the court sets bond, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.
COURT CLERK 12453
Description: Court Clerk Sends Continuance Order at Bond Call to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Bond Call event, if the court sets bond, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 12456
Description: Court Clerk Sends Continuance Order at Bond Call to Court Services
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Bond Call event, if the court sets bond, and if the defendant has a conditional bond, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to Court Services for the Intake event in the Pre-disposition Supervision process.

Prosecution Charging Decision
STATE’S ATTORNEY 25500
Description: State’s Attorney Files Nolle With Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Prosecution Charging Decision event, if the State’s Attorney decides not to continue prosecution after a charge has been filed with the court, State’s Attorney sends Nolle Prosequi to Court Clerk for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

Protection Order Hearing
COURT CLERK 15607
Description: Court Clerk Sends Protection Order to Sheriff’s Office
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Protection Order Hearing event, if a Judge signs a protection order, Court Clerk sends Summons, Protection Order, Petition for Protection Order, and Court Findings to Sheriff’s Office for the Protection Order Entry event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

Initial Appearance
COURT CLERK 16200
Description: Court Clerk Assigns Public Defender to Defendant
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Initial Appearance event, if court appoints Public Defender, Court Clerk sends Appointing Order to Public Defender for the Open Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 16201
Description: Court Clerk Assigns Public Defender to Juvenile
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Initial Appearance event, if court appoints Public Defender, Court Clerk sends Appointing Order to Public Defender for the Open Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.
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COURT CLERK 41501
Description: Court Clerk Sends Continuance/Transport Order to Jail
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Initial Appearance event, if a subject is in jail, if the case is continued, and if the subject is to remain in custody, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to Jail for the Transport Subject to Jail event in the Detention process.

COURT CLERK 41500
Description: Court Clerk Sends Continuance/Transport Order to Holding Facility
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Initial Appearance event, if a subject is in a holding facility, if the case is continued, and if the subject is to remain in custody, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to Holding Facility for the Transport Subject to Holding Facility event in the Detention process.

COURT CLERK 65402
Description: Court Clerk Sends Continuance Order at Initial Appearance to Court Services
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Initial Appearance event, if the defendant is able to post bond, and if the bond contains conditions, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to Court Services for the Intake event in the Pre-disposition Supervision process.

COURT CLERK 66404
Description: Court Clerk Sends Notice to Appear to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the defendant has a Public Defender, if the subject fails to appear, and if the case is continued, Court Clerk sends Notice to Appear to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 66400
Description: Court Clerk Sends Continuance Order to Court Services
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the bond contains conditions, and if the case is continued, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to Court Services for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Supervision process.

COURT CLERK 66401
Description: Court Clerk Sends Continuance Order to State’s Attorney
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the case is continued, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.
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COURT CLERK 66402
Description: Court Clerk Sends Continuance Order to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the case is continued, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 15250
Description: Court Clerk Sends Case Dismissal Order to State’s Attorney
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if charges are dismissed by the court, Court Clerk sends Court Order to State’s Attorney for the Close Case File event in the Post Supervision/Case Closure process.

COURT CLERK 15251
Description: Court Clerk Sends Case Dismissal Order to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if charges are dismissed by the court, Court Clerk sends Court Order to Public Defender for the Close Case File event in the Post Supervision/Case Closure process.

COURT CLERK 41650
Description: Court Clerk Sends Remand Order to Jail – Defendant to Remain in Custody
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the subject is to remain in custody, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to Jail for the Transport Subject to Jail event in the Detention process.

COURT CLERK 66700
Description: Court Clerk Sends Request for Pretrial Services Bond Report to Court Services
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the court wants a pretrial services bond report, if the Public Defender has filed a motion to reduce bond, and if the court schedules a motion hearing, Court Clerk sends Court Order, and Notice of Hearing to Court Services for the Prepare Report event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 12454
Description: Court Clerk Sends Bond Forfeiture Notice to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the defendant has a Public Defender, and if the court revokes subject’s bond, Court Clerk sends Bond Forfeiture Notice to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.
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COURT CLERK 12455
Description: Court Clerk Sends Bond Forfeiture Notice to State’s Attorney
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the court revokes subject’s bond, Court Clerk sends Bond Forfeiture Notice to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 15902
Description: Court Clerk Sends Booking Order to Jail
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the court orders a defendant to be booked at the jail, and if the subject has not been booked, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to Jail for the Booking event in the Detention process.

COURT CLERK 63601
Description: Court Clerk Sends Request for Pre-plea Report to Court Services
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the court wants a pre-plea report, Court Clerk sends Court Order, and Notice of Hearing to Court Services for the Prepare Report event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 77800
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Petition to Revoke Bond to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the Judge does not issue a bench warrant in court, if the defendant fails to appear, and if the defendant has a conditional bond, State’s Attorney sends Petition to Revoke Bond to Court Clerk for the Status Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 77801
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Petition to Revoke Bond to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the defendant has a Public Defender, if the defendant fails to appear, and if the Judge does not issue a bench warrant in court, State’s Attorney sends Petition to Revoke Bond to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

JUDGE 71804
Description: Judge Sends Order for Bench Warrant to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if a Judge issues a bench warrant, Judge sends Court Order to Court Clerk for the Generate Warrant event in the Pre-disposition Court process.
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STATE’S ATTORNEY 76050
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Plea Agreement to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if a plea agreement has been reached, and if the court not prepared to sentence defendant when plea entered, State’s Attorney sends Plea Agreement to Court Clerk for the Sentence Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 76051
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Plea Agreement to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if a plea agreement has been reached, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, State’s Attorney sends Plea Agreement to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 71800
Description: Court Clerk Sends Diversion Order to State’s Attorney
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if a diversion agreement is reached, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 71801
Description: Court Clerk Sends Diversion Order to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if a diversion agreement is reached, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

PUBLIC DEFENDER 72100
Description: Public Defender Sends Drug Court Application to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if a subject applies for the drug court program, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, Public Defender sends Drug Court Application to Court Clerk for the Drug Court Eligibility Review event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

PUBLIC DEFENDER 72101
Description: Public Defender Sends TA Court Application to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the defendant has a Public Defender, and if a subject applies for the TA court program, Public Defender sends TA Court Application to Court Clerk for the TA Court Eligibility Review event in the Pre-disposition Court process.
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PUBLIC DEFENDER 78400
Description: Public Defender Sends Waiver of Jury Trial to Court Clerk, State’s Attorney
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the defendant waives a jury trial, Public Defender sends Jury Trial Waiver to State’s Attorney, and Court Clerk for the Trial Status Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 47600
Description: Court Clerk Sends Jury Trial Notice to State’s Attorney
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the case is being prosecuted by the State’s Attorney, and if the case set for jury trial, Court Clerk sends Trial Notice to State’s Attorney for the Subpoena Request event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 47550
Description: Court Clerk Sends Jury Trial Notice to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the defendant has a Public Defender, and if the case set for jury trial, Court Clerk sends Trial Notice to Public Defender for the Subpoena Request event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 17800
Description: Court Clerk Sends Bench Trial Notice to State’s Attorney
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the defendant waives a jury trial, and if a trial date is entered on the court calendar, Court Clerk sends Trial Notice to State’s Attorney for the Subpoena Request event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 17550
Description: Court Clerk Sends Bench Trial Notice to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if a trial date is entered on the court calendar, if the defendant waives a jury trial, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, Court Clerk sends Trial Notice to Public Defender for the Subpoena Request event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 71750
Description: Court Clerk Sends Psychological Referral to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the court orders a psychological evaluation, Court Clerk sends Court Order to Public Defender, and State’s Attorney for the Psychological Evaluation Referral event in the Pre-disposition Court process.
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COURT CLERK 63600
Description: Court Clerk Sends Request for Pre-sentence Investigation to Court Services
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the court orders a pre-sentence investigation, Court Clerk sends Presentence Investigation Order to Court Services for the Prepare Report event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 71802
Description: Court Clerk Sends Diversion Completion Order to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the defendant has a Public Defender, and if the subject successfully completes the diversion program, Court Clerk sends Dismissal Order to Public Defender for the Close Case File event in the Post Supervision/Case Closure process.

COURT CLERK 71803
Description: Court Clerk Sends Diversion Completion Order to State’s Attorney
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the subject successfully completes the diversion program, Court Clerk sends Dismissal Order to State’s Attorney for the Close Case File event in the Post Supervision/Case Closure process.

COURT CLERK 71804
Description: Court Clerk Sends Diversion Failure Order to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the defendant has a Public Defender, and if a subject fails the diversion program, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 71805
Description: Court Clerk Sends Diversion Failure Order to State’s Attorney
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if a subject fails the diversion program, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 71853
Description: Court Clerk Sends Social History Court Order to Juvenile Court Services
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the court orders a social history, and if the subject is a juvenile, Court Clerk sends Court Order to Juvenile Court Services for the Prepare Report event in the Pre-disposition Court process.
COURT CLERK 71854
Description: Court Clerk Sends Social History Court Order to Juvenile Court Services (Juvenile on Probation)
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the court orders a social history, and if a juvenile is already on probation, Court Clerk sends Court Order to Juvenile Court Services for the Prepare Report event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 627000
Description: Court Clerk Sends Request for Biological Test to Court Services
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the court orders a biological test, Court Clerk sends Court Order to Court Services for the Collect Biological Sample event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 627010
Description: Court Clerk Sends Request for Biological Test to Juvenile Court Services
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the court orders a biological test, and if the subject is a juvenile, Court Clerk sends Court Order to Juvenile Court Services for the Collect Biological Sample event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 71855
Description: Court Clerk Sends Fee Calculation Court Order to Juvenile Court Services
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if electronic monitoring is ordered for a subject, and if the subject is a juvenile, Court Clerk sends Court Order to Juvenile Court Services for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Supervision process.

Amendment of Charges
STATE’S ATTORNEY 71200
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Amended Felony Complaint to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Amendment of Charges event, if the State’s Attorney wants to amend the original charge, and if the charge is a felony, State’s Attorney sends Amended Felony Complaint to Court Clerk for the Status Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 71503
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Amended Felony Complaint to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Amendment of Charges event, if the State’s Attorney wants to amend the original charge, if the charge is a felony, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, State’s Attorney sends Amended Felony Complaint to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.
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STATE’S ATTORNEY 71500
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Amended Misdemeanor Complaint to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Amendment of Charges event, if the State’s Attorney wants to amend the original charge, and if the charge is a misdemeanor, State’s Attorney sends Amended Misdemeanor Complaint to Court Clerk for the Status Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 71501
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Amended Misdemeanor Complaint to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Amendment of Charges event, if the State’s Attorney wants to amend the original charge, if the charge is a misdemeanor, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, State’s Attorney sends Amended Misdemeanor Complaint to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

Submit Application
COURT CLERK 12100
Description: Court Clerk Sends Drug Court Application to Court Services
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Submit Application event, if a subject applies for the drug court program, Court Clerk sends Drug Court Application to Court Services for the Review Application event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 12101
Description: Court Clerk Sends TA Court Application to Kane County Diagnostic Center
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Submit Application event, if a subject applies for the TA court program, Court Clerk sends TA Court Application to Court Services, and Kane County Diagnostic Center for the Review Application event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

Review Application
COURT SERVICES 71600
Description: Court Services Sends Drug Court Application Rejection to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Review Application event, if an application for drug court is rejected, Court Services sends Drug Court Rejection to Court Clerk for the Status Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT SERVICES 71603
Description: Court Services Sends TA Court Application Rejection to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Review Application event, if an application for TA court is rejected, Court Services sends TA Court Rejection to Court Clerk for the Status Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.
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COURT SERVICES 71601
Description: Court Services Sends Drug Court Application Acceptance to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Review Application event, if an application for drug court is accepted, Court Services sends Drug Court Packet to Court Clerk for the Status Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT SERVICES 71602
Description: Court Services Sends TA Court Application Acceptance to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Review Application event, if an application for TA court is accepted, Court Services sends TA Court Packet to Court Clerk for the Status Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

Motion Filing
STATE’S ATTORNEY 75100
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Motion to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Motion Filing event, if the State’s Attorney files a motion, State’s Attorney sends Motion, and Notice of Hearing to Court Clerk for the Motion Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

PUBLIC DEFENDER 75100
Description: Public Defender Sends Motion to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Motion Filing event, if the Public Defender files a motion, Public Defender sends Motion, and Notice of Hearing to Court Clerk for the Motion Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

PUBLIC DEFENDER 75101
Description: Public Defender Sends Motion to State’s Attorney
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Motion Filing event, if the case is being prosecuted by the State’s Attorney, and if the Public Defender files a motion, Public Defender sends Motion, and Notice of Hearing to State’s Attorney for the Response Filing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 75101
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Motion to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Motion Filing event, if the defendant has a Public Defender, and if the State’s Attorney files a motion, State’s Attorney sends Motion, and Notice of Hearing to Public Defender for the Response Filing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.
Description: Public Defender Hands Motion to Judge
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Motion Filing event, if the Public Defender files a motion in court, Public Defender sends Motion to Judge for the Motion Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

Description: State’s Attorney Hands Motion to Judge
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Motion Filing event, if the State’s Attorney files a motion in court, State’s Attorney sends Motion to Judge for the Motion Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

Description: State’s Attorney Hands Motion to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Motion Filing event, if the defendant has a Public Defender, and if the State’s Attorney files a motion in court, State’s Attorney sends Motion to Public Defender for the Response Filing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

Description: Public Defender Hands Motion to State’s Attorney
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Motion Filing event, if the Public Defender files a motion in court, Public Defender sends Motion to State’s Attorney for the Response Filing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

Description: State’s Attorney Sends Response Motion to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Response Filing event, if the Public Defender files a motion, State’s Attorney sends Response to Court Clerk for the Motion Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

Description: Public Defender Sends Response Motion to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Response Filing event, if the Public Defender files a response to State’s Attorney’s motion, Public Defender sends Response to Court Clerk for the Motion Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.
STATE’S ATTORNEY 75103  
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Response Motion to Public Defender  
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Response Filing event, if the Public Defender files a motion, State’s Attorney sends Response to Court Clerk for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

PUBLIC DEFENDER 75102  
Description: Public Defender Sends Response Motion to State’s Attorney  
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Response Filing event, if the Public Defender files a response to State’s Attorney’s motion, Public Defender sends Response to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

Motion Hearing  
COURT CLERK 53650  
Description: Court Clerk Sends Motion Findings to State’s Attorney  
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Motion Hearing event, if the case is being prosecuted by the State’s Attorney, Court Clerk sends Court Order to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 53600  
Description: Court Clerk Sends Motion Findings to Public Defender  
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Motion Hearing event, if the defendant has a Public Defender, Court Clerk sends Court Order to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

Open Case File  
PUBLIC DEFENDER 75551  
Description: Public Defender Sends Discovery Request to State’s Attorney  
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Open Case File event, if the case is being prosecuted by the State’s Attorney, and if a Public Defender has been appointed to the subject, Public Defender sends Discovery Request to State’s Attorney for the Discovery Preparation event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

Discovery Preparation  
STATE’S ATTORNEY 72201  
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Discovery Documents to Public Defender  
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Discovery Preparation event, if the defendant has a Public Defender, State’s Attorney sends Discovery Information to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.
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**Diversion Decision**
STATE’S ATTORNEY 72100  
**Description:** State’s Attorney Sends Diversion Court Order to Judge  
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Diversion Decision event, if a diversion agreement is reached, State’s Attorney sends Diversion Court Order to Judge for the Signing of Order event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

**Diversion Program Completion**  
STATE’S ATTORNEY 72200  
**Description:** State’s Attorney Sends Diversion Completion to Court Clerk  
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Diversion Program Completion event, if the subject successfully completes the diversion program, State’s Attorney sends Unsigned Court Order to Court Clerk for the Signing of Order event in the Post-disposition Court process.

**Trial Status Hearing**  
JUDGE 74400  
**Description:** Judge Sends Trial List to Jury Commissioner  
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Trial Status Hearing event, if the case proceeds to trial, Judge sends Jury Form to Jury Commissioner for the Jury Pool Selection event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

**Jury Pool Selection**  
JURY COMMISSIONER 74400  
**Description:** Jury Commissioner Sends Juror List to Court Clerk  
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Jury Pool Selection event, if no condition specified, Jury Commissioner sends Juror List to Court Clerk for the Trial Commencement event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

**Trial Commencement**  
COURT CLERK 74450  
**Description:** Court Clerk Sends Juror List to State’s Attorney  
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Trial Commencement event, if the case is to be prosecuted by the State’s Attorney, and if the case set for jury trial, Court Clerk sends Juror List to State’s Attorney for the Voir Dire event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 74452  
**Description:** Court Clerk Sends Juror List to Public Defender  
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Trial Commencement event, if the defendant has a Public Defender, and if the case set for jury trial, Court Clerk sends Juror List to Public Defender for the Voir Dire event in the Pre-disposition Court process.
Voir Dire
JUDGE 44400
Description: Judge Sends Juror List to Jury Commissioner
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Voir Dire event, if jury selected, Judge sends Updated Juror List to Jury Commissioner for the Update Records event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

Subpoena Request
STATE’S ATTORNEY 77100
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Subpoena to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Subpoena Request event, if the State’s Attorney requested the subpoena, State’s Attorney sends Unstamped Subpoena to Court Clerk for the Subpoena Issuance event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

PUBLIC DEFENDER 77101
Description: Public Defender Sends Subpoena to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Subpoena Request event, if the Public Defender requested the subpoena, Public Defender sends Unstamped Subpoena to Court Clerk for the Subpoena Issuance event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

Subpoena Issuance
COURT CLERK 71701
Description: Court Clerk Sends Subpoena to State’s Attorney
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Subpoena Issuance event, if the State’s Attorney requested the subpoena, Court Clerk sends Stamped Subpoena to State’s Attorney for the Subpoena Service event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 71702
Description: Court Clerk Sends Subpoena to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Subpoena Issuance event, if the Public Defender requested the subpoena, Court Clerk sends Stamped Subpoena to Public Defender for the Subpoena Service event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

Subpoena Service
PUBLIC DEFENDER 77752
Description: Public Defender Sends Subpoena Service to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Subpoena Service event, if a subpoena is served on a subject, and if the Public Defender requested the subpoena, Public Defender sends Return of Service to Court Clerk for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.
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STATE’S ATTORNEY 77752
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Subpoena Service to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Subpoena Service event, if a subpoena is served on a subject, and if the State’s Attorney requested the subpoena, State’s Attorney sends Return of Service to Court Clerk for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

Psychological Evaluation Referral
PUBLIC DEFENDER 77100
Description: Public Defender Sends Request for Psychological Evaluation to Kane County Diagnostic Center
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Psychological Evaluation Referral event, if the court orders a psychological evaluation, and if the Public Defender represents the juvenile, Public Defender sends Referral Form, Case Report, and Court Order to Kane County Diagnostic Center for the Prepare Report event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 76951
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Request for Domestic Violence Evaluation to Kane County Diagnostic Center
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Psychological Evaluation Referral event, if the subject is diverted on a domestic violence case, State’s Attorney sends Case Report, Referral Form, and Court Order to Kane County Diagnostic Center for the Prepare Report event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 77100
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Request for Psychological Evaluation to Kane County Diagnostic Center
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Psychological Evaluation Referral event, if the court orders a psychological evaluation, Juvenile Court Services sends Referral Form, Case Report, and Court Order to Kane County Diagnostic Center for the Prepare Report event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

Prepare Report
COURT SERVICES 66700
Description: Court Services Sends Pretrial Services Bond Report to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Prepare Report event, if the court wants a pretrial services bond report, Court Services sends Pretrial Services Bond Report to Court Clerk for the Status Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.
COURT SERVICES 66701
Description: Court Services Sends Pre-plea Report to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Prepare Report event, if the court wants a pre-plea report, Court Services sends Pre-plea Report to Court Clerk for the Status Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT SERVICES 66702
Description: Court Services Sends Pre-plea Report to State’s Attorney
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Prepare Report event, if the court wants a pre-plea report, Court Services sends Pre-plea Report to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT SERVICES 66703
Description: Court Services Sends Pre-plea Report to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Prepare Report event, if the court wants a pre-plea report, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, Court Services sends Pre-plea Report to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT SERVICES 76300
Description: Court Services Sends Presentence Investigation Report to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Prepare Report event, if the court orders a pre-sentence investigation, Court Services sends Presentence Investigation Report to Court Clerk for the Sentence Hearing event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT SERVICES 76350
Description: Court Services Sends Presentence Investigation Report to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Prepare Report event, if the court orders a pre-sentence investigation, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, Court Services sends Presentence Investigation Report to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT SERVICES 76351
Description: Court Services Sends Presentence Investigation Report to State’s Attorney
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Prepare Report event, if the court orders a pre-sentence investigation, Court Services sends Presentence Investigation Report to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.
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KANE COUNTY DIAGNOSTIC CENTER 66700
Description: Kane County Diagnostic Center Sends Psychological Evaluation to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Prepare Report event, if the court orders a psychological evaluation, Kane County Diagnostic Center sends Psychological Evaluation to Court Clerk for the Status Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

KANE COUNTY DIAGNOSTIC CENTER 66701
Description: Kane County Diagnostic Center Sends Psychological Evaluation to State’s Attorney
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Prepare Report event, if the court orders a psychological evaluation, Kane County Diagnostic Center sends Psychological Evaluation to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

KANE COUNTY DIAGNOSTIC CENTER 66702
Description: Kane County Diagnostic Center Sends Psychological Evaluation to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Prepare Report event, if the court orders a psychological evaluation, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, Kane County Diagnostic Center sends Psychological Evaluation to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT SERVICES 76301
Description: Court Services Sends Presentence Investigation Report Addendum to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Prepare Report event, if the court orders a pre-sentence investigation, and if additional information comes in after submitting the PSI, Court Services sends Addendum to Presentence Investigation Report to Court Clerk for the Sentence Hearing event in the Post-Disposition Court process.

JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 31452
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Social History Report to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Prepare Report event, if the court orders a social history, if the subject is a juvenile, and if the Public Defender represents the juvenile, Juvenile Court Services sends Social History to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Pre-Disposition Court process.

Status Update
STATE’S ATTORNEY 72101
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Diversion Failure to Court Clerk
During the Pre-Disposition Court process, at the Status Update event, if the subject fails the diversion program, State’s Attorney sends Diversion Failure Report to Court Clerk for the Status Hearing event in the Pre-Disposition Court process.
**Prepare Order**  
STATE’S ATTORNEY 24100  
Description: State’s Attorney Hands Order to Judge  
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Prepare Order event, if the State’s Attorney files an unsigned order in court, State’s Attorney sends Court Order to Judge for the Signing of Order event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

**Signing of Order**  
JUDGE 24100  
Description: Judge Sends Court Order to Court Clerk  
During the Pre-disposition Court process, at the Signing of Order event, if a Judge signs a court order, Judge sends Court Order to Court Clerk for the Order Filing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

### PRE-DISPOSITION SUPERVISION

**Violation of Electronic Monitoring**  
GPS MONITORING SERVICE 76750  
Description: GPS Monitoring Service Sends Active Violation Report to Court Services  
During the Pre-disposition Supervision process, at the Violation of Electronic Monitoring event, if the subject violates terms of electronic monitoring, and if the subject is on active GPS monitoring, GPS Monitoring Service sends GPS Violation Notification to Court Services for the Violation Request event in the Pre-disposition Supervision process.

GPS MONITORING SERVICE 76752  
Description: GPS Monitoring Service Sends Active Violation Report to Law Enforcement  
During the Pre-disposition Supervision process, at the Violation of Electronic Monitoring event, if the subject violates terms of electronic monitoring, and if the subject is on active GPS monitoring, GPS Monitoring Service sends GPS Violation Notification to Law Enforcement for the Call For Service event in the Investigation process.

GPS MONITORING SERVICE 76754  
Description: GPS Monitoring Service sends Active Violation Report to Victim  
During the Pre-disposition Supervision process, at the Violation of Electronic Monitoring event, if a victim is identified, if the subject is on active GPS monitoring, and if the subject violates terms of electronic monitoring, GPS Monitoring Service sends GPS Violation Notification to Victim for the Update Records event in the Pre-disposition Supervision process.
Violation Request
COURT SERVICES 76800
Description: Court Services Sends Pretrial Release Violation Report to State’s Attorney
During the Pre-disposition Supervision process, at the Violation Request event, if the subject violates the conditions of their bond, Court Services sends Request for Violation of Court Order to State’s Attorney for the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

COURT SERVICES 76801
Description: Court Services Sends Electronic Monitoring Violation Report to State’s Attorney
During the Pre-disposition Supervision process, at the Violation Request event, if the subject violates terms of electronic monitoring, Court Services sends Request for Violation of Court Order to State’s Attorney for the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event in the Pre-disposition Supervision process.

Prosecution Petition Filing Decision
STATE’S ATTORNEY 76700
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Petition to Revoke Pretrial Release to Court Clerk
During the Pre-disposition Supervision process, at the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event, if the defendant does not comply with terms of pre-trial release, State’s Attorney sends Petition to Revoke to Court Clerk for the Status Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 76701
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Petition to Revoke Pretrial Release to Public Defender
During the Pre-disposition Supervision process, at the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event, if the defendant has a Public Defender, and if the defendant does not comply with terms of pre-trial release, State’s Attorney sends Petition to Revoke to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Supervision process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 76702
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Petition to Revoke Pretrial Release to Court Services
During the Pre-disposition Supervision process, at the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event, if the defendant does not comply with terms of pre-trial release, State’s Attorney sends Petition to Revoke to Court Services for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Supervision process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 76950
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Request for Risk Assessment Evaluation to Kane County Diagnostic Center
During the Pre-disposition Supervision process, at the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event, if the subject violates an order of protection, State’s Attorney sends Case Report, Referral Form, and Court Order to Kane County Diagnostic Center for the Prepare Report event in the Pre-disposition Court process.
Diversion Decision
JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 23100
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Referral Decision to Law Enforcement
During the Pre-disposition Supervision process, at the Diversion Decision event, if Juvenile Court Services does not divert the juvenile, Juvenile Court Services sends Juvenile Referral Form to Law Enforcement for the Update Case File event in the Pre-disposition Supervision process.

JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 31453
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Request for Adjudication to State’s Attorney
During the Pre-disposition Supervision process, at the Diversion Decision event, if Juvenile Court Services wants charges filed, Juvenile Court Services sends Request for Petition to Adjudicate to State’s Attorney for the Prosecution Charging Decision event in the Investigation process.

JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 31454
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Request for Adjudication to State’s Attorney (Juvenile on Probation)
During the Pre-disposition Supervision process, at the Diversion Decision event, if a juvenile is already on probation, Juvenile Court Services sends Request for Petition to Adjudicate to State’s Attorney for the Prosecution Charging Decision event in the Investigation process.

Diversion Failure
JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 31455
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Request for Adjudication to State’s Attorney (Fails Diversion)
During the Pre-disposition Supervision process, at the Diversion Failure event, if Juvenile Court Services wants charges filed, Juvenile Court Services sends Request for Petition to Adjudicate to State’s Attorney for the Prosecution Charging Decision event in the Investigation process.

POST-DISPOSITION COURT

Sentence Hearing
COURT CLERK 15611
Description: Court Clerk Sends Sentence Order to Public Defender
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if the defendant has a Public Defender, Court Clerk sends Sentence Order to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.
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COURT CLERK 15615
Description: Court Clerk Sends Sentence Order to Court Services
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if a subject is sentenced to probation, Court Clerk sends Sentence Order to Court Services for the Intake event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT CLERK 15620
Description: Court Clerk Sends Sentence Order to State’s Attorney
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if the case is being prosecuted by the State’s Attorney, Court Clerk sends Sentence Order to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 15901
Description: Court Clerk Sends Sentence/Release Order to Jail
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if the charge is a misdemeanor, if the defendant is found guilty, and if the defendant is given credit for time served, Court Clerk sends Release Order, and Sentence Order to Jail for the Release event in the Detention process.

COURT CLERK 25100
Description: Court Clerk Sends Prison Order to Jail
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if a subject is sentenced to prison, Court Clerk sends Sentence Order to Jail for the Deliver Subject to DOC event in the Incarceration process.

COURT CLERK 25150
Description: Court Clerk Sends Prison Order to Public Defender
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if a subject is sentenced to prison, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, Court Clerk sends Sentence Order to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 25151
Description: Court Clerk Sends Prison Order to State’s Attorney
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if a subject is sentenced to prison, Court Clerk sends Sentence Order to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 44000
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Statement of Facts to Court Clerk
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if a subject is sentenced to prison, State’s Attorney sends Statement of Facts to Court Clerk, and Department of Corrections for the Update Case File event in the Incarceration process.
COURT CLERK 71850
Description: Court Clerk Sends Drug Court Order to State’s Attorney
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if a subject enters the drug court program, Court Clerk sends Sentence Order to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 71851
Description: Court Clerk Sends Drug Court Order to Public Defender
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if a subject enters the drug court program, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, Court Clerk sends Sentence Order to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 71852
Description: Court Clerk Sends Drug Court Order to Court Services
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if a subject enters the drug court program, Court Clerk sends Sentence Order to Court Services for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 71856
Description: Court Clerk Sends TA Court Order to Kane County Diagnostic Center
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if a subject enters the TA court program, Court Clerk sends Sentence Order to Kane County Diagnostic Center for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 71857
Description: Court Clerk Sends TA Court Order to Public Defender
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if the defendant has a Public Defender, and if a subject enters the TA court program, Court Clerk sends Sentence Order to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 71858
Description: Court Clerk Sends TA Court Order to State’s Attorney
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if a subject enters the TA court program, Court Clerk sends Sentence Order to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 62700
Description: Court Clerk Sends Request for DNA Test to Court Services
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if the court orders a biological test, if the charge is a felony, and if a subject is sentenced to probation, Court Clerk sends Sentence
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Order to Court Services for the Collect Biological Sample event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT CLERK 62701
Description: Court Clerk Sends Request for DNA Test to Juvenile Court Services
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if the court orders a biological test, if the charge is a felony, if a subject is sentenced to probation, and if the subject is a juvenile, Court Clerk sends Sentence Order to Juvenile Court Services for the Collect Biological Sample event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT CLERK 15616
Description: Court Clerk Sends Sentence Order to Juvenile Court Services
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if a subject is sentenced to probation, and if the subject is a juvenile, Court Clerk sends Sentence Order to Juvenile Court Services for the Intake event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT CLERK 15617
Description: Court Clerk Sends Sentence Order to Juvenile Justice Center
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if a subject is sentenced to detention, and if the subject is a juvenile, Court Clerk sends Sentence Order to Juvenile Justice Center for the Intake event in the Incarceration process.

COURT CLERK 26100
Description: Court Clerk Sends IDJJ Sentence to Juvenile Court Services, State's Attorney
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if a subject is sentenced to department of juvenile justice, and if the subject is a juvenile, Court Clerk sends Juvenile Sentence Packet to Juvenile Court Services, and State's Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 26102
Description: Court Clerk Sends IDJJ Sentence to Juvenile Justice Center
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if a subject is sentenced to department of juvenile justice, and if the subject is a juvenile, Court Clerk sends Juvenile Sentence Packet to Juvenile Justice Center for the Transport Subject to IDJJ event in the Incarceration process.

COURT CLERK 26110
Description: Court Clerk Sends IDJJ Sentence to Public Defender
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if a subject is sentenced to department of juvenile justice, if the subject is a juvenile, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, Court Clerk sends Juvenile Sentence Packet to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.
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COURT CLERK 41660
Description: Court Clerk Sends Remand Order to Juvenile Justice Center
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Sentence Hearing event, if the subject is a juvenile, if minor is sentenced to serve time in JJC, and if the subject is to be remanded into custody, Court Clerk sends Sentence Order and Remand Order to Juvenile Justice Center for the Remand event in the Incarceration process.

Status Hearing
COURT CLERK 77100
Description: Court Clerk Sends Drug Court Completion Order to State’s Attorney
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if a subject successfully completes drug court, Court Clerk sends Court Order to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 77101
Description: Court Clerk Sends Drug Court Completion Order to Public Defender
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if a subject successfully completes drug court, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, Court Clerk sends Court Order to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 77102
Description: Court Clerk Sends Drug Court Failure Order to State’s Attorney
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if a subject fails drug court, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 77103
Description: Court Clerk Sends Drug Court Failure Order to Public Defender
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if a subject fails drug court, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 77104
Description: Court Clerk Sends Drug Court Failure Order to Court Services
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if a subject fails drug court, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to Court Services for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.
COURT CLERK 77105
Description: Court Clerk Sends TA Court Completion Order to Public Defender
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if the defendant has a Public Defender, and if a subject successfully completes TA court, Court Clerk sends Court Order to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 77106
Description: Court Clerk Sends TA Court Completion Order to State’s Attorney
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if a subject successfully completes TA court, Court Clerk sends Court Order to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 77107
Description: Court Clerk Sends TA Court Failure Order to Kane County Diagnostic Center
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if a subject fails TA court, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to Kane County Diagnostic Center for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 77108
Description: Court Clerk Sends TA Court Failure Order to Public Defender
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if a subject fails TA court, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 77109
Description: Court Clerk Sends TA Court Failure Order to State’s Attorney
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Status Hearing event, if a subject fails TA court, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

Case Disposition
COURT CLERK 12800
Description: Court Clerk Sends Case Disposition to State Police - BOI
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Case Disposition event, if the case included a misdemeanor or felony charge, Court Clerk sends Charge Disposition Form to State Police - BOI for the Update Records event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 12801
Description: Court Clerk Sends Case Disposition to Secretary of State
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Case Disposition event, if the case involved a motor vehicle, Court Clerk sends Charge Disposition Form to Secretary of State for the Update Records event in the Post-disposition Court process.
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COURT CLERK 12802
Description: Court Clerk Sends Case Disposition to State Police - Traffic
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Case Disposition event, if the charge is a traffic offense, and if the state police issued the violation, Court Clerk sends Charge Disposition Form to State Police - Traffic for the Update Records event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 12803
Description: Court Clerk Sends Case Dispositions (monthly) to Law Enforcement
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Case Disposition event, if case dispositions are prepared (monthly), Court Clerk sends Charge Disposition Report to Law Enforcement for the Update Records event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 12804
Description: Court Clerk Sends Case Dispositions (monthly) to Secretary of State (Statistical Reporting)
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Case Disposition event, if case dispositions are prepared (monthly), Court Clerk sends Charge Disposition Report to Secretary of State for the Update Records event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 53200
Description: Court Clerk Sends Fine Collection to Law Enforcement
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Case Disposition event, if a subject pays their fine, and if a citation was issued, Court Clerk sends Fine Collection Sheet to Law Enforcement for the Update Records event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 77500
Description: Court Clerk Sends Traffic School List to Junior College
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Case Disposition event, if a subject pays their fine, if a subject decides to attend traffic school, and if a citation was issued, Court Clerk sends Traffic School List to Junior College for the Enroll in Traffic School event in the Post-disposition Court process.

Prepare Report
JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 31457
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Social History Report to State’s Attorney
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Prepare Report event, if the court orders a social history, if the subject is a juvenile, and if the defendant is found guilty, Juvenile Court Services sends Social History to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.
**Motion Filing**
COURT CLERK 19100
Description: Court Clerk Sends Relief Motion to State’s Attorney, Judge
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Motion Filing event, if a subject files a post-conviction relief motion, Court Clerk sends Motion to State’s Attorney, and Judge for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

**STATE’S ATTORNEY 19200**
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Writ to Judge
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Motion Filing event, if the subject must appear in person in court, State’s Attorney sends Writ of Habeas Corpus to Judge for the Writ Issuance event in the Post-disposition Court process.

**Writ Issuance**
JUDGE 19200
Description: Judge Sends Writ to Court Clerk
During the Post-Disposition Court process, at the Writ Issuance event, if a Judge signs a writ, Judge sends Writ of Habeas Corpus to Court Clerk for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

**JUDGE 19202**
Description: Judge Sends Writ to State’s Attorney
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Writ Issuance event, if a Judge signs a writ, Judge sends Writ of Habeas Corpus to State’s Attorney for the Writ Distribution event in the Post-disposition Court process.

**Writ Distribution**
STATE’S ATTORNEY 19300
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Writ to Department of Corrections
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Writ Distribution event, if the subject must appear in person in court, State’s Attorney sends Writ of Habeas Corpus to Department of Corrections for the Transport Subject to Court event in the Incarceration process.

**PTR Hearing**
COURT CLERK 22218
Description: Court Clerk Sends Court Order regarding PTR to State’s Attorney, Court Services
During the Post-Disposition Court process, at the PTR Hearing event, if court finds that defendant has not violated terms of supervision, Court Clerk sends Court Order to State’s Attorney, and Court Services for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.
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COURT CLERK 22219
Description: Court Clerk Sends Court Order regarding PTR to Public Defender
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the PTR Hearing event, if court finds that defendant has not violated terms of supervision, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, Court Clerk sends Court Order to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 22222
Description: Court Clerk Sends Court Order regarding PTR to State’s Attorney, Court Services - need for revocation hearing
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the PTR Hearing event, if court finds that defendant has violated terms of supervision, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to State’s Attorney, and Court Services for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 22224
Description: Court Clerk Sends Court Order regarding PTR to Public Defender - need for revocation hearing
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the PTR Hearing event, if court finds that defendant has violated terms of supervision, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, Court Clerk sends Continuance Order to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

Revocation Hearing
COURT CLERK 22210
Description: Court Clerk Sends Court Order to Public Defender at Revocation Hearing - PSI Needed to Resentence
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Revocation Hearing event, if court finds that defendant has violated terms of supervision, if the defendant has a Public Defender, and if court requires PSI to resentence defendant, Court Clerk sends Court Order to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 22232
Description: Court Clerk Sends Court Order to State’s Attorney at Revocation Hearing - PSI Needed to Resentence
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Revocation Hearing event, if court finds that defendant has violated terms of supervision, and if court requires PSI to resentence defendant, Court Clerk sends Court Order to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 22230
Description: Court Clerk Sends Court Order to Court Services at Revocation Hearing -- PSI Needed to Resentence
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Revocation Hearing event, if court requires PSI to resentence defendant, and if court finds that defendant has violated terms of supervision, Court Clerk sends Court Order to Court Services for the Prepare Report event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT CLERK 22234
Description: Court Clerk Sends Court Order to Jail at Revocation Hearing -- PSI Needed to Resentence
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Revocation Hearing event, if court requires PSI to resentence defendant, if court finds that defendant has violated terms of supervision, and if the subject is to remain in custody, Court Clerk sends Court Order, and Remand Order to Jail for the Transport Subject to Jail event in the Detention process.

COURT CLERK 22231
Description: Court Clerk Sends Court Order to Court Services, State’s Attorney at Revocation Hearing -- PSI Not Needed to Resentence
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Revocation Hearing event, if court finds that defendant has violated terms of supervision, and if court is prepared to resentence defendant, Court Clerk sends Sentence Order to Court Services, and State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 22233
Description: Court Clerk Sends Court Order to Public Defender at Revocation Hearing -- PSI Not Needed to Resentence
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Revocation Hearing event, if court finds that defendant has violated terms of supervision, if court is prepared to resentence defendant, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, Court Clerk sends Sentence Order to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 22235
Description: Court Clerk Sends Court Order to Court Services, State’s Attorney at Revocation Hearing -- no revocation
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Revocation Hearing event, if court finds that defendant has not violated terms of supervision, Court Clerk sends Court Order to Court Services, and State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 22237
Description: Court Clerk Sends Court Order to Court Services, State’s Attorney at Revocation Hearing -- no revocation
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Revocation Hearing event, if court finds that defendant has not violated terms of supervision, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, Court Clerk sends Court Order to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.
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COURT CLERK 22238
Description: Court Clerk Sends Court Order to Jail at Revocation Hearing -- no revocation
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Revocation Hearing event, if court finds that defendant has not violated terms of supervision, and if the subject is held in the county jail, Court Clerk sends Court Order, and Release Order to Jail for the Release event in the Detention process.

Appeal Filed
COURT CLERK 19400
Description: Court Clerk Sends Appeal to Judge
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Appeal Filed event, Court Clerk sends Notice of Appeal to Judge for the Preparation of Transcripts event in the Post-disposition Court process.

Preparation of Transcripts
JUDGE 19400
Description: Judge Sends Transcripts to Court Clerk
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Preparation of Transcripts event, if trial transcripts have been prepared by chief Judge, Judge sends Court Transcripts to Court Clerk for the Appellate Review Initiation event in the Post-disposition Court process.

Appellate Review Initiation
COURT CLERK 19500
Description: Court Clerk Sends Appeal to Appellate Court
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Appellate Review Initiation event, Court Clerk sends Common Law Record to Appellate Court for the Open Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT CLERK 19510
Description: Court Clerk Sends Case File to Appellate Defender
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Appellate Review Initiation event, if appellate defender assigned to handle appeal, Court Clerk sends Common Law Record, Court Order, and Notice of Appeal to Appellate Defender for the Open Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

Appellate Review
APPELLATE COURT 19100
Description: Appellate Court Sends Mandate to State’s Attorney, Court Clerk, Judge
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Appellate Review event, if appellate court issues a mandate, Appellate Court sends Court Findings to State’s Attorney, Court Clerk, and Judge for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.
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APPELLATE COURT 19200
Description: Appellate Court Sends Mandate to Public Defender
During the Post-disposition Court process, at the Appellate Review event, if appellate court issues a mandate, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, Appellate Court sends Court Findings to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Court process.

**POST-DISPOSITION SUPERVISION**

**Intake**
COURT SERVICES 21800
Description: Court Services Sends Request for Criminal History to LEADS
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Intake event, if Court Services needs a criminal history report, Court Services sends Subject Information to LEADS for the Prepare Report event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 21801
Description: Court Services Sends Request for Case File to State’s Attorney
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Intake event, if the charge is a felony, and if Court Services has yet to receive subject's case file, Court Services sends Request for Information to State’s Attorney for the Prepare Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 21802
Description: Court Services Sends Request for Case Report to Law Enforcement
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Intake event, if the charge is not a felony, and if Court Services has yet to receive subject's case file, Court Services sends Request for Information to Law Enforcement for the Prepare Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 21803
Description: Court Services Sends Request for Driving Abstract to Secretary of State
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Intake event, if Court Services needs a driving abstract report, Court Services sends Subject Information to Secretary of State for the Prepare Report event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 77110
Description: Court Services Sends Address Update to Court Clerk
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Intake event, if Court Services collects updated address information regarding defendant, Court Services sends Address Information to Court Clerk for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.
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COURT SERVICES 22800
Description: Court Services Sends DNA Adjustment Fee Report to Court Clerk
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Intake event, if DNA fees need to be adjusted, Court Services sends Fee Adjustment Letter to Court Clerk for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 23800
Description: Court Services Sends Sex Offender Registration Form to Law Enforcement
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Intake event, if the subject is a sex offender, Court Services sends Sex Offender Registration Form to Law Enforcement for the Update Records event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 23810
Description: Court Services Sends Request for Sex Offender Evaluation to KCDC
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Intake event, if the subject is a sex offender, and if the subject has not been evaluated, Court Services sends Referral Form to Kane County Diagnostic Center for the Prepare Report event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 21802
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Request for Case Report to Law Enforcement
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Intake event, if Juvenile Court Services requires additional information from arresting agency, Juvenile Court Services sends Request for Information to Law Enforcement for the Prepare Report event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 23200
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Gang Conditions to Law Enforcement (Aurora PD Gang Unit)
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Intake event, if gang conditions exist, and if the subject is a juvenile, Juvenile Court Services sends Sentence Order to Law Enforcement for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

Transfer-In
COURT SERVICES 21810
Description: Court Services Sends Request for Probation Transfer Packet to Transferring County
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-In event, if the transfer packet has not been received, and if supervision is based on intrastate transfer, Court Services sends Transfer Packet Request to Transferring County for the Prepare Transfer Packet event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.
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TRANSFERRING COUNTY 22100
Description: Transferring County Sends Request for Reporting Instructions to Court Services
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-In event, if supervision is based on intrastate transfer, Transferring County sends Request for Reporting Instructions to Court Services for the Prepare Reporting Instructions event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

TRANSFERRING COUNTY 22110
Description: Transferring County Sends Transfer Packet to Court Services
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-In event, if supervision is based on intrastate transfer, and if reporting instructions have been received, Transferring County sends Transfer Packet to Court Services for the Intake event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 22810
Description: Court Services Sends Reporting Instructions to Transferring County
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-In event, if supervision is based on intrastate transfer, Court Services sends Response to Reporting Instructions to Transferring County for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 22820
Description: Court Services Sends Acceptance to Transferring County
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-In event, if the subject's address is in Kane County, if supervision is based on intrastate transfer, and if transfer in is accepted, Court Services sends Intrastate Memo Form to Transferring County for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 22821
Description: Court Services Sends Rejection to Transferring County
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-In event, if Court Services denies the transfer, Court Services sends Intrastate Memo Form to Transferring County for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 66710
Description: Court Services Sends Financial Fee Form to Court Clerk
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-In event, if fees have been assessed, and if supervision is based on intrastate transfer, Court Services sends Financial Fee Form to Court Clerk for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.
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COURT SERVICES 22110
Description: Court Services Sends Payment Transfer Agreement to Transferring State
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-In event, if the transfer was from a different state, Court Services sends Transfer Agreement to Transferring State for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

TRANSFERRING STATE 22120
Description: Transferring State Sends Transfer Packet to Court Services
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-In event, if Court Services accepts transfer from another state, Transferring State sends Transfer Packet to Court Services for the Intake event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 21820
Description: Court Services Sends Request for Probation Transfer Packet to Transferring State
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-In event, if Court Services needs more information on the subject, and if the transfer was from a different state, Court Services sends Transfer Packet Request to Transferring State for the Prepare Transfer Packet event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 21830
Description: Court Services Sends Notice of Arrival to Transferring State
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-In event, if the transfer was from a different state, Court Services sends Notice of Arrival to Transferring State for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

TRANSFERRING COUNTY 23110
Description: Transferring County Sends Case File to Court Clerk
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-In event, if the subject is a juvenile, and if supervision is based on intrastate transfer, Transferring County sends Case File to Court Clerk for the Open Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT CLERK 27100
Description: Court Clerk Sends Case File to Juvenile Court Services - Intake Intrastate Transfer
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-In event, if the subject is a juvenile, and if supervision is based on intrastate transfer, Court Clerk sends Case File to Juvenile Court Services for the Intake event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.
COURT CLERK 27110
Description: Court Clerk Sends Case File to State’s Attorney - Juvenile Intrastate Transfer-In
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-In event, if the subject is a juvenile, and if supervision is based on intrastate transfer, Court Clerk sends Case File to State’s Attorney for the Open Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 24100
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Transfer Assessment Fee to State’s Attorney
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-In event, if the subject is a juvenile, and if supervision is based on intrastate transfer, Juvenile Court Services sends Transfer Assessment Fee to State’s Attorney for the Prepare Order event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 24300
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Juvenile Probation Transfer Acceptance to Court Clerk
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-In event, if supervision is based on intrastate transfer, and if the subject is a juvenile, Juvenile Court Services sends Transfer-In Report to Court Clerk for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

Transfer-Out
COURT SERVICES 22100
Description: Court Services Sends Request for Reporting Instructions to Receiving County
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-Out event, if Court Services is seeking to transfer supervision to another county, Court Services sends Request for Reporting Instructions to Receiving County for the Prepare Reporting Instructions event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 21811
Description: Court Services Sends Transfer Packet to Receiving County
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-Out event, if Court Services is seeking to transfer supervision to another county, Court Services sends Transfer Packet to Receiving County for the Intake event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 66720
Description: Court Services Sends Transfer Agreement to Court Clerk
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-Out event, if Court Services is seeking to transfer supervision to another state, Court Services sends Financial Fee Form, and Transfer Agreement to Court Clerk for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.
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COURT SERVICES 22120
Description: Court Services Sends Probation Transfer Packet to Receiving State
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-Out event, if probationer has paid transfer fee, Court Services sends Transfer Agreement, and Transfer Packet to Receiving State for the Intake event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 21840
Description: Court Services Sends Notice of Departure to Receiving State
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-Out event, if transfer out accepted by receiving state, Court Services sends Notice of Departure to Receiving State for the Intake event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

RECEIVING STATE 22810
Description: Receiving State Sends Reporting Instructions to Court Services
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-Out event, if subject is being supervised in another state, Receiving State sends Response to Reporting Instructions to Court Services for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 21850
Description: Court Services Sends Request for Probation Transfer to Receiving State
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-Out event, if Court Services is seeking to transfer supervision to another state, Court Services sends Probation Transfer Request to Receiving State for the Intake event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 21811
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Transfer Packet to Receiving County
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-Out event, if the subject is a juvenile, and if Juvenile Court Services is seeking to transfer supervision to another county, Juvenile Court Services sends Transfer Packet to Receiving County for the Intake event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT CLERK 23110
Description: Court Clerk Sends Juvenile Case File to Receiving County Court Clerk
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-Out event, if the subject is a juvenile, Court Clerk sends Case File to Receiving County Court Clerk for the Open Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 24200
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Juvenile Probation Intrastate Transfer to Law Enforcement, State’s Attorney
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-Out event, if Juvenile Court Services is seeking to transfer supervision to another county, Juvenile Court Services sends Transfer-Out Report to Law Enforcement, and State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT CLERK 23120  
Description: Court Clerk Sends Juvenile Case File Closure to State’s Attorney, Juvenile Court Services  
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-Out event, if the subject is a juvenile, and if probation is transferred to another county in Illinois, Court Clerk sends Court Order to Juvenile Court Services, and State’s Attorney for the Close Case File event in the Post Supervision/Case Closure process.

JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 24310  
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Juvenile Probation Interstate Transfer Out to Judge  
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-Out event, if Juvenile Court Services is seeking to transfer supervision to another state, Juvenile Court Services sends Interstate Paperwork to Judge for the Signing of Order event in the Post-disposition Court process.

JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 24320  
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Juvenile Probation Transfer Out to Receiving State  
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Transfer-Out event, if Juvenile Court Services is seeking to transfer supervision to another state, Juvenile Court Services sends Interstate Paperwork to Receiving State for the Intake event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

Information Request  
RECEIVING COUNTY 22810  
Description: Receiving County Sends Reporting Instructions to Court Services  
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Information Request event, if Court Services is seeking to transfer supervision to another county, Receiving County sends Response to Reporting Instructions to Court Services for the Transfer-Out event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

Violation Request  
COURT SERVICES 76810  
Description: Court Services Sends Request for PTR to State’s Attorney  
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Violation Request event, if the subject violates their court ordered supervision, Court Services sends Request for Petition to Revoke to State’s Attorney for the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.
COURT SERVICES 76820
Description: Court Services Sends Violation Report Form to Transferring County
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Violation Request event, if supervision is based on intrastate transfer, and if the subject violates their court ordered supervision, Court Services sends Violation Report Form to Transferring County for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 76830
Description: Court Services Sends Violation Report Form to Transferring State
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Violation Request event, if the transfer was from a different state, and if the subject violates their court ordered supervision, Court Services sends Violation Report Form to Transferring State for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 77101
Description: Court Services Sends Drug Court Violation Report to State’s Attorney
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Violation Request event, if the subject violates terms of drug court, Court Services sends Request for Petition to Revoke to State’s Attorney for the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 77103
Description: Court Services Sends TA Court Violation Report to State’s Attorney
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Violation Request event, if the subject violates their court order to TA court, Court Services sends TA Court Report to State’s Attorney for the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 24330
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Request for Petition to Revoke to State’s Attorney
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Violation Request event, if the subject violates their court ordered supervision, and if the subject is a juvenile, Juvenile Court Services sends Request for Petition to Revoke to State’s Attorney for the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

3RD PARTY PROGRAM 63600
Description: Third Party Program Sends Failure to Comply Report to State’s Attorney
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Violation Request event, if the subject violates their court ordered supervision, 3rd Party Program sends Status Report to State’s Attorney for the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.
Prosecution Petition Filing Decision
STATE’S ATTORNEY 76800
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Petition to Revoke Drug Court Order to Court Clerk
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event, if the subject violates terms of drug court, State’s Attorney sends Petition to Revoke to Court Clerk for the PTR Hearing event in the Post-disposition Court process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 76801
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Petition to Revoke Drug Court Order to Court Services
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event, if the subject violates terms of drug court, State’s Attorney sends Petition to Revoke to Court Services for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 76802
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Petition to Revoke Drug Court Order to Public Defender
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event, if the subject violates terms of drug court, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, State’s Attorney sends Petition to Revoke to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 76803
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Petition to Revoke TA Court Order to Court Clerk
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event, if the subject violates their court order to TA court, State’s Attorney sends Petition to Revoke to Court Clerk for the PTR Hearing event in the Post-disposition Court process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 76804
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Petition to Revoke TA Court Order to Court Services
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event, if the subject violates their court order to TA court, State’s Attorney sends Petition to Revoke to Court Services for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 76805
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Petition to Revoke TA Court Order to Public Defender
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event, if the defendant has a Public Defender, and if the subject violates their court order to TA court, State’s Attorney sends Petition to Revoke to Public Defender for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.
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STATE’S ATTORNEY 79100
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Petition to Revoke Probation to Court Clerk
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event, if State’s Attorney seeks to violate subject’s probation, State’s Attorney sends Petition to Revoke to Court Clerk for the PTR Hearing event in the Post-disposition Court process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 79110
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Petition to Revoke Probation to Court Services
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event, if the subject violates their court ordered supervision, State’s Attorney sends Petition to Revoke to Court Services for the Update Records event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 79120
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Petition to Revoke Probation to Public Defender
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event, if the subject violates their court ordered supervision, and if the defendant has a Public Defender, State’s Attorney sends Petition to Revoke to Public Defender for the Update Records event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 79112
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Petition to Revoke Juvenile Probation to Court Clerk
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Prosecution Petition Filing Decision event, if the subject violates their court ordered supervision, and if the subject is a juvenile, State’s Attorney sends Petition to Revoke to Court Clerk for the Status Hearing event in the Pre-disposition Court process.

Status Update
COURT SERVICES 66740
Description: Court Services Sends Community Service Report to Court Clerk - hours completed
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Status Update event, if subject completes community service hours ordered by court, Court Services sends Notice of Completion to Court Clerk for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 66742
Description: Court Services Sends Community Service Report to Court Clerk - hours not completed
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Status Update event, if subject fails to complete community service hours ordered by court, Court Services sends Status Report to Court Clerk for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.
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COURT SERVICES 66750
Description: Court Services Sends Community Service Report to Transferring County
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Status Update event, if supervision is based on intrastate transfer, and if subject completes community service hours ordered by court, Court Services sends Notice of Completion to Transferring County for the Close Case File event in the Post Supervision/Case Closure process.

COURT SERVICES 77100
Description: Court Services Sends Drug Court Report to Court Clerk
During the Post-disposition supervision process, at the Status Update event, if a subject successfully completes drug court, Court Services sends Drug Court Report to Court Clerk for the Review Hearing event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT SERVICES 77102
Description: Court Services Sends TA Court Report to Court Clerk
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Status Update event, if a subject successfully completes TA court, Court Services sends TA Court Report to Court Clerk for the Status Hearing event in the Post-disposition Court process.

COURT SERVICES 76840
Description: Court Services Sends Progress Report to Transferring County
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Status Update event, if supervision is based on intrastate transfer, Court Services sends Intrastate Memo Form to Transferring County for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 76850
Description: Court Services Sends Progress Report to Transferring State
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Status Update event, if the transfer was from a different state, Court Services sends Progress Report to Transferring State for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

RECEIVING COUNTY 76840
Description: Receiving County Sends Progress Report to Court Services
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Status Update event, if the subject had their probation sentence transferred, and if supervision is based on intrastate transfer, Receiving County sends Progress Report to Court Services for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.
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RECEIVING COUNTY 76850
Description: Receiving State Sends Progress Report to Court Services
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Status Update event, if subject is being supervised in another state, Receiving State sends Progress Report to Court Services for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 25610
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Probation Status Report to State’s Attorney
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Status Update event, if a subject successfully completes probation, and if the subject is a juvenile, Juvenile Court Services sends Status Report to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

Prepare Report
JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 25600
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Progress Report to Court Clerk
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Prepare Report event, if the court has requested a progress report, and if the subject is a juvenile, Juvenile Court Services sends Progress Report to Court Clerk for the Status Hearing event in the Post-disposition Court process.

TASC PROBATION 63600
Description: TASC Probation Sends Monthly Report to Court Services
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Prepare Report event, if the subject violates their court ordered TASC sentence, TASC sends Status Report to Court Services for the Violation Request event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

Prepare Case File
STATE’S ATTORNEY 22100
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Case File to Court Services
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Prepare Case File event, if the charge is a felony, and if Court Services has requested subject’s case file, State’s Attorney sends Case File to Court Services for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

LAW ENFORCEMENT 71601
Description: Law Enforcement Sends Case Report to Court Services
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Prepare Case File event, if a subject is sentenced to probation, if the charge is not a felony, and if Court Services has requested subject’s case file, Law Enforcement sends Case File to Court Services for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.
Collect Biological Sample
COURT SERVICES 25500
Description: Court Services Sends Biological Test to State Police
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Collect Biological Sample event, if the court orders a biological test, Court Services sends Biological Test Results to State Police - BOI for the Update Records event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

COURT SERVICES 25550
Description: Court Services Sends Biological Test to Court Clerk
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Collect Biological Sample event, if the court orders a biological test, Court Services sends Biological Test Results to Court Clerk for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 25550
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Biological Test to Court Clerk
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Collect Biological Sample event, if the court orders a biological test, and if the subject is a juvenile, Juvenile Court Services sends Biological Test Results to Court Clerk for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 25560
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Biological Test to State Police
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Collect Biological Sample event, if the court orders a biological test, and if the subject is a juvenile, Juvenile Court Services sends Biological Test Results to State Police - BOI for the Update Records event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

Request for EHM Calculation
JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 31456
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Request for Fee Calculation to State’s Attorney
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Request for EHM Calculation event, if electronic monitoring is ordered for a subject, if electronic home monitoring fees are not specified on original court order, and if the subject is a juvenile, Juvenile Court Services sends Fee Calculation Request to State’s Attorney for the Prepare Order event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

Probation Termination
COURT SERVICES 66760
Description: Court Services Sends Final Evaluation to Court Clerk
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Probation Termination event, if the subject successfully completes all terms of supervision, Court Services sends Final Evaluation to Court Clerk for the Update Case File event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.
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COURT SERVICES 66770
Description: Court Services Sends Memo Intrastate Form to Transferring County
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Probation Termination event, if the subject successfully completes all terms of supervision, and if supervision is based on intrastate transfer, Court Services sends Intrastate Memo Form to Transferring County for the Close Case File event in the Post Supervision/Case Closure process.

Report Request
JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 24400
Description: Juvenile Court Services Sends Monthly Request for Progress Report to 3rd Party Program
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Report Request event, if a subject is sentenced to a 3rd party program, and if the subject is a juvenile, Juvenile Court Services sends Request for Information to 3rd Party Program for the Prepare Report event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

Case Disposition
COURT SERVICES 12804
Description: Court Services Sends Case Dispositions (monthly) to Secretary of State (Statistical Reporting)
During the Post-disposition Supervision process, at the Case Disposition event, if case dispositions are prepared (monthly), Court Services sends Probation Disposition Report to Secretary of State for the Update Records event in the Post-disposition Supervision process.

INCARCERATION

Intake
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS 41600
Description: Department of Corrections Sends Transfer Sheet to Jail
During the Incarceration process, at the Intake event, if a subject is delivered to the department of corrections, Department of Corrections sends Transfer Sheet to Jail for the Update Case File event in the Incarceration process.

Transport Subject to Department of Corrections
JAIL 22100
Description: Jail Sends DOC Packet to Department of Corrections
During the Incarceration process, at the Transport Subject to Department of Corrections event, if the subject is held in the county jail, and if a subject is sentenced to prison, Jail sends DOC Packet to Department of Corrections for the Intake event in the Incarceration process.
Transport Subject to IDJJ

**Description:** Juvenile Justice Center Sends IDJJ Packet to IDJJ

During the Incarceration process, at the Transport Subject to IDJJ event, if the subject is a juvenile, and if a subject is sentenced to department of juvenile justice, Juvenile Justice Center sends Detention Questionnaire, and IDJJ Packet to IDJJ for the Intake event in the Incarceration process.

**Parole Hearing**

**Description:** IDJJ Sends Parole Hearing Notice to State’s Attorney

During the Incarceration process, at the Parole Hearing event, if a subject is scheduled for a parole hearing, and if the subject is a juvenile, IDJJ sends Notice of Hearing to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Incarceration process.

---

**POST SUPERVISION/CASE CLOSURE**

**Request for Expungement/Sealing of Records**

**Description:** Court Clerk Sends Petition to Expunge/Seal Records to State’s Attorney, Sheriff’s Office, State Police, Law Enforcement

During the Post Supervision/Case Closure process, at the Request for Expungement/Sealing of Records event, if defendant/defense attorney has filed a petition to expunge/seal records, Court Clerk sends Petition to Expunge/Seal to State’s Attorney, Sheriff’s Office, State Police - BOI, and Law Enforcement for the Update Records event in the Post Supervision/Case Closure process.

**Description:** Court Clerk Sends Denial of Order to Expunge/Seal Records to State’s Attorney

During the Post Supervision/Case Closure process, at the Request for Expungement/Sealing of Records event, if the court does not expunge/seal the records, and if defendant/defense attorney has filed a petition to expunge/seal records, Court Clerk sends Court Order to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Post Supervision/Case Closure process.

**Description:** State’s Attorney Sends Order to Expunge/Seal Records to Judge

During the Post Supervision/Case Closure process, at the Request for Expungement/Sealing of Records event, if no one objects to the expungement/sealing, State’s Attorney sends Court Order to Judge for the Signing of Order event in the Post Supervision/Case Closure process.
Evidence Release Request
STATE’S ATTORNEY 23100
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Evidence Disposition to Law Enforcement
During the Post Supervision/Case Closure process, at the Evidence Release Request event, if evidence is in custody of law enforcement, and if evidence is no longer needed, State’s Attorney sends Evidence Disposition Form to Law Enforcement for the Release of Evidence event in the Post Supervision/Case Closure process.

STATE’S ATTORNEY 23110
Description: State’s Attorney Sends Evidence Release Order to Judge
During the Post Supervision/Case Closure process, at the Evidence Release Request event, if evidence is no longer needed, and if evidence is in custody of court clerk, State’s Attorney sends Unsigned Court Order to Judge for the Signing of Order event in the Post Supervision/Case Closure process.

Evidence Release Authorization
COURT CLERK 23130
Description: Court Clerk Sends Evidence Release Notice to State’s Attorney, Law Enforcement
During the Post Supervision/Case Closure process, at the Evidence Release Authorization event, if evidence is released from court clerk, Court Clerk sends Release Receipt to State’s Attorney, and Law Enforcement for the Update Case File event in the Post Supervision/Case Closure process.

Evidence Destruction Request
COURT CLERK 23150
Description: Court Clerk Sends Evidence Destruction Order to Judge
During the Post Supervision/Case Closure process, at the Evidence Destruction Request event, if evidence is no longer needed, if evidence is in custody of court clerk, and if evidence is to be destroyed, Court Clerk sends Unsigned Court Order to Judge for the Signing of Order event in the Post Supervision/Case Closure process.

Evidence Destruction Authorization
COURT CLERK 23140
Description: Court Clerk Sends Evidence Destruction Notice to State’s Attorney
During the Post Supervision/Case Closure process, at the Evidence Destruction Authorization event, if evidence is no longer needed, if evidence is to be destroyed, and if evidence is in custody of court clerk, Court Clerk sends Release Notice to State’s Attorney for the Update Case File event in the Post Supervision/Case Closure process.

Signing of Order
COURT CLERK 28120
Description: Court Clerk Sends Order to Expunge/Seal Records to State’s Attorney, Sheriff’s Office, State Police, Law Enforcement
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During the Post Supervision/Case Closure process, at the Signing of Order event, if the court order is for expungement/sealing of records, Court Clerk sends Court Order to State’s Attorney, Sheriff’s Office, State Police - BOI, and Law Enforcement for the Update Records event in the Post Supervision/Case Closure process.

JUDGE 8500
Description: Judge Sends Signed Evidence Destruction Order to Court Clerk
During the Post Supervision/Case Closure process, at the Signing of Order event, if evidence is no longer needed, if evidence is in custody of court clerk, and if evidence is to be destroyed, Judge sends Court Order to Court Clerk for the Evidence Release Authorization event in the Post Supervision/Case Closure process.

Close Case File
COURT CLERK 15630
Description: Court Clerk Sends Juvenile Probation Completion to State’s Attorney
During the Post Supervision/Case Closure process, at the Close Case File event, if a subject successfully completes probation, and if the subject is a juvenile, Court Clerk sends Court Order to State’s Attorney for the Close Case File event in the Post Supervision/Case Closure process.

COURT CLERK 15640
Description: Court Clerk Sends Juvenile Probation Completion to Public Defender
During the Post Supervision/Case Closure process, at the Close Case File event, if a subject successfully completes probation, if the defendant has a Public Defender, and if the subject is a juvenile, Court Clerk sends Court Order to Public Defender for the Close Case File event in the Post Supervision/Case Closure process.
APPENDIX K: DOCUMENT-CENTRIC EXCHANGE REPORTS

The following pages cover the following document-centric reports:

- Arrest Warrant / Related Documents
- Case Report / Arrest Report
- Charging Documents
- Citation
- Continuance Order
- Protection Order
- Pre-Sentence Investigation (PSI) Report
- Sentence Order
## Arrest Warrant / Related Documents

### Document Centric Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exchange Name</th>
<th>Exchange Description</th>
<th>Sending Agency</th>
<th>Prevailing Process</th>
<th>Triggering Event</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Receiving Agencies</th>
<th>Subsequent Process</th>
<th>Subsequent Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT 76103</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Sends Request for Misdemeanor Case Number to Court Clerk</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Arrest Warrant Request</td>
<td>• If law enforcement decides to pursue an arrest warrant&lt;br&gt;• If the charge is a misdemeanor</td>
<td>Unsigned Order for Probable Cause&lt;br&gt;Misdemeanor Complaint</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Case Number Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT 76102</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Sends Request for Felony Case Number to Court Clerk</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Arrest Warrant Request</td>
<td>• If law enforcement decides to pursue an arrest warrant&lt;br&gt;• If the charge is a felony&lt;br&gt;• If the State's Attorney approved the felony charge</td>
<td>Unsigned Order for Probable Cause&lt;br&gt;Felony Complaint</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Case Number Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATES ATTORNEY 76100</td>
<td>States Attorney Sends Request for Misdemeanor Case Number to Court Clerk</td>
<td>State's Attorney</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Arrest Warrant Request</td>
<td>• If a State's Attorney decides to file a charge&lt;br&gt;• If the charge is a misdemeanor</td>
<td>Unsigned Order for Probable Cause&lt;br&gt;Misdemeanor Complaint</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Case Number Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAW ENFORCEMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>JUVENILE COURT SERVICES</strong></td>
<td><strong>STATES ATTORNEY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76100</td>
<td>22100</td>
<td>22200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement Sends Request for Felony Arrest Warrant to Judge</td>
<td>Juvenile Court Services Sends Request for Arrest Warrant to States Attorney</td>
<td>States Attorney Sends Request for Juvenile Arrest Warrant to Judge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Juvenile Court Services</td>
<td>State's Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest Warrant Request</td>
<td>Arrest Warrant Request</td>
<td>Arrest Warrant Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If law enforcement decides to pursue an arrest warrant &lt;br&gt; • If the State's Attorney approved the felony charge &lt;br&gt; • If the court has assigned a case number</td>
<td>If Juvenile Court Services seeks an arrest warrant</td>
<td>• If a State's Attorney decides to pursue an arrest warrant &lt;br&gt; • If the court has assigned a case number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>State's Attorney</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable Cause Hearing</td>
<td>Probable Cause Hearing</td>
<td>Probable Cause Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Kane County Case Management System (CMS) Assessment Project**

- **LAW ENFORCEMENT 76100**
  - Law Enforcement Sends Request for Felony Arrest Warrant to Judge
  - Law Enforcement
  - At Large
  - Arrest Warrant Request
  - • If law enforcement decides to pursue an arrest warrant
  - • If the State's Attorney approved the felony charge
  - • If the court has assigned a case number
  - Unsigned Order for Probable Cause
  - Felony Complaint
  - New Case Information Sheet
  - Judge
  - At Large
  - Probable Cause Hearing

- **LAW ENFORCEMENT 76101**
  - Law Enforcement Sends Request for Misdemeanor Arrest Warrant to Judge
  - Law Enforcement
  - At Large
  - Arrest Warrant Request
  - • If law enforcement decides to pursue an arrest warrant
  - • If the court has assigned a case number
  - Unsigned Order for Probable Cause
  - Misdemeanor Complaint
  - New Case Information Sheet
  - Judge
  - At Large
  - Probable Cause Hearing

- **LAW ENFORCEMENT 22105**
  - Law Enforcement Sends Request for Arrest Warrant to States Attorney
  - Law Enforcement
  - At Large
  - Arrest Warrant Request
  - • If law enforcement seeks an arrest warrant
  - • If the subject is a juvenile
  - Sworn Synopsis
  - State's Attorney
  - At Large
  - Arrest Warrant Request

- **JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 22100**
  - Juvenile Court Services Sends Request for Arrest Warrant to States Attorney
  - Juvenile Court Services
  - At Large
  - Arrest Warrant Request
  - If Juvenile Court Services seeks an arrest warrant
  - Sworn Affidavit
  - State's Attorney
  - At Large
  - Arrest Warrant Request

- **STATES ATTORNEY 22200**
  - States Attorney Sends Request for Juvenile Arrest Warrant to Judge
  - State's Attorney
  - At Large
  - Arrest Warrant Request
  - • If a State's Attorney decides to pursue an arrest warrant
  - • If the court has assigned a case number
  - Sworn Affidavit
  - Sworn Synopsis
  - Petition for Warrant
  - Judge
  - At Large
  - Probable Cause Hearing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATES ATTORNEY 76400</th>
<th>States Attorney Sends Request for Misdemeanor Arrest Warrant to Court Clerk</th>
<th>State's Attorney</th>
<th>At Large</th>
<th>Arrest Warrant Request</th>
<th>• If the subject is a juvenile</th>
<th>• If a State's Attorney decides to pursue an arrest warrant</th>
<th>• Misdemeanor Complaint</th>
<th>• Signed Order for Probable Cause</th>
<th>• New Case Information Sheet</th>
<th>Court Clerk</th>
<th>At Large</th>
<th>Probable Cause Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE 71800</td>
<td>Judge Sends Order for Probable Cause to Court Clerk</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Probable Cause Hearing</td>
<td>If a Judge finds probable cause to issue an arrest warrant</td>
<td>Signed Order for Probable Cause</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Generate Warrant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT CLERK 15600</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Arrest Warrant to Judge</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Generate Warrant</td>
<td>If no condition specified</td>
<td>Unsigned Arrest Warrant</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Arrest Warrant Issued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE 71801</td>
<td>Judge Sends Arrest Warrant to Court Clerk</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Arrest Warrant Issued</td>
<td>If a Judge signs an arrest warrant</td>
<td>Signed Arrest Warrant</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Warrant Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT CLERK 15603</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Arrest Warrant to States Attorney</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Warrant Distribution</td>
<td>If a Judge signs an arrest warrant</td>
<td>Arrest Warrant</td>
<td>State's Attorney</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Update Case File</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT CLERK 15601</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Arrest Warrant to Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Warrant Distribution</td>
<td>If law enforcement is responsible for LEADS warrant entry/cancellation</td>
<td>Service Copy of Arrest Warrant</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Warrant Entry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kane County Case Management System (CMS) Assessment Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COURT CLERK 15602</strong></td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Arrest Warrant to Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Warrant Distribution</td>
<td>If the Sheriff's Office is responsible for LEADS warrant entry/cancellation</td>
<td>Service Copy of Arrest Warrant</td>
<td>Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Warrant Entry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **SHERIFFS OFFICE 21800** | Sheriff’s Office Sends Arrest Warrant to LEADS | Sheriff’s Office | At Large | Warrant Entry | • If an arrest warrant needs to be entered into LEADS  
• If the Sheriff's Office is responsible for LEADS warrant entry/cancellation | Arrest Warrant Information | LEADS | At Large | Update Records |
| **LAW ENFORCEMENT 21800** | Law Enforcement Sends Arrest Warrant to LEADS | Law Enforcement | At Large | Warrant Entry | • If an arrest warrant needs to be entered into LEADS  
• If law enforcement is responsible for LEADS warrant entry/cancellation | Arrest Warrant Information | LEADS | At Large | Update Records |
| **LAW ENFORCEMENT 21801** | Law Enforcement Sends Arrest Warrant Cancellation to LEADS | Law Enforcement | At Large | Arrest on Warrant | • If law enforcement is responsible for LEADS warrant entry/cancellation  
• If an arrest warrant needs to be cancelled in LEADS | Arrest Warrant Information | LEADS | At Large | Update Records |
| **SHERIFFS OFFICE 21801** | Sheriff’s Office Sends Arrest Warrant Cancellation to LEADS | Sheriff’s Office | At Large | Arrest on Warrant | • If the Sheriff’s Office is responsible for LEADS warrant entry/cancellation  
• If an arrest warrant needs to be cancelled in LEADS | Arrest Warrant Information | LEADS | At Large | Update Records |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAW ENFORCEMENT 78100</th>
<th>Law Enforcement Sends Arrest Warrant Service to Court Clerk</th>
<th>Law Enforcement</th>
<th>At Large</th>
<th>Arrest on Warrant</th>
<th>If the subject was arrested on a warrant</th>
<th>Service Copy of Arrest Warrant</th>
<th>Court Clerk</th>
<th>Pre-disposition Court</th>
<th>Bond Call</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LAW ENFORCEMENT 28100 | Law Enforcement Detains Warrant Arrest in Jail             | Law Enforcement | At Large | Arrest on Warrant | • If bond cannot be posted
• If the subject was arrested on a warrant
• If the subject is held in the county jail | Service Copy of Arrest Warrant | Jail         | Detention          | Intake   |
## Kane County Case Management System (CMS) Assessment Project

### Case Report / Arrest Report

#### Document Centric Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exchange Name</th>
<th>Exchange Description</th>
<th>Sending Agency</th>
<th>Prevailing Process</th>
<th>Triggering Event</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Receiving Agencies</th>
<th>Subsequent Process</th>
<th>Subsequent Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LAW ENFORCEMENT 73600 | Law Enforcement Sends Case Report to States Attorney for Review                        | Law Enforcement| Investigation    | Incident         | • If law enforcement does not make an arrest while investigating an incident
• If law enforcement wants the State's Attorney to review an incident for charges                                                   | Case Report     | State's Attorney | Investigation | Prosecution Charging Decision |
| LAW ENFORCEMENT 71600 | Law Enforcement Sends Case Report to States Attorney                                  | Law Enforcement| Investigation    | Referral          | • If the subject was not arrested on a warrant
• If the case is to be prosecuted by the State's Attorney
• If charge is not for DUI                                                                                                           | Case Report     | State's Attorney | Investigation | Prosecution Charging Decision |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAW ENFORCEMENT 72801</th>
<th>Law Enforcement Sends DUI Case Report to States Attorney</th>
<th>Law Enforcement</th>
<th>Investigation</th>
<th>Law Enforcement Referral</th>
<th>If a citation is for DUI • If a citation is issued • If the case is to be prosecuted by the State's Attorney</th>
<th>DUI BAC Report Form • Case Report</th>
<th>State's Attorney</th>
<th>Investigation</th>
<th>Prosecution Charging Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATES ATTORNEY 76950</td>
<td>States Attorney Sends Request for Risk Assessment Evaluation to Kane County Diagnostic Center</td>
<td>State's Attorney</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Supervision</td>
<td>Prosecution Petition Filing Decision</td>
<td>If the subject violates an order of protection • Case Report • Referral Form • Court Order</td>
<td>Kane County Diagnostic Center</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Prepare Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATES ATTORNEY 76951</td>
<td>States Attorney Sends Request for Domestic Violence Evaluation to Kane County Diagnostic Center</td>
<td>State's Attorney</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Psychological Evaluation Referral</td>
<td>If the subject is diverted on a domestic violence case • Case Report • Referral Form • Court Order</td>
<td>Kane County Diagnostic Center</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Prepare Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC DEFENDER 77100</td>
<td>Public Defender Sends Request for Psychological Evaluation to Kane County Diagnostic Center</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Psychological Evaluation Referral</td>
<td>If the court orders a psychological evaluation • If the Public Defender represents the juvenile • Referral Form • Case Report • Court Order</td>
<td>Kane County Diagnostic Center</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Prepare Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Kane County Case Management System (CMS) Assessment Project

| LAW ENFORCEMENT 73601 | Law Enforcement Sends Juvenile Referral to Court Services | Law Enforcement | Investigation | Incident | If law enforcement does not make an arrest while investigating an incident  
If the subject is a juvenile | Case Report  
Arrest Synopsis  
Juvenile Referral Form | Juvenile Court Services  
Pre-disposition Supervision  
Diversion Decision |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| LAW ENFORCEMENT 73603 | Law Enforcement Sends Juvenile Referral to States Attorney | Law Enforcement | Investigation | Incident | If the subject is a juvenile  
If law enforcement wants the State’s Attorney to review an incident for charges | Case Report  
Arrest Synopsis  
Juvenile Referral Form | State’s Attorney  
Investigation  
Prosecution Charging Decision |
| LAW ENFORCEMENT 73602 | Law Enforcement Sends Juvenile Detention Report to States Attorney | Law Enforcement | Investigation | Arrest | If a juvenile is held at the Juvenile Justice Center  
If the court orders a psychological evaluation | Case Report  
Arrest Synopsis  
Juvenile Referral Form | State’s Attorney  
Investigation  
Prosecution Petition Filing Decision |
| JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 77100 | Juvenile Court Services Sends Request for Psychological Evaluation to Kane County Diagnostic Center | Juvenile Court Services | Pre-disposition Court  
Psychological Evaluation Referral | Psychological Evaluation  
Referral | Referral Form  
Case Report  
Court Order | Kane County Diagnostic Center  
Pre-disposition Court  
Prepare Report |
# Kane County Case Management System (CMS) Assessment Project

## Charging Documents

### Document Centric Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exchange Name</th>
<th>Exchange Description</th>
<th>Sending Agency</th>
<th>Prevaling Process</th>
<th>Triggering Event</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Receiving Agencies</th>
<th>Subsequent Process</th>
<th>Subsequent Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LAW ENFORCEMENT 21703 | Law Enforcement Detains Misdemeanor Arrest in Jail | Law Enforcement | Investigation | Arrest | • If the subject was not arrested on a warrant  
• If the charge is a misdemeanor  
• If the subject is held in the county jail | • Arrest Synopsis  
• Unsigned Order for Probable Cause  
• Misdemeanor Complaint | Jail | Detention | Intake |

| LAW ENFORCEMENT 21753 | Law Enforcement Detains Misdemeanor Arrest in Jail After Medical Release | Law Enforcement | Investigation | Arrest | • If a medical release is required for the subject to be detained  
• If the subject was not arrested on a warrant  
• If the charge is a misdemeanor  
• If the subject is held in the county jail | • Jail Medical Release to Admit  
• Arrest Synopsis  
• Unsigned Order for Probable Cause  
• Misdemeanor Complaint | Jail | Detention | Intake |
| LAW ENFORCEMENT 22101 | Law Enforcement Detains Misdemeanor Domestic Arrest in Jail | Law Enforcement Investigation | Arrest | If the charge is domestic related | If the subject was not arrested on a warrant | If the charge is a misdemeanor | If the subject is held in the county jail | Victim Notification Form | Arrest Synopsis | Misdemeanor Complaint | Unsigned Order for Probable Cause | Jail | Detention | Intake |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|------|-----------|--------|
| LAW ENFORCEMENT 22151 | Law Enforcement Detains Misdemeanor Domestic Arrest in Jail After Medical Release | Law Enforcement Investigation | Arrest | If the charge is domestic related | If the subject was not arrested on a warrant | If a medical release is required for the subject to be detained | If the charge is a misdemeanor | If the subject is held in the county jail | Victim Notification Form | Jail Medical Release to Admit | Arrest Synopsis | Unsigned Order for Probable Cause | Misdemeanor Complaint | Jail | Detention | Intake |
| LAW ENFORCEMENT 21702 | Law Enforcement Detains Misdemeanor Arrest in Holding Facility | Law Enforcement | Investigation | Arrest | • If the charge is not domestic related
  • If no medical release is required for the subject to be detained
  • If the subject was not arrested on a warrant
  • If the charge is a misdemeanor
  • If the subject is held in a local holding facility | • Arrest Synopsis
• Unsigned Order for Probable Cause
• Misdemeanor Complaint | Holding Facility | Detention | Intake |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------|--------|
| LAW ENFORCEMENT 21702 | Law Enforcement Detains Misdemeanor Arrest in Holding Facility | Law Enforcement | Investigation | Arrest | • If the charge is not domestic related
  • If no medical release is required for the subject to be detained
  • If the subject was not arrested on a warrant
  • If the charge is a misdemeanor
  • If the subject is held in a local holding facility | • Arrest Synopsis
• Unsigned Order for Probable Cause
• Misdemeanor Complaint | Holding Facility | Detention | Intake |
| LAW ENFORCEMENT 21752 | Law Enforcement Detains Misdemeanor Arrest in Holding Facility After Medical Release | Law Enforcement Investigation Arrest | • If a medical release is required for the subject to be detained  
• If the subject was not arrested on a warrant  
• If the charge is a misdemeanor  
• If the subject is held in a local holding facility  
• If the charge is domestic related | • Jail Medical Release to Admit  
• Arrest Synopsis  
• Unsigned Order for Probable Cause  
• Misdemeanor Complaint  
• Victim Notification Form | Holding Facility Detention Intake |
| LAW ENFORCEMENT 22103 | Law Enforcement Detains Misdemeanor Domestic Arrest in Holding Facility | Law Enforcement Investigation Arrest | • If the charge is domestic related  
• If the subject was not arrested on a warrant  
• If the charge is a misdemeanor  
• If the subject is held in a local holding facility | • Victim Notification Form  
• Arrest Synopsis  
• Misdemeanor Complaint  
• Unsigned Order for Probable Cause | Holding Facility Detention Intake |
### Kane County Case Management System (CMS) Assessment Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Incident</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Report/Document</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT 22153</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Detains Misdemeanor Domestic Arrest in Holding Facility After Medical Release</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>If the charge is domestic related, If the subject was not arrested on a warrant, If a medical release is required for the subject to be detained, If the charge is a misdemeanor, If the subject is held in a local holding facility</td>
<td>Holding Facility</td>
<td>Detention</td>
<td>Intake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT 76101</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Sends Request for Misdemeanor Arrest Warrant to Judge</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Arrest Warrant Request</td>
<td>If law enforcement decides to pursue an arrest warrant, If the court has assigned a case number</td>
<td>Unsigned Order for Probable Cause, Misdemeanor Complaint</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>At Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT 76103</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Sends Request for Misdemeanor Case Number to Court Clerk</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>Arrest Warrant Request</td>
<td>If law enforcement decides to pursue an arrest warrant, If the charge is a misdemeanor</td>
<td>Unsigned Order for Probable Cause, Misdemeanor Complaint</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>At Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT 71151</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Sends Request for Search Warrant to Judge</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Investigation Search Warrant Request</td>
<td>If law enforcement decides to pursue a search warrant</td>
<td>• Complaint • Search Warrant</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>Investigation Search Warrant Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATES ATTORNEY 25101</td>
<td>States Attorney Files Misdemeanor Complaint With Court Clerk</td>
<td>State's Attorney Investigation Prosecution Charging Decision</td>
<td>• If a State's Attorney decides to file a charge • If the charge is a misdemeanor • If law enforcement does not make an arrest while investigating an incident • If the complainant comes to the State's Attorney to file charges • If the victim comes to state's attorney with case report requesting prosecution</td>
<td>Misdemeanor Complaint</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court Initial Appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Kane County Case Management System (CMS) Assessment Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATES ATTORNEY 25100</th>
<th>States Attorney Sends Misdemeanor Complaint to Law Enforcement</th>
<th>State's Attorney</th>
<th>Investigation</th>
<th>Prosecution Charging Decision</th>
<th>Misdemeanor Complaint</th>
<th>Law Enforcement</th>
<th>Investigation</th>
<th>Update Case File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>States Attorney Sends Request for Direct Indictment Hearing to Grand Jury</td>
<td>State's Attorney</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Prosecution Charging Decision</td>
<td>If the charge is a felony</td>
<td>Bill of Information</td>
<td>Grand Jury</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Grand Jury Indictment Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States Attorney Sends Indictment to States Attorney</td>
<td>Grand Jury</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Grand Jury Indictment Decision</td>
<td>If a Grand Jury issues a true bill</td>
<td>Indictment</td>
<td>State's Attorney</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Prosecution Charging Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States Attorney Sends Indictment to Court Clerk</td>
<td>State's Attorney</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Prosecution Charging Decision</td>
<td>If a Grand Jury issues a true bill</td>
<td>Indictment</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Status Hearing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Kane County Case Management System (CMS) Assessment Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States Attorney</th>
<th>Process Description</th>
<th>Institute/Office</th>
<th>Next Step Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>States Attorney Sends Petition to Adjudicate to Court Clerk</td>
<td>State's Attorney sends petition to adjudicate to court clerk.</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Prosecution Charging Decision: If a State's Attorney decides to file a charge, if the subject is a juvenile, Petition to Adjudicate, Court Clerk, Pre-disposition Court, Initial Appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States Attorney Sends Request for Misdemeanor Case Number to Court Clerk</td>
<td>State's Attorney sends request for misdemeanor case number to court clerk.</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Arrest Warrant Request: If a State's Attorney decides to file a charge, the charge is a misdemeanor, Court Clerk, Case Number Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States Attorney Sends Request for Misdemeanor Arrest Warrant to Court Clerk</td>
<td>State's Attorney sends request for misdemeanor arrest warrant to court clerk.</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Arrest Warrant Request: If a State's Attorney decides to pursue a warrant, the charge is a misdemeanor, if the court has assigned a case number, Court Clerk, At Large, Probable Cause Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States Attorney Sends Request for Summons to Judge</td>
<td>State's Attorney sends request for summons to judge.</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Summons Request: If the State's Attorney decides to pursue an summons rather than an arrest warrant, Misdemeanor Complaint, UNSIGNED Summons, Judge, At Large, Summons Issued</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Kane County Case Management System (CMS) Assessment Project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATES ATTORNEY 73103</th>
<th>States Attorney Sends Request for Protection Order (no arrest) to Court Clerk</th>
<th>State's Attorney</th>
<th>Investigation</th>
<th>Request Protection Order</th>
<th>If the charge is domestic related • If a police report has been filed • If the victim requests a protection order</th>
<th>Summons • Court Findings • Petition for Protection Order • Protection Order • Complaint • Signed Order for Probable Cause</th>
<th>Court Clerk</th>
<th>Investigation</th>
<th>Protection Order Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATES ATTORNEY 71200</td>
<td>States Attorney Sends Amended Felony Complaint to Court Clerk</td>
<td>State's Attorney</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Amendment of Charges</td>
<td>If the State's Attorney wants to amend the original charge • If the charge is a felony</td>
<td>Amended Felony Complaint</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Status Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATES ATTORNEY 71503</td>
<td>States Attorney Sends Amended Felony Complaint to Public Defender</td>
<td>State's Attorney</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Amendment of Charges</td>
<td>If the State's Attorney wants to amend the original charge • If the charge is a felony • If the defendant has a public defender</td>
<td>Amended Felony Complaint</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Update Case File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAIL 31501</td>
<td>Jail Sends Misdemeanor Complaint (detained) to Court Clerk</td>
<td>Jail</td>
<td>Detention</td>
<td>Intake</td>
<td>If the charge is a misdemeanor • If the subject was not arrested on a warrant • If the subject is held in the county jail</td>
<td>Misdemeanor Complaint</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Bond Call</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| JAIL 31503 | Jail Sends Misdemeanor Complaint (detained) to States Attorney | Jail | Detention | Intake | • If the charge is a misdemeanor  
• If the subject was not arrested on a warrant  
• If the subject is held in the county jail | Arrest Synopsis  
Misdemeanor Complaint | State's Attorney | Detention | Update Case File |
| JAIL 31508 | Jail Sends Misdemeanor Complaint (released) to Court Clerk | Jail | Detention | Booking | • If the charge is a misdemeanor  
• If the subject was not arrested on a warrant  
• If the subject is released on bond from the county jail | Misdemeanor Complaint  
Bond Sheet | Court Clerk | Pre-disposition Court | Initial Appearance |
| JAIL 31509 | Jail Sends Misdemeanor Complaint (released) to States Attorney | Jail | Detention | Booking | • If the charge is a misdemeanor  
• If the subject was not arrested on a warrant  
• If the subject is released on bond from the county jail | Arrest Synopsis  
Misdemeanor Complaint  
Bond Sheet | State's Attorney | Detention | Update Case File |
| HOLDING FACILITY 31501 | Holding Facility Sends Misdemeanor Complaint (detained) to Court Clerk | Holding Facility | Detention | Intake | • If the charge is a misdemeanor  
• If the subject was not arrested on a warrant  
• If the subject is held in a local holding facility | Misdemeanor Complaint | Court Clerk | Pre-disposition Court | Bond Call |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holding Facility</th>
<th>Detention</th>
<th>Intake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOLDING FACILITY 31503</td>
<td>Holding Facility</td>
<td>Intake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLDING FACILITY 31508</td>
<td>Holding Facility</td>
<td>Booking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLDING FACILITY 31509</td>
<td>Holding Facility</td>
<td>Booking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- If the charge is a misdemeanor
- If the subject was not arrested on a warrant
- If the subject is held in a local holding facility
- Arrest Synopsis
- Misdemeanor Complaint
- Bond Sheet
- Pre-disposition Court
- Initial Appearance
- Update Case File
### Citation
#### Document Centric Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exchange Name</th>
<th>Exchange Description</th>
<th>Sending Agency</th>
<th>Prevailing Process</th>
<th>Triggering Event</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Receiving Agencies</th>
<th>Subsequent Process</th>
<th>Subsequent Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT 71150</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Sends Citation to Court Clerk</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Cite and Release</td>
<td>• If law enforcement chooses to route a citation through court&lt;br&gt;• If a citation is issued&lt;br&gt;• If a citation is not for DUI</td>
<td>Citation&lt;br&gt;Citation Transfer Sheet</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Initial Appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT 71254</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Sends DUI Arrest to Court Clerk</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>• If the subject was not arrested on a warrant&lt;br&gt;• If the charge is a misdemeanor&lt;br&gt;• If a citation is for DUI&lt;br&gt;• If the subject is released on bond</td>
<td>Warning to Motorist&lt;br&gt;Law Enforcement Sworn Affidavit of Arrest&lt;br&gt;Citation</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Initial Appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW ENFORCEMENT 71253</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Sends DUI Arrest to States Attorney</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>• If the subject was not arrested on a warrant&lt;br&gt;• If the charge is a misdemeanor&lt;br&gt;• If a citation is for DUI&lt;br&gt;• If the subject is released on bond</td>
<td>Warning to Motorist&lt;br&gt;Law Enforcement Sworn Affidavit of Arrest&lt;br&gt;Citation</td>
<td>State's Attorney</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Update Case File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange Name</td>
<td>Exchange Description</td>
<td>Sending Agency</td>
<td>Prevailing Process</td>
<td>Triggering Event</td>
<td>Conditions</td>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Receiving Agencies</td>
<td>Subsequent Process</td>
<td>Subsequent Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT CLERK 12452</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Continuance Order at Bond Call to States Attorney</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Bond Call</td>
<td>If the court sets bond</td>
<td>Continuance Order</td>
<td>State’s Attorney</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Update Case File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT CLERK 12456</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Continuance Order at Bond Call to Court Services</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Bond Call</td>
<td>• If the court sets bond</td>
<td>Continuance Order</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Supervision</td>
<td>Intake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT CLERK 12453</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Continuance Order at Bond Call to Public Defender</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Bond Call</td>
<td>• If the court sets bond</td>
<td>Continuance Order</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Update Case File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT CLERK 41501</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Continuance/Transport Order to Jail</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Initial Appearance</td>
<td>• If a subject is in jail</td>
<td>Continuance Order</td>
<td>Jail</td>
<td>Detention</td>
<td>Transport Subject to Jail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| COURT CLERK 41500 | Court Clerk Sends Continuance/Transport Order to Holding Facility | Court Clerk | Pre-disposition Court | Initial Appearance | • If a subject is in a holding facility  
• If the case is continued  
• If the subject is to remain in custody | Continuance Order | Holding Facility | Detention | Transport Subject to Holding Facility |
|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------|
| COURT CLERK 65402| Court Clerk Sends Continuance Order at Initial Appearance to Court Services | Court Clerk | Pre-disposition Court | Initial Appearance | • If the defendant is able to post bond  
• If the bond contains conditions | Continuance Order | Court Services | Pre-disposition Supervision | Intake |
| COURT CLERK 71800| Court Clerk Sends Diversion Order to States Attorney | Court Clerk | Pre-disposition Court | Status Hearing | If a diversion agreement is reached | Continuance Order | State's Attorney | Pre-disposition Court | Update Case File |
| COURT CLERK 71801| Court Clerk Sends Diversion Order to Public Defender | Court Clerk | Pre-disposition Court | Status Hearing | • If a diversion agreement is reached  
• If the defendant has a public defender | Continuance Order | Public Defender | Pre-disposition Court | Update Case File |
| COURT CLERK 15902| Court Clerk Sends Booking Order to Jail | Court Clerk | Pre-disposition Court | Status Hearing | • If the court orders a defendant to be booked at the jail  
• If the subject has not been booked | Continuance Order | Jail | Detention | Booking |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court Clerk Code</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
<th>Disposition Court</th>
<th>Status Hearing</th>
<th>Continuance Order Reason</th>
<th>Continuance Order To</th>
<th>Final Disposition</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41650</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Continuance Order to Jail - Defendant to Remain in Custody</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Status Hearing</td>
<td>If the subject is to remain in custody</td>
<td>Continuance Order</td>
<td>Jail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66400</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Continuance Order to Court Services</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Status Hearing</td>
<td>If the bond contains conditions</td>
<td>Continuance Order</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66401</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Continuance Order to States Attorney</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Status Hearing</td>
<td>If the case is continued</td>
<td>Continuance Order</td>
<td>State's Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66402</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Continuance Order to Public Defender</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Status Hearing</td>
<td>If the case is continued</td>
<td>Continuance Order</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71804</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Diversion Failure Order to Public Defender</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Status Hearing</td>
<td>If the defendant has a public defender</td>
<td>Continuance Order</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71805</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Diversion Failure Order to States Attorney</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Status Hearing</td>
<td>If a subject fails the diversion program</td>
<td>Continuance Order</td>
<td>State's Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77102</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Drug Court Failure Order to States Attorney</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Post-disposition Court</td>
<td>Status Hearing</td>
<td>If a subject fails drug court</td>
<td>Continuance Order</td>
<td>State's Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Action Description</td>
<td>Post-Disposition Court</td>
<td>Status Hearing</td>
<td>Continuance Order</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>Post-Disposition Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT CLERK 77103</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Drug Court Failure Order to Public Defender</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Post-Disposition Court</td>
<td>Status Hearing</td>
<td>If a subject fails drug court</td>
<td>Continuance Order</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT CLERK 77104</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Drug Court Failure Order to Court Services</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Post-Disposition Court</td>
<td>Status Hearing</td>
<td>If a subject fails drug court</td>
<td>Continuance Order</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT CLERK 77107</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends TA Court Failure Order to Kane County Diagnostic Center</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Post-Disposition Court</td>
<td>Status Hearing</td>
<td>If a subject fails TA court</td>
<td>Continuance Order</td>
<td>Kane County Diagnostic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT CLERK 77108</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends TA Court Failure Order to Public Defender</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Post-Disposition Court</td>
<td>Status Hearing</td>
<td>If a subject fails TA court</td>
<td>Continuance Order</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT CLERK 77109</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends TA Court Failure Order to States Attorney</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Post-Disposition Court</td>
<td>Status Hearing</td>
<td>If a subject fails TA court</td>
<td>Continuance Order</td>
<td>State's Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT CLERK 22222</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Court Order regarding PTR to State's Attorney, Court Services - need for revocation hearing</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Post-Disposition Court</td>
<td>PTR Hearing</td>
<td>If court finds that defendant has violated terms of supervision</td>
<td>Continuance Order</td>
<td>State's Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT CLERK 22224</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Court Order regarding PTR to Public Defender - need for revocation hearing</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Post-Disposition Court</td>
<td>PTR Hearing</td>
<td>If court finds that defendant has violated terms of supervision</td>
<td>Continuance Order</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Protection Order
Document Centric Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exchange Name</th>
<th>Exchange Description</th>
<th>Sending Agency</th>
<th>Prevailing Process</th>
<th>Triggering Event</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Receiving Agencies</th>
<th>Subsequent Process</th>
<th>Subsequent Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| STATES ATTORNEY 73102 | States Attorney Sends Request for Protection Order (arrested) to Court Clerk | State's Attorney | Investigation | Request Protection Order | • If the charge is domestic related  
• If a police report has been filed  
• If the victim requests a protection order  
• If the defendant has been arrested | • Summons  
• Court Findings  
• Petition for Protection Order  
• Protection Order | Court Clerk | Investigation | Protection Order Hearing |
| STATES ATTORNEY 73103 | States Attorney Sends Request for Protection Order (no arrest) to Court Clerk | State's Attorney | Investigation | Request Protection Order | • If the charge is domestic related  
• If a police report has been filed  
• If the victim requests a protection order | • Summons  
• Court Findings  
• Petition for Protection Order  
• Protection Order  
• Complaint  
• Signed Order for Probable Cause | Court Clerk | Investigation | Protection Order Hearing |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURTS CLERK 15607</th>
<th>Court Clerk Sends Protection Order to Sheriff’s Office</th>
<th>Court Clerk</th>
<th>Pre-disposition Court</th>
<th>Protection Order Hearing</th>
<th>If a Judge signs a protection order</th>
<th>Sheriff’s Office</th>
<th>Pre-disposition Court</th>
<th>Protection Order Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHERIFFS OFFICE 21804</td>
<td>Sheriff’s Office Sends Protection Order to LEADS</td>
<td>Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Protection Order Entry</td>
<td>If a Judge signs a protection order</td>
<td>Protection Order Information</td>
<td>LEADS</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHERIFFS OFFICE 21802</td>
<td>Sheriff’s Office Sends Protection Order Update to LEADS</td>
<td>Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
<td>Protection Order Entry</td>
<td>If the protection order was served</td>
<td>Protection Order Information</td>
<td>LEADS</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Pre-Sentence Investigation (PSI) Report

**Document Centric Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exchange Name</th>
<th>Exchange Description</th>
<th>Sending Agency</th>
<th>Prevailing Process</th>
<th>Triggering Event</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Receiving Agencies</th>
<th>Subsequent Process</th>
<th>Subsequent Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COURT SERVICES 76300</td>
<td>Court Services Sends Presentence Investigation Report to Court Clerk</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Prepare Report</td>
<td>If the court orders a pre-sentence investigation</td>
<td>Presentence Investigation Report</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Post-disposition Court</td>
<td>Sentence Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT SERVICES 76351</td>
<td>Court Services Sends Presentence Investigation Report to States Attorney</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Prepare Report</td>
<td>If the court orders a pre-sentence investigation</td>
<td>Presentence Investigation Report</td>
<td>State's Attorney</td>
<td>Pre-disposition Court</td>
<td>Update Case File</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| COURT SERVICES 76350 | Court Services Sends Presentence Investigation Report to Public Defender | Court Services | Pre-disposition Court | Prepare Report | • If the court orders a pre-sentence investigation  
• If the defendant has a public defender | Presentence Investigation Report | Public Defender | Pre-disposition Court | Update Case File |
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## Sentence Order

### Document Centric Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exchange Name</th>
<th>Exchange Description</th>
<th>Sending Agency</th>
<th>Prevailing Process</th>
<th>Triggering Event</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Receiving Agencies</th>
<th>Subsequent Process</th>
<th>Subsequent Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COURT CLERK 15620</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Sentence Order to States Attorney</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Post-disposition Court</td>
<td>Sentence Hearing</td>
<td>If the case is being prosecuted by the State's Attorney</td>
<td>Sentence Order</td>
<td>State's Attorney</td>
<td>Post-disposition Court</td>
<td>Update Case File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT CLERK 15611</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Sentence Order to Public Defender</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Post-disposition Court</td>
<td>Sentence Hearing</td>
<td>If the defendant has a public defender</td>
<td>Sentence Order</td>
<td>Public Defender</td>
<td>Post-disposition Court</td>
<td>Update Case File</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| COURT CLERK 15901 | Court Clerk Sends Sentence/Release Order to Jail | Court Clerk | Post-disposition Court | Sentence Hearing | • If the charge is a misdemeanor  
• If the defendant is found guilty  
• If the defendant is given credit for time served | • Release Order  
• Sentence Order | Jail | Detention | Release |
| COURT CLERK 15615 | Court Clerk Sends Sentence Order to Court Services | Court Clerk | Post-disposition Court | Sentence Hearing | If a subject is sentenced to probation | Sentence Order | Court Services | Post-disposition Supervision | Intake |
| COURT CLERK 62700 | Court Clerk Sends Request for DNA Test to Court Services | Court Clerk | Post-disposition Court | Sentence Hearing | • If a subject is sentenced to probation  
• If the court orders a biological test  
• If the charge is a felony | Sentence Order | Court Services | Post-disposition Supervision | Collect Biological Sample |
| COURT CLERK 15616 | Court Clerk Sends Sentence Order to Juvenile Court Services | Court Clerk | Post-disposition Court | Sentence Hearing | • If a subject is sentenced to probation  
• If the subject is a juvenile | Sentence Order | Juvenile Court Services | Post-disposition Supervision | Intake |
| COURT CLERK 62701 | Court Clerk Sends Request for DNA Test to Juvenile Court Services | Court Clerk | Post-disposition Court | Sentence Hearing | • If the court orders a biological test  
• If the charge is a felony  
• If a subject is sentenced to probation  
• If the subject is a juvenile | Sentence Order | Juvenile Court Services | Post-disposition Supervision | Collect Biological Sample |
| COURT CLERK 25151 | Court Clerk Sends Prison Order to States Attorney | Court Clerk | Post-disposition Court | Sentence Hearing | If a subject is sentenced to prison | Sentence Order | State’s Attorney | Post-disposition Court | Update Case File |
| COURT CLERK 25100 | Court Clerk Sends Prison Order to Jail | Court Clerk | Post-disposition Court | Sentence Hearing | If a subject is sentenced to prison | Sentence Order | Jail | Incarceration | Deliver Subject to DOC |
| COURT CLERK 25150 | Court Clerk Sends Prison Order to Public Defender | Court Clerk | Post-disposition Court | Sentence Hearing | • If a subject is sentenced to prison  
• If the defendant has a public defender | Sentence Order | Public Defender | Post-disposition Court | Update Case File |
| COURT CLERK 71850 | Court Clerk Sends Drug Court Order to States Attorney | Court Clerk | Post-disposition Court | Sentence Hearing | If a subject enters the drug court program | Sentence Order | State’s Attorney | Post-disposition Court | Update Case File |
| COURT CLERK 71851 | Court Clerk Sends Drug Court Order to Public Defender | Court Clerk | Post-disposition Court | Sentence Hearing | • If a subject enters the drug court program  
• If the defendant has a public defender | Sentence Order | Public Defender | Post-disposition Court | Update Case File |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COURT CLERK 71852</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends Drug Court Order to Court Services</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Post-disposition Court</td>
<td>Sentence Hearing</td>
<td>If a subject enters the drug court program</td>
<td>Sentence Order</td>
<td>Court Services</td>
<td>Post-disposition Court</td>
<td>Update Case File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURT CLERK 71858</td>
<td>Court Clerk Sends TA Court Order to States Attorney</td>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td>Post-disposition Court</td>
<td>Sentence Hearing</td>
<td>If a subject enters the TA court program</td>
<td>Sentence Order</td>
<td>State's Attorney</td>
<td>Post-disposition Court</td>
<td>Update Case File</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| COURT CLERK 71857 | Court Clerk Sends TA Court Order to Public Defender | Court Clerk | Post-disposition Court | Sentence Hearing | • If the defendant has a public defender  
• If a subject enters the TA court program | Sentence Order | Public Defender | Post-disposition Court | Update Case File |
| COURT CLERK 71856 | Court Clerk Sends TA Court Order to Kane County Diagnostic Center | Court Clerk | Post-disposition Court | Sentence Hearing | If a subject enters the TA court program | Sentence Order | Kane County Diagnostic Center | Post-disposition Court | Update Case File |
| COURT CLERK 15617 | Court Clerk Sends Sentence Order to Juvenile Justice Center | Court Clerk | Post-disposition Court | Sentence Hearing | • If a subject is sentenced to detention  
• If the subject is a juvenile | Sentence Order | Juvenile Justice Center | Incarceration | Intake |
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| COURT CLERK 41660 | Court Clerk Sends Remand Order to Juvenile Justice Center | Court Clerk | Post-disposition Court | Sentence Hearing | • If the subject is a juvenile  
• If minor is sentenced to serve time in JJC  
• If the subject is to be remanded into custody | • Sentence Order  
• Remand Order | Juvenile Justice Center | Incarceration | Remand |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| JUVENILE COURT SERVICES 23200 | Juvenile Court Services Sends Gang Conditions to Law Enforcement (Aurora PD Gang Unit) | Juvenile Court Services | Post-disposition Supervision | Intake | • If gang conditions exist  
• If the subject is a juvenile | Sentence Order | Law Enforcement | Post-disposition Supervision | Update Case File |
| COURT CLERK 22231 | Court Clerk Sends Court Order to Court Services, State's Attorney at Revocation Hearing -- PSI Not Needed to Resentence | Court Clerk | Post-disposition Court | Revocation Hearing | • If court finds that defendant has violated terms of supervision  
• If court is prepared to resentence defendant | Sentence Order | • Court Services  
• State's Attorney | Post-disposition Court | Update Case File |
| COURT CLERK 22233 | Court Clerk Sends Court Order to Public Defender at Revocation Hearing -- PSI Not Needed to Resentence | Court Clerk | Post-disposition Court | Revocation Hearing | • If court finds that defendant has violated terms of supervision  
• If court is prepared to resentence defendant  
• If the defendant has a public defender | Sentence Order | Public Defender | Post-disposition Court | Update Case File |