

**ANNUAL REPORT  
OF THE  
AUTOMATION AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE  
TO THE ILLINOIS JUDICIAL CONFERENCE**

Hon. Robert E. Byrne, Chair

Hon. Francis J. Dolan  
Hon. John K. Greanias  
Hon. R. Peter Grometer  
Hon. Thomas H. Sutton

Hon. George W. Timberlake  
Hon. Edna Turkington  
Hon. Grant S. Wegner

October 2005

## I. STATEMENT ON COMMITTEE CONTINUATION

The Automation and Technology Committee (“Committee”) of the Illinois Judicial Conference is charged with evaluating, monitoring, coordinating and making recommendations concerning automated systems for the Illinois judiciary. This is a formidable undertaking, given the variety of technological applications available to the courts. Technology affects, or has the potential to affect, nearly every operational and administrative judicial function. New and improved applications and devices are introduced regularly, each promising to bestow greater efficiency upon the judicial system and lowering operating costs. Moreover, technology choices must be made carefully and guided by thorough evaluation before resources are committed. The Committee occupies a unique position in this regard.

Since its inception, the Committee has reviewed automation-related work being done by other judicial branch committees and criminal justice agencies; surveyed Illinois judges’ use of computers and other automated systems; evaluated a number of software applications; assisted in the development of a computer education program for judges; developed a web page concept for the Illinois judiciary, which was approved by the Judicial Conference and Supreme Court for implementation; distributed a computer security brief at the Education Conference 2002; made a recommendation during 2003 to amend Supreme Court Rule 63A(7) regarding technology issues; surveyed the trial courts to identify funding sources for automation projects in 2005; and pursued a variety of other activities in fulfillment of its charge. Much remains to be accomplished. Accordingly, the Committee respectfully requests that it be continued.

## II. SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

### *Computer Security*

During the 2005 Conference Year, the Committee reviewed numerous security briefs and articles that identified viruses and worms that affect computer systems. The staff liaisons of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC) were essential to the collection and review process. The Committee attempted to identify different ways to inform members of the judiciary of new threats in a timely manner. One concept discussed was to utilize the listserver designed for the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges. Information regarding new threats could be posted as the information became available. One new security issue that surfaced during the 2005 Conference Year was “Phishing.” This process usually begins with an email requesting a user to update their personal information on the user’s banking site or other financial site. A link in the email takes the user to a look-a-like site for his/her financial institution where personal IDs and passwords are requested to be entered, allowing them to be copied by the email author. The Committee continues to review these types of threats and look for the best method to distribute information about them in a more timely and efficient manner.

### *Illinois Judiciary Survey on Technology Usage*

The *Illinois Judicial Survey on Technology Usage*, which was conducted by the Committee during the 2004 Judicial Conference Year showed that 298 (84.4%) judges, of the 353 judges responding to the survey, indicated that they would take advantage of additional computer training,

if made available. Considering that the percentage was so high, the Committee believed it should tabulate this data by circuit and provide it to the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges, so that they would be aware of the responses from the judges in their circuit. With the assistance of the AOIC, a report by circuit was provided to the Chairman of the Conference of Chief Circuit Judges for distribution to its membership in April 2005.

### *Illinois Court Technology Survey*

With the continued changes in technology, the Committee attempts to keep abreast of how the judiciary is positioned with technology and how the technology is funded. To assist the Committee in this effort, a survey was conducted of the case management systems used in the Illinois courts, how they are managed, who uses the information, and how they are funded. Since automation is ever-changing in the court systems, the survey will serve as a guide for these purposes.

Generally, the survey was conducted to collect information on the case management systems, funding of these systems, integration with other offices, and whether the information collected is used by judges and/or the public. In addition, the survey also collected information regarding general computer use by judges and the availability of research tools and internet access.

During the 2004 Conference Year, the Committee indicated that the AOIC offered to take the lead role in collecting and disseminating the survey results. On behalf of the Committee, the AOIC distributed the survey to the chief circuit judge of each circuit who was asked to forward the survey to the presiding judge or Information Technology Manager in each county of their circuit. In total, one-hundred two surveys were distributed. Of those, eighty-five surveys were returned giving a response rate of roughly 83 percent.

Questions one and two collected county, circuit and contact information. The remainder of the survey consisted of a total of fourteen questions. A complete copy of the survey results has been attached to this Report (See Appendix 1). Of the eighty-five responses, sixty-five (76.5%) responded that the case management information system utilized by the Circuit Clerk is JIMS (Goodin & Associates). Six (7.1%) of the responses indicated that the case management information system used was JANO; six (7.1%) use the Justice Addition of Sustain; one response (1.2%) identified the use of the MAXIMUS case management system; three (3.5%) currently utilize the Clerk's proprietary system; and seven (8.2%) are maintaining case management information using other systems such as IBM, GAVEL, Integrated Justice Information System, and Choice Information Systems. However, it should be noted that MAXIMUS recently purchased Manatron's GAVEL case management system. Those counties identified the GAVEL system in the other category. In one instance, one of the counties identified two systems in use, Choice Information Systems and Justice Addition of Sustain. Choice was purchased by and upgraded by Justice Addition of Sustain.

A majority of judges may view case management information in a variety of areas. Of the responses received, sixty-nine (81.2%) of judges can view case management information in their chambers while fifty-six (65.9%) can view this information while on the bench. With internet usage

becoming more widely available, nineteen (22.4%) of judges have begun taking advantage of the availability of viewing case management information via the internet. Nine (10.6%) of the responses received indicated judges could not view the information.

Public access to court records is an important part of technology today. The Circuit Clerk's office is the preferred method of public access with seventy-five (88.2%) of the responses using a terminal in the Circuit Clerk's office to view case management information. Thirty-two (37.6%) of the responses can access this information via the internet, while nine (10.6%) cannot view case management information electronically.

If the public can view case management information electronically, the information allowed to be viewed varies. Of the responses received, seventy (82.4%) can view court dockets; forty-six (54.1%) of the public can view record sheet entries; sixty-five (76.5%) can locate fine and fee balances electronically, while fourteen (16.5%) use public access to find disposition information, hearing dates, case information, and child support information.

The survey collected computer availability information. Seventy-three (85.9%) responded that computers were available to all judges in chambers, while thirty-six (42.4%) of the responses indicated that all judges have a computer available on the bench. Thirty-four (40.0%) of the responses, indicated in the survey, used a mobile laptop computer in their duties. Only four (4.7%) of the responses reflected that computers were not available to all judges in their county.

Research continues to be a very important tool in judicial duties. With increased technology use, online legal research is an invaluable tool. Of the responses for the judges who have online legal research available, eighty (94.1%) advised they can access this information in chambers; thirty-two (37.6%) have online legal research on the bench; thirty-four (40.0%) are using the internet to access research tools; three (3.5%) responded that online legal research is not available to judges at this time.

The survey asked what software was used for online legal research: Westlaw, Lexis, or other software vendor. The responses indicated that Westlaw was the preferred software vendor with sixty-three (74.1%). Thirty-three (38.8%) use Lexis for online legal research. The remainder of the responses, eleven (12.9%), indicated Findlaw or other software is used for online research purposes.

Considering the importance of online legal research and internet access, the survey collected information regarding internet access for judges. The overwhelming response was that most judges have access to the internet with eighty-four (98.8%) having access in chambers and thirty-two (37.6%) having access on the bench.

The speed of the internet access is an important factor. Of the responses received, fifty-nine (69.4%) use either a high-speed cable or DSL connection. Only twelve (14.1%) use a dial-up connection for the internet, which is considerably slower than the cable or DSL connections. Thirty-seven (43.5%) use a T1 line to access the internet. Other connections to the internet described in the survey, with six (7.1%) responding, were wireless and satellite. Note that these responses total more than one hundred percent, as many of the responses identified more than one connection speed was available.

Computer security continues to be a pursuit that needs to be considered. Virus protection software needs to be kept current, thereby preventing infection and eliminating the time and effort

spent to repair any damage caused. Various virus and worm software protection is available including: Norton, McAfee, AVG, and PANDA. Of the responses received, the majority, fifty-one (60.0%), use Norton to protect their computers from viruses. The remainder of the responses indicated that other vendors were preferred. Thirteen (15.3%) use McAfee; four (4.7%) use AVG; and twenty (23.5%) use another form of protection such as Symantec or E-trust Anti-virus. None of the responses indicated the use of PANDA as the method of virus protection.

Funds to pay for the computer hardware and software come from a variety and combination of funds. Forty-six (54.1%) of the responses collected use county funds; forty-eight (56.5%) use Circuit Clerk special funds; thirty-six (42.4%) spend court special funds on computer hardware and software. Three (3.5%) of the responses indicated grant funds were utilized such as a drug court grant.

The majority, sixty-nine (81.2%), of the funds used to pay for internet access and online research for judges comes from county funds. Circuit Clerk special funds are used for seventeen (20.0%); twenty-three (27.1%) use court special funds for internet access and online legal research for judges. One response indicated that access is funded through the superintendent of school's office.

Integration of the Circuit Clerk's case management system with other county offices plays an important role in information sharing and case flow. Of the responses received sixty-four (75.3%) are integrated with the Probation Department in their county. Forty-four (51.8%) indicated the State's Attorney has access to the case management system. Nineteen (22.4%) of the Sheriff /Police Departments share information with the Circuit Clerk's Office using the case management system. Other agencies included Public Defender, Court Reporters and other Circuit Clerk's Offices. Fifteen (17.6%) of the responses received indicated the Circuit Clerk's case management system was not integrated with other county offices.

The final survey question asked about future integrated justice initiatives that may be underway or planned that would share court information outside of the county. Twenty-five (29.4%) of the returned surveys identified projects underway or that there are plans for these types of initiatives.

### *Video Conferencing*

The Committee reviewed its conference charge in an attempt to identify other activities and technologies that might be of interest to the Judicial Conference. One suggestion discussed by the Committee was the use of video conferencing to reduce the time and cost associated with expert witnesses and prisoner transports. Currently, some arraignments in Illinois are held through closed-circuit television. Expansion of that concept could prove beneficial to the trial courts. Additionally, using video conferencing to depose doctors and other witnesses could save hundreds of dollars in witness fees and the amount of time witnesses are away from their place of business. The Committee reviewed an article of a program that has been implemented in Cook County. Hopefully, the Committee can take a closer review of this project during the next Conference Year.

### **III. PROPOSED COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES FOR THE NEXT CONFERENCE YEAR**

During the 2006 Conference Year, the Committee, with the approval of the Conference and Court, will continue its efforts to review the results of the Illinois court technology survey on funding, continue its efforts to evaluate and provide notice to the judiciary of security issues, such as new viruses and worms, and continue to review the benefits of the use of video conferencing and other technologies by the judiciary.

The members of the Committee look forward to the coming Conference year and appreciate the opportunity to be of service to the Supreme Court and the judicial branch.

#### **IV. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee is making no recommendations to the Conference at this time.

2005 REPORT

# APPENDIX 1

## ILLINOIS JUDICIAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON AUTOMATION AND TECHNOLOGY

## Illinois Court Technology Survey Summary

Data is based on results of 85 survey responses. A total of 102 surveys were distributed, giving a response rate of 83.3% of surveys distributed.

1. Circuit/County
2. Name/Title/Address/Telephone/E-mail of contact person for Circuit/County
3. The case management information system utilized by the Circuit Clerk is:
 

<b><u>N = 65/76.5%</u></b>	JIMS (Goodin Assoc.)
<b><u>N = 6/7.1%</u></b>	JANO
<b><u>N = 6/7.1%</u></b>	Justice Addition of Sustain
<b><u>N = 1/1.2%</u></b>	MAXIMUS
<b><u>N = 3/3.5%</u></b>	Clerk's proprietary system
<b><u>N = 7/8.2%</u></b>	Other (describe)
4. Case management information may be viewed by judges:
 

<b><u>N = 69/81.2%</u></b>	In chambers
<b><u>N = 56/65.9%</u></b>	On bench
<b><u>N = 19/22.4%</u></b>	Away from courthouse via internet
<b><u>N = 9/10.6%</u></b>	Not viewable by judges
5. Public may view case management information by means of:
 

<b><u>N = 75/88.2%</u></b>	Public access terminal in Circuit Clerk's office
<b><u>N = 32/37.6%</u></b>	Public access via internet
<b><u>N = 9/10.6%</u></b>	Not viewable by public

## ILLINOIS JUDICIAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON AUTOMATION AND TECHNOLOGY

## Illinois Court Technology Survey Summary

6. Case management information viewable by public includes:

<b><u>N = 70/82.4%</u></b>	Court docket
<b><u>N = 46/54.1%</u></b>	Record sheet entries
<b><u>N = 65/76.5%</u></b>	Fine and fee balances
<b><u>N = 14/16.5%</u></b>	Other (describe)

7. Computers are available for all judges:

<b><u>N = 73/85.9%</u></b>	In chambers
<b><u>N = 36/42.4%</u></b>	On bench
<b><u>N = 34/40.0%</u></b>	Mobile laptop
<b><u>N = 4/4.7%</u></b>	Not available for all judges

8. Judges have online legal research available:

<b><u>N = 80/94.1%</u></b>	In chambers
<b><u>N = 32/37.6%</u></b>	On bench
<b><u>N = 34/40.0%</u></b>	Away from courthouse via internet
<b><u>N = 3/3.5%</u></b>	Not available

9. Online legal research for judges is:

<b><u>N = 63/74.1%</u></b>	Westlaw
<b><u>N = 33/38.8%</u></b>	Lexis
<b><u>N = 11/12.9%</u></b>	Other (describe)

## ILLINOIS JUDICIAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON AUTOMATION AND TECHNOLOGY

## Illinois Court Technology Survey Summary

10. Judges have internet access:
- |                            |             |
|----------------------------|-------------|
| <b><u>N = 84/98.8%</u></b> | In chambers |
| <b><u>N = 32/37.6%</u></b> | On bench    |
11. Internet access is:
- |                            |                  |
|----------------------------|------------------|
| <b><u>N = 12/14.1%</u></b> | Dial-up          |
| <b><u>N = 13/15.3%</u></b> | Cable            |
| <b><u>N = 46/54.1%</u></b> | DSL              |
| <b><u>N = 37/43.5%</u></b> | T1               |
| <b><u>N = 6/7.1%</u></b>   | Other (describe) |
12. Virus and worm software is:
- |                            |                  |
|----------------------------|------------------|
| <b><u>N = 51/60.0%</u></b> | Norton           |
| <b><u>N = 13/15.3%</u></b> | McAfee           |
| <b><u>N = 4/4.7%</u></b>   | AVG              |
| <b><u>N = 0/0.0%</u></b>   | PANDA            |
| <b><u>N = 20/23.5%</u></b> | Other (describe) |
13. Cost of judicial hardware and software is paid by:
- |                            |                             |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b><u>N = 46/54.1%</u></b> | County funds                |
| <b><u>N = 48/56.5%</u></b> | Circuit Clerk special funds |
| <b><u>N = 36/42.4%</u></b> | Court special funds         |
| <b><u>N = 3/3.5%</u></b>   | Grant Funds (describe)      |

*ILLINOIS JUDICIAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ON AUTOMATION AND TECHNOLOGY***Illinois Court Technology Survey Summary**

14. Cost internet access and online research for judges is paid by:
- |                            |                             |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b><u>N = 69/81.2%</u></b> | County funds                |
| <b><u>N = 17/20.0%</u></b> | Circuit Clerk special funds |
| <b><u>N = 23/27.1%</u></b> | Court special funds         |
| <b><u>N = 1/1.2%</u></b>   | Grant Funds (describe)      |
15. The Circuit Clerk case management system is integrated with:
- |                            |                                    |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b><u>N = 64/75.3%</u></b> | Probation                          |
| <b><u>N = 44/51.8%</u></b> | State's Attorney                   |
| <b><u>N = 14/16.5%</u></b> | Sheriff                            |
| <b><u>N = 5/5.9%</u></b>   | Police                             |
| <b><u>N = 13/15.3%</u></b> | Other (describe)                   |
| <b><u>N = 15/17.6%</u></b> | Not integrated with other offices. |
16. Please list any integrated justice initiatives underway or planned in your county that intend to share court information outside of your county.

## 2005 REPORT