

# County-Level Justice Systems Integration Survey Results

In February 2006, IIJIS staff mailed surveys to chairs of each county board. The survey instrument asked each county to explain their integrated justice initiative's governance structure and planning efforts. It also requested information concerning the development of county-level integrated justice systems. The goal of the survey was to enhance the Implementation Board's understanding of county-level integrated justice initiatives. This was an important step in determining what types of assistance the board should make available to these projects. As of April 1<sup>st</sup>, 26% of the surveys have been returned.<sup>1</sup> This document sets forth the pertinent results and makes recommendations to help support county-level integrated justice efforts.

<b>General Automation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>48% of respondents indicated that there was some electronic exchange of justice information taking place</b> in their county. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The narrative responses indicated that the majority of electronic information sharing takes place between justice agencies.<sup>2</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Governance Structure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>74% of respondents did not have any type of intergovernmental or interagency governance structure</b> to help plan justice integration projects. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Those counties that had a governance structure in place developed governing bodies that were tailored to meet each county's needs.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Integration Planning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>74% of respondents reported that they did not have strategic plans</b> for the integration of justice information systems. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seven counties reported that there was some type of planning documentation but explained that the plans were either outdated or were still being developed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Only six counties (22%) indicated that they had conducted an analysis of the points in the justice system where essential information is exchanged between justice agencies.<sup>3</sup> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Of those six, only three utilized the Justice Information Exchange Model (JIEM) tool provided by SEARCH and the U.S. Bureau of Justice Assistance.</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Only four counties (15%) responded that they had an integrated justice proof-of-concept project at least planned.</li> </ul>
<b>Standards</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>59% of respondents (16 counties) had no plans to incorporate the Global Justice XML Data Model</b> into their existing or future justice information systems.</li> </ul>
<b>Findings &amp; Recommendations</b>	<p><b>[1] A majority of respondents<sup>4</sup> who completed the survey did so without comprehensive knowledge of justice systems integration.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> IIJIS should continue educating counties about justice information systems integration through increased outreach efforts.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> IIJIS should utilize its website as a centralized knowledge base for counties to go to for guidance as they address their integration issues. The website should serve as a conduit to share the Global work products with county-level integration efforts.</li> </ul> <p><b>[2] Several counties do not yet exchange justice information electronically.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> IIJIS should assess why counties aren't exchanging information electronically and develop strategies to increase the number of counties that are sharing data electronically.</li> </ul> <p><b>[3] Strategic planning at the county-level seems to be lacking.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> IIJIS should assist counties in organizing governance structures and developing strategic plans.</li> </ul> <p><b>[4] Many counties do not have plans to utilize the Global JXDM.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> IIJIS should complete its review of the Global JXDM standard and adopt it as the Illinois standard for future justice information systems. This standard should then be publicized on the IIJIS website.</li> </ul> <p><b>[5] At least 16 counties are engaged in some type of integrated justice effort.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> IIJIS should follow up with these counties to gather more details about their efforts. This will help identify the areas where counties could use assistance from the statewide integrated justice initiative.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> IIJIS should identify all the counties engaged in integrated justice efforts.</li> </ul>

## County Integrated Justice Efforts

- [1] **Champaign County** – Champaign County was in the process of implementing the JANO Justice System Management application to electronically link the records of the Sheriff, State’s Attorney, Public Defender, and Court Clerk.
- [2] **Cook County** – The Cook County Integrated Criminal Justice Information System has completed its Strategic Plan and is developing its Detailed Plan of Action.
- [3] **DuPage County** – DuPage County implemented the DuPage Unified Court System, which provides the Sheriff, State’s Attorney, Public Defender, Court Services, and local law enforcement agencies with electronic access to court records.
- [4] **Kankakee County** – Kankakee County reported that it conducted an analysis of its information exchange-points and had a proof-of-concept project planned.
- [5] **Lake County** – Lake County has completed documenting adult criminal and juvenile exchanges and is developing a system to exchange information between its circuit court clerk and state’s attorney’s offices using the Global Justice XML Data Model.
- [6] **Macon County** – Macon County reported that it had a governance structure in place, developed both a strategic plan and a tactical plan regarding the integration of justice information systems, and conducted an information exchange-points analysis.
- [7] **McHenry County** – McHenry County documented the exchange points for adult criminal and juvenile delinquent processes and is developing an interface between its court case management system and the sheriff’s office to electronically transfer arrest warrant information.
- [8] **McLean County** – McLean County implemented E\*Justice, an integrated software package with courts, attorney, law enforcement and jail modules.
- [9] **St. Clair County** – St. Clair County reported that they conducted an analysis of its information exchange-points and had a tactical plan for the integration of its justice information systems.
- [10] **Stephenson County** – Stephenson County reported that it had a governance structure in place to integrate justice information systems.
- [11] **Tazewell County** – Tazewell County explored implementing the E\*Justice software solution utilized by McLean County.
- [12] **Winnebago County** – Winnebago County indicated that it had a governance structure in place to integrate justice information systems and that it had conducted an information exchange-points analysis using the JIEM tool.
- [13] **Edgar, Kendall, Mason, & Mercer Counties** – These four counties indicated that they had county-level information systems that were integrated with the information systems of other counties.

<sup>1</sup> The following 27 counties responded to the survey: Calhoun, Clinton, Edgar, Fulton, Greene, Jackson, Kane, Kankakee, Kendall, Lake, Macon, Mason, McHenry, McLean, Mercer, Moultrie, Piatt, Pike, Pope, Richland, Rock Island, Schuyler, Shelby, St. Clair, Stephenson, Whiteside, and Winnebago. The response rate is average given the mailed survey method employed.

<sup>2</sup> The types of agency information sharing identified by respondents is set forth in the following table:

Electronic Information Sharing	Responses
Within an agency	2
Between agencies	10
Both within and between agencies	3

<sup>3</sup> The six counties include: Kankakee, Lake, Macon, McHenry, St. Clair, and Winnebago.

<sup>4</sup> Approximately 24 responses (89%) revealed a lack of education about information systems integration.